



# City of Maricopa Redevelopment District Area Plan

May 2009  
Final Draft

Prepared by Morrison-Maierle, Inc.



For the City of Maricopa



### **Acknowledgments**

#### **City Council Members**

Anthony Smith, Mayor  
Brent Murphee, Vice-Mayor  
Councilmember Marvin Brown  
Councilmember Carl Diedrich  
Councilmember Joe Estes  
Councilmember Edward Farrell  
Councilmember Marquisha Griffin

#### **Planning and Zoning Commission Members**

Richard Reeves, Chairman  
Harry Dale Jones, Commissioner  
Thomas Bradbury, Commissioner  
Courtney Tyler, Commissioner  
Bruce Houghton, Commissioner  
Henry Wade, Commissioner  
William Michael Robertson, Commissioner

#### **City Staff**

Kevin Evans, City Manager  
Danielle Casey, Economic Development Manager  
Nicole Dailey, Assistant to the City Manager  
Brent Billingsley, Development Service Director  
Kazi Haque, Planning Manager  
Eric Fitzer, Planner II  
Many other city staff that provided information

#### **REDI Program, AZ Department of Commerce**

Tom Doyle, Program Director

#### **Industrial Development Authority Board Members**

#### **Ak-Chin and Gila River Indian Community Councilmembers and Staff**

Resident, business and property owner stakeholders interviewed and workshop participants

#### **Consulting Team**

##### ***Morrison-Maierle Inc.***

Keith Belden, Project Director  
Paul Basha                      Greg Crossman  
Yung Cossar                     Arden Ranshaw  
Mike Carlson                    Jinx Maloney  
Rachel Ranshaw

***Joy Mee, Joy A. Mee, Planning Strategies, Inc.***

***Jordan Feld, Jordan Feld Consulting, LLC***

***Joe McClure, McClure Consulting, Inc.***

**Table of Contents**

1. List of Figures..... ii

2. Executive Summary ..... 1

3. Purpose.....5

4. General Plan Direction .....6

5. Public Process to Establish Initial Findings and Establish Boundaries ..... 15

6. Map and Description of Boundaries ..... 16

7. Existing Conditions..... 18

8. Existing Zoning and Land Use ..... 38

9. Resolution Establishing the Area ..... 42

10. Public Involvement in the Development of the Plan..... 45

11. Presentation to IDA Board and Planning Commission..... 48

12. Goals and Objectives ..... 49

    a. Goal 1 – Character, Identity and Downtown Destination..... 49

    b. Goal 2 – Adequate Infrastructure ..... 59

    c. Goal 3 – Existing Neighborhood Protection ..... 60

    d. Goal 4 – Improved Traffic Circulation ..... 64

    e. Goal 5 – Greater Variety of Land Uses ..... 68

    f. Goal 6 – Improved Property Values and Economic Activity ..... 77

    g. Goal 7 – Citizen Advisory Committee..... 85

13. Implementation Priorities..... 87

14. Analysis of Implementation Costs and Benefits ..... 89

15. Amendment Procedure ..... 102

16. Statutorily Required Planning Statements ..... 103

17. Resolutions of Adoption ..... 106

18. Appendix: Public Comment Summaries..... 109

**List of Figures**

Figure 1: General Plan and RDA Plan Land Use Category Equivalency Table..... 12

Figure 2: Boundary Map ..... 17

Figure 3: Water and Sewer Service by Provider Map ..... 19

Figure 4: Partially Screened Junk Yard ..... 20

Figure 5: Unscreened Junk Yard ..... 21

Figure 6: Floodplain Areas Map ..... 22

Figure 7: Proposed Drainage Way Map..... 23

Figure 8: Water Retention in Street in Area Scheduled for Retention Basin ..... 24

Figure 9: Present and Future Parks, Open Spaces and Drainageways Map ..... 25

Figure 10: Green Alignment Drainage Way ..... 26

Figure 11: Neighborhoods #1, #2, and #3 Map ..... 27

Figure 12: Old Town Housing with Code Violations..... 30

Figure 13: Unpaved Alleys and Streets ..... 31

Figure 14: Streets without Sidewalks ..... 31

Figure 15: Portable and Temporary Structures..... 32

Figure 16: Temporary Signs ..... 33

Figure 17: Major Street Lanes with Average Daily Traffic Volumes Map..... 34

Figure 18: S.R. 347 and Railroad Crossing ..... 35

Figure 19: Headquarters, La Roca, Napa Auto Parts, and Water Tower..... 36

Figure 20: Existing Zoning Map ..... 39

Figure 21: Zoning Summary Table ..... 40

Figure 22: Existing Land Use Summary Table ..... 40

Figure 23: Existing Land Use Map..... 41

Figure 24: Public Involvement..... 45

Figure 25: Redevelopment District Plan Website ..... 47

Figure 26: Water Tower and Zephyr Train..... 49

Figure 27: Existing Amtrak Station and Historic Train Station ..... 50

Figure 28: Gateway Example..... 51

Figure 29: Interim Public Safety Building & Interim City Hall ..... 52

Figure 30: Example of Western Architecture (Tucson, AZ) ..... 54

Figure 31: Example of Agrarian Architecture (Laveen, AZ) ..... 54

Figure 32: Freeway Overpass Art..... 56

Figure 33: Edison Road Streetscape ..... 57

Figure 34: Maricopa City / County Courthouse .....58

Figure 35: Modular Buildings with Façade Treatment, Casa Grande, AZ.....58

Figure 36: New Home in Old Town #2 .....61

Figure 37: Transitional Land Along Honeycutt Road .....62

Figure 38: Abandoned Mobile Homes .....63

Figure 39: Future Overpass Locations, Option E Map.....65

Figure 40: Access to Westernmost 160 Acres within RDA Map .....66

Figure 41: Tempe Transportation Center.....67

Figure 42: Santa Rosa Wash Trail System.....68

Figure 43: Existing General Plan Future Lane Use Map .....69

Figure 44: Proposed General Plan Future Land Use Map.....70

Figure 45: Aquatic Center .....76

Figure 46: RDA Development Forecast for New Development Table.....78

Figure 47: Citywide Development Forecast for New Development Table.....78

Figure 48: Partially Screened Junk Yard .....85

Figure 49: Unscreened Junk Yard .....85

Figure 50: Land Use Per Capita Growth Curves Chart.....92

Figure 51: Development Model Summary Table .....93

Figure 52: Percent of Land Absorbed by Major Land Use Category, 5-year Intervals Chart.....94

Figure 53: Other Supportable Uses Table .....95

Figure 54: Aquatic Center Characteristics Table .....95

Figure 55: Vacant Land by Parcel Study Number Map.....97

Figure 56: Projected General Progression of Development in the RDA Table .....98

Figure 57: Estimated Fiscal Benefits – Redevelopment Area Table.....99

Figure 58: Estimated Fiscal Benefits – City of Maricopa Table .....100

Figure 59: Realistic Supportable Land Price Ranges (2009 dollars) .....101

## **Executive Summary**

**Purpose:** Recognizing the importance of the Old Town area to the identity of Maricopa and the area's need for preservation and redevelopment, the City Council of Maricopa adopted boundaries for the Redevelopment Area of Maricopa on September 2, 2008. This action began an extensive public involvement process to define goals and objectives that would result in a long term revitalization strategy for this 3.1 square mile area.

**Process:** The City hired a consultant team in November 2008 to prepare a Redevelopment Area Plan (RDA) in accordance with state statutes, the city's General Plan adopted in 2006, and input from the area's residents, business owners and property owners. The General Plan recognizes the importance of the Old Town area as the heart and historic origin of the community and calls for a special plan for this area. The RDA plan provides more specific guidance for land uses, circulation, infrastructure, and design, as well as strategies and timing, than is found in the much broader citywide General Plan.

Residents, businesses and property owners participated in three public workshops and many individual interviews were held. The City published the information presented and the results of each workshop on its website after each meeting. Initial research focused on identifying existing conditions and establishing six goals. Later meetings focused on solutions to achieve these goals, presented below. The goals as presented are not in any priority order:

- 1. Character, Identity and Downtown Destination**
- 2. Adequate Infrastructure**
- 3. Existing Neighborhood Protection**
- 4. Improved Traffic Circulation**
- 5. Greater Variety of Land Uses**
- 6. Improved Property Values and Economic Activity**

There were also briefings for the Industrial Development Authority and the Planning and Zoning Commission, some of whose members also attended the workshops. The City Council also heard a briefing at which some community members shared goals for the area or for their properties. Consultant team members met with representatives of the Ak Chin Community and the Gila River Indian Community and city staff served as valuable resources in providing data, history, and contacts.

**Existing Conditions:** The area includes three older neighborhoods built long before incorporation when the community was less than 5,000 people. Life was focused around the railroad and agriculture with most homes and businesses close to the intersection of the railroad and S.R. 347. The area is served by two water providers and one sewer provider. All older homes and many businesses are on septic tanks. Upgrading inadequate infrastructure and addressing transportation barriers caused by limited railroad crossings are high priorities. Much of the older area developed without the benefit of current zoning requirements for screening of parking and outside storage, paving and landscaping. There are unpaved streets in some areas and a lack of sidewalks and streetlights. Many older homes would not meet current City code. There are many mobile homes, and some modular structures used as temporary buildings for businesses. Some areas north of the tracks are within a federally defined floodplain. Some residential areas are in the process of transitioning to nonresidential development along their edges.

## **Goal 1. Character, Identity and Downtown Destination**

Maricopa's residents want their city to be more than a collection of subdivisions and shopping centers. They want to identify with the historic origin and heart of their city and have a destination core for their own activities and those of visitors. They support the establishment of a Railroad Heritage Park and Visitor Center around a refurbished historic water tower and a relocated Zephyr train. This area could have historic information and visitor attractions with park and shopping areas and a relocated Chamber of Commerce center. Eligible historic structures in the vicinity could be designated for the federal or state registers or City-created districts with property owner support. The historic train station, possibly the most significant structure in early Maricopa, could be rebuilt as part of a multi-modal Transportation Center. Four gateway structures could announce the arrival to Downtown Maricopa at its entryways. A consolidated Government Center or Public Activity Area and Town Square special events park could draw employees and visitors to the area and support more restaurants and higher density pedestrian and transit oriented development.

The City should adopt design guidelines reflective of its Western, Agrarian/Railroad heritage. The plan gives examples of features of significant structures in Maricopa's history that could be utilized in modern buildings. Railroad overpasses provide an opportunity to celebrate this design heritage using symbols and themes as public art incorporated into the structures. Increased landscaping to provide shade and visual attraction along with detached sidewalks would improve the appearance of S.R. 347, which bisects the RDA, creating a positive image on the most highly traveled street in the city. Today the portion of S.R. 347 through the RDA contains many vacant or underutilized parcels and lacks a cohesive, attractive image where development exists.

## **Goal 2. Adequate Infrastructure**

The Plan presents three options for upgrading water volumes and providing sanitary sewer service in the RDA where it is lacking. They are all complex and expensive. There are ways to reduce the costs and spread them out over 10 or more years. Providing adequate water and sewer service is essential if the vacant and underutilized land not served by Global Water is to develop with anything more than single-family homes or small commercial uses.

The City has begun paving portions of the unpaved streets and should continue its efforts, particularly in developed neighborhoods. They should investigate costs and interest in improvement districts to install sidewalks and streetlights. Work has already begun on how and where to build drainage ways and/or retention basins to eliminate the federal floodplain designation. This would eliminate the need for property owners in the floodplain to pay for flood insurance, and encourage new development.

## **Goal 3. Existing Neighborhood Protection**

At the first public workshop, residents of Old Town Neighborhoods 1, 2 and 3 shared their fears that adoption of the plan would force them out of their homes. It was made clear that there is no need or plan to force anyone to relocate or to put pressure on them to sell to private developers. There is adequate vacant land for future development. Some residents are second generation owners or are original owners and have paid off their mortgages. They and their relatives and friends have ties to the area. The Plan does provide for transition along the southern edge of Neighborhood 2, the northern and southern boundaries of Neighborhood 3, and policies for change by block or block face in Neighborhood 3 which has the most vacant land.

It is important to demolish abandoned or boarded up homes if they become hazards so that they are not allowed to become long term eyesores and devalue property. It is equally important to support periodic neighborhood cleanups. If lots or groups of lots redevelop, they become subject to

citywide maintenance and outside storage codes. The City should provide information and assistance to help homeowners find low cost loans or grants to upgrade their homes.

#### **Goal 4. Improved Traffic Circulation**

Improving traffic circulation through the provision of overpasses over the railroad tracks, which carry 50 to 60 trains a day, is a high priority. The plan identified two overpass locations—S.R. 347 and the Loma alignment—for future funding. As the Union Pacific railroad doubles the tracks through Maricopa, this will become even more important as trains will eventually reach over 100 per day. With as many as 100 cars, trains can cause backups for 10 minutes or more, creating a public safety hazard for emergency vehicles and delays for school buses as well as passenger vehicles and deliveries. Cross-street traffic can also be affected. Some trains also carry hazardous cargo. The City is already seeking federal funding for the S.R. 347 overpass, and there have been preliminary conceptual designs prepared. The plan shows additional collector and arterial street patterns that would work well with the overpasses and development of the western lands.

Other objectives include limiting curb cuts along S.R. 347, developing a Transportation Center west of S. R. 347 along the north side of the railroad to support train travel and all types of transit including a park-n-ride lot and a shared parking structure. Relocation of the Amtrak station to the Transportation Center area and building it to replicate the historic train station with retail and food uses is a key recommendation of this goal. Use of a trail system for bicycles and pedestrians to connect residents to public facilities, transit, shopping, and a regional trail system is also an important recommendation. Sidewalks and trails in washes and drainage ways are the main components.

#### **Goal 5. Greater Variety of Land Uses**

At the first workshop, attendees identified a long list of desired land uses from multi-family housing of various types to hotels, medical services, office complexes, clothing stores, theatres, bowling alleys, aquatic centers, unique restaurants, furniture stores, and auto repair shops. They would also like parks, permanent government buildings and community centers, recreation facilities for all ages, a transit center, and trails. In addition, some would like these uses to be mixed into a pedestrian and transit oriented environment in which you could walk from place to place comfortably. This type of development works best with greater heights and densities and is recommended in some locations in the RDA. There is interest in uses that would provide a greater variety of employment such as industrial parks and manufacturing. Location criteria are listed for many generic uses.

A future land use map shows appropriate locations for land use categories and a few specific uses. It is more detailed than the current General Plan which covers approximately 278 square miles. The General Plan should be amended to reflect this greater level of detail and policy. The goals and objectives of the RDA plan as well as the land use map further support the goals and objectives of the adopted General Plan.

The RDA plan recognizes the need for compatible development adjacent to and respectful treatment of the Ak-Chin Indian Community lands which border the RDA on the west side, and any artifacts found while digging in the RDA.

#### **Goal 6. Improved Property Values and Economic Activity**

The RDA Plan should become part of the Maricopa's economic development strategy. The plan is based not only on adopted city plans and public input, but on an economic analysis specifically commissioned as part of this process. The analysis provides dwelling unit and square footage



projections for the RDA and city. It estimates that the RDA should capture at least 20% of the development coming to the city. By 2030, this would result in two-thirds of the residential land and 30% of the non-residential development in the RDA being developed. Specific desired commercial uses are also analyzed. Attracting basic employment not currently serving local residents requires the most aggressive marketing strategies as the city is competing with other communities for these companies. The plan describes which development sectors will likely develop first and which sites as well as what factors could speed up or slow down that process.

To help the city achieve its goals, the RDA plan lists financial incentive tools, public investment actions, and regulatory and policy steps which could stimulate development. These are subject not only to legal issues, but monetary resources and economic market conditions for their timing and effectiveness. Financial tools include tax abatement strategies, Industrial Development Authority tax exempt bonds, different fee structures and zoning rules, loans and grants, construction of public facilities to enhance and attract development, provision of public infrastructure, streetscape improvements, shared parking facilities, and elimination or screening of blight.

### **Goal 7. Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)**

A Council appointed CAC should monitor progress toward achievement of the RDA's goals and objectives, champion specific projects, provide an annual report, suggest amendments as necessary, and develop a logo for the RDA to be used in all activities and on all signs related to redevelopment or improvement projects. It is important to build on and sustain the public enthusiasm shown during development of the plan. Public involvement and commitment are crucial to the plan's successful implementation.

### **Implementation Priorities, Costs, and Benefits**

The plan describes a list of projects to begin in each five-year or ten year-period. A redevelopment plan for an area of 3.1 square miles will take 25 years or more to accomplish. Not everything can begin at once. Some recommendations require further research or funding. Others require a change in market conditions or are contingent on solving infrastructure problems. Some require regulatory action. To the extent feasible within the scope of work for this plan, costs ranges for infrastructure improvements have been identified, variables listed, and funding sources mentioned.

Based on development projects, the economic analysis provides estimated tax benefits to the city.

The plan includes a description of the amendment procedure and recommends that amendments occur only for major changes due to the required process. It also includes the statutorily required planning statements.

## **Purpose**

Arizona Revised Statutes allow for municipalities to prepare and implement a redevelopment plan. The purpose of a redevelopment plan is to identify goals and objectives for a specific area which culminate in a unified, cohesive strategy for facilitating the long term prosperity, welfare and health of the area. This redevelopment area plan provides the community with greater flexibility in encouraging desirable projects with incentives and assistance while promoting and facilitating investment and appropriate development in the area.

In recognizing the importance of Maricopa's historical center for commerce, transportation, housing, recreation, and education, the city's leaders, residents, and businesses have come together to develop and implement this City of Maricopa Redevelopment Area Plan.

The City of Maricopa, Arizona serves an area of approximately 52 square miles with an estimated population of 38,000. Based upon current growth patterns, the city will have a population in excess of 51,000 by 2015. Presently, 95% of city residents are new to the community as it has grown rapidly due to a massive residential housing boom. Many new residents do not yet identify themselves with the city and do not feel that they have arrived "home." In addition, Maricopa is, at present, largely a bedroom community, with infrastructure and transportation challenges.

It is critical for the future sustainability of the community that the City ensures that an urban core, embracing Maricopa's uniqueness and a place where the community can live, work and play, be realized. In identifying the redevelopment area and setting forth the objectives of this plan, Maricopa has embarked on this realization.

The community is committed to focusing public resources in the redevelopment area to achieve its vision for the City of Maricopa. This plan provides a framework for policies and actions, both public, private for guiding investment and growth in the redevelopment area.

*Note: throughout this plan, the redevelopment area, redevelopment district and planning area are used interchangeably and are often abbreviated as "RDA"*

## **General Plan Direction and Parks, Trails and Open Space Master Plan Direction**

This section discusses existing policy direction which informs and guides the framework for this redevelopment planning effort. The overarching land use and growth policy for Maricopa is the city's General Plan. In addition, the city has functional plans which concentrate on specific areas of policy and which influence the redevelopment planning process. These functional plans consider parks, recreation, trails, and open space, as well as regional transportation issues.

The *"italicized"* sections, are taken directly from the General Plan or the Parks, Trails and Open Space Master Plan. The information enumerated by small Roman numerals summarizes the Redevelopment Area Plan's response to the General Plan Direction.

### ***General Plan, text conformity (p.6)***

*"Old Town revitalization will help project a positive image for Maricopa and capitalize on its rich history through developing the themes and images that make Maricopa unique."*

- i. Proposed Heritage Park near the restored Union Pacific Railroad water tower.
- ii. Potential designation of eligible historic structures.
- iii. Screening of junkyards pre-incorporation and removal of junkyards post-incorporation will reduce the amount of visual blight and health and safety hazards.
- iv. Screening of all open commercial storage post-incorporation will improve the RDA's appearance.

*"Old Town themes can serve as design keys in establishing overall guidelines for the large city."*

- i. Use of Western Agrarian/Railroad themes with shaded porches for commercial projects.
- ii. Gateway features using a Western theme at four entrances to Old Town.

*"Old Town can be a point of pride for city residents."*

- i. Proposed installation of paved streets, sidewalks, and streetlights will increase neighborhood pride in Old Town.
- ii. Use of a public art program in the design and decoration of the overpasses can create an identity for Maricopa, a tourist attraction and source of pride and identity.

*"Neighborhoods are the framework for citizenship and have roles in Plan monitoring and performance measurement. They exhibit acceptable standards of security, convenience, appearance and amenities."*

- i. Old Town neighborhoods should be represented on the Redevelopment Plan Advisory Committee that reviews plan implementation progress, helps set priorities for implementation and reviews amendments.
- ii. Old Town neighborhoods can work together for cleanups, block watch programs, and rehabilitation efforts.

- iii. Elimination of abandoned structures will approve the appearance of the three neighborhoods.

*“Economic development should emphasize job creation, business expansion and retention and municipal revenue generation.”*

- i. Provision of modern water and sewer service to vacant and nonresidential parcels not served now in the RDA will promote more intense urban commercial development that can support more jobs than the parcels can as presently served.
- ii. Availability of modern infrastructure will remove a disincentive for development in the area.
- iii. Provision of overpasses will eliminate much of the traffic congestion in the area and open up new arterials and collector streets.

**General Plan, special planning area conformity (p.24)**

*“The Old Town Redevelopment Area is a special planning area that provides opportunities and challenges. It has a small town flavor and rich history. It is an underdeveloped area with a strategic location that provides opportunities for investment. A feasibility study analyzing development and redevelopment potential is recommended. Suggested uses include specialty shopping, dining, and other retail and tourist-based activities.”*

- i. The RDA Plan includes an economic analysis of retail demand and absorption for the city and RDA.
- ii. The RDA Plan calls for a pedestrian oriented development area around the Transportation Center and the Government Center. This area could include specialty retail and restaurants to serve residents, workers and tourists.

**General Plan land use goals, objectives and recommendations conformity (p. 28-30)**

*“Goal 1 – Achieve a balance in the community between jobs and housing.”*

*“Objective c – Allow flexibility for mixed commercial and residential uses.”*

- i. The RDA plan promotes a mix of uses in transit and pedestrian oriented design districts near the Government or Public Activity Centers and the Transportation Center as well as in other locations designated Mixed Use. This could involve the creation of new zoning districts.

*“Objective e – Encourage, through land use controls, the development of hospitality uses including hotel, resorts and restaurants.”*

- i. The RDA Plan designates potential sites for hotels, promotes restaurants near the Government or Public Activity Centers and Transportation Centers and in mixed use areas.
- ii. The RDA Plan recommends use of financial, zoning and processing incentives to facilitate these uses.

*“Goal 2 – Assure the development of a diverse housing stock in both dwelling type and density.”*

- i. The RDA Plan calls for multi-family and mixed density housing in numerous locations. This housing could include apartments, townhomes and condos, live/work homes, housing above stores or offices, senior housing and a percentage of affordable housing units.

*“Goal 3 – Reflect Maricopa’s agricultural and western history in the design character of the community as it develops and expands.”*

*“Objective a – Apply reasonable design guidelines and standards to new development.”*

- ii. Design guidelines are proposed for the RDA.

*“Objective b – Identify Maricopa’s desired design image(s), which should include but is not limited to agricultural and western character, to serve as themes and components to desired design guidelines and standards.”*

- i. Design themes are proposed for certain areas of the RDA.

*“Objective c – Study the redevelopment and preservation potential of the Maricopa Old Town area.”*

- i. The Redevelopment Area Plan has goals and objectives about redeveloping and preserving the Old Town Area.

*“Objective d – Utilize public and private sector grants and other resources to support redevelopment and historic preservation activities.”*

- i. The Plan includes strategies for achieving the goals and objectives, including funding mechanisms and financial incentive tools. Goal 6 lists funding options and tools.

*“Objective e – Conduct detailed planning and design studies for the city’s Special Planning Areas including Seven Ranches and the Volkswagen Test Facility.”*

- i. The RDA is one of the special planning areas.

*“Objective f – Establish cultural resource protection measures.”*

- i. The Plan includes language on proper procedures for immediate notification if any cultural artifacts are uncovered during development.

*“Goal 4 – Minimize conflicts between land uses.”*

*“Objective c – Based on noise, vibration and safety concerns, strongly discourage residential development adjacent to airports and railroad corridors.”*

- i. The proposed land use map does not locate new residential areas directly adjacent to the railroad tracks. The only location where a residential designation is shown adjacent to the railroad tracks is in the Master Planned

Community. It is believed that this district, which allows supportive nonresidential uses, provides sufficient flexibility of uses to avoid locating homes adjacent to the tracks. School playgrounds, a golf course or retention areas are possible options.

*“Objective f – Seek appropriate buffers and land use transitions along Native American Community boundaries. Support lower density/intensity land uses along Native American Community boundaries. Recommendation: Incorporate low density, single-story development with setbacks of 300 feet when adjacent to agricultural areas of the Ak-Chin Indian Community.”*

- i. The RDA Plan recommends less intensive land uses adjacent to the Ak-Chin reservation to achieve compatibility with their farming and trespassing concerns. Compatible uses should be discussed with staff and the Ak-Chin representatives.

*“Goal 5 – Coordinate land management and planning activities with neighboring Indian Communities, Federal, State and private interests.”*

*“Objective a – Participate in regular meetings with Ak-Chin and Gila River Indian Communities to address land use and transportation issues and concerns.”*

- i. Representatives of both tribes were engaged in the planning process, this involvement focused on key issues related to land use and transportation.

*“Objective f – Support the development of public information materials regarding respectful interaction and travel within nearby Native American communities.”*

- i. The RDA Plan will include a discussion of concerns about trespassing on reservation lands and keeping them clean.

*“General Plan Recommendation – Preserve industrially zoned properties, particularly those in close proximity to the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) and other transportation corridors including the Maricopa-Casa Grande Highway, John Wayne Parkway and S.R. 238.”*

- i. The proposed land use map includes 339 acres of Industrial Park/Heavy Commercial Use consistent with the Employment/Industrial General Plan category.

**General Plan circulation goals, objectives and recommendations conformity (p. 39)**

*“Goal 1 – Develop an efficient and safe transportation system, including a hierarchy of roadways, which meets the long-term needs of residents, businesses and visitors.”*

*“Objective c – Identify and improve major rail crossings and deficient roadway intersections.”*

- i. The RDA Plan recommends overpasses over the railroad at S.R. 347 and the Loma Alignment.

- ii. The RDA Plan also recommends the elimination of unnecessary and hazardous intersections with S.R. 347 and a cutover to Honeycutt Road from the Maricopa-Casa Grande Highway.

*“Goal 2 – Create a multi-modal circulation system, including transit, pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian facilities.”*

*“Objective b – Work with ADOT to improve pedestrian safety along and across John Wayne Parkway.”*

- i. The RDA Plan recommends that detached sidewalks be included along S.R. 347 (John Wayne Parkway) within the RDA.

*“Objective c – Encourage incorporation of bike and pedestrian facilities within and connecting all developments.”*

- i. The RDA Plan identifies trail corridors and encourages wider sidewalks to connect all public uses and retail commercial areas. This includes use of washes to connect to neighborhoods outside the RDA.

*“Objective d – Enhance transit services connecting Maricopa with Phoenix, Casa Grande and Tucson.”*

- i. The recommended Transportation Center would be the point of departure for all types of transit service to other cities. It would connect with shuttle buses and have bicycle facilities.

*“Objective c – Connect planned community and regional commercial development to the Maricopa Trail System via bicycle lanes or public access multi-use trails.”*

- i. The Master Planned Community would utilize washes crossing it north and south to develop connecting trail systems as well as a potential drainage corridor south of the railroad tracks.

*“Goal 5 – Maintain and expand local passenger and freight rail service in Maricopa.”*

*“Objective a – Support continued Amtrak passenger service in Maricopa.”*

- i. The Plan recommends relocation of the Amtrak station west of S.R. 347 into a Transportation Center serving all forms of transit. This would provide connecting services for rail passengers and supportive retail services.

*“Objective b – Address development and circulation compatibility issues between the community and the UPRR rail corridor.”*

- i. The Plan’s land use and circulation recommendations recognize the impact of the railroad on traffic backups and noise compatibility.

*“Objective c – Study the feasibility of establishing commuter rail service between Maricopa, greater Phoenix and Casa Grande.”*

- i. The Transportation Center would support a stop for commuter rail service.

***General Plan economic development goals, objectives and recommendations conformity (p. 45)***

*“Goal 3 – Maintain economically vital and visually attractive activity centers including Old Town and newly developed commercial and employment centers.”*

*“Objective a – Prepare a redevelopment feasibility study to assess the potential of the Old Town area.”*

- i. The Plan provides square footage projections by land use category to 2030. It projects that the RDA will capture about 20% of the nonresidential development coming to Maricopa.

*“Objective b – Identify and preserve viable historical resources in the Maricopa planning area.”*

- i. The Plan identifies several historical resources and encourages the formation of a historic district and designations of individual structures that are eligible.

*“Objective c – Identify and develop distinct ‘Maricopa’ design theme(s) that can be marketed to and be built upon by the business community for both the Old Town area and the community at-large.”*

- i. The Plan includes design facades treatments, shapes and materials to implement a unified design theme for the older commercial areas.

*“Objective d – Establish regional, commercial destination attractions, such as sporting, cultural or recreational venues, with activities for all ages, especially youth and families and active adults.”*

- i. The Plan identifies locations for an aquatic center in the RDA and recommends the establishment of a theatre, bowling alley and fitness center with childcare services and food.

***General Plan, map conformity***

- i. The RDA Plan map has more than 160 acres that are different from the General Plan Land Use Map. Therefore, replacing the General Plan Map with the proposed land use map requires a major amendment. The map reflects a careful analysis of the wishes of stakeholders and an economic analysis of the redevelopment area’s role in the city. It is more detailed than a land use map covering an area the size of Maricopa planning area similar to a specific area plan. It does not change any underlying zoning, but it would be taken into consideration in requests for rezoning. The following sections provide more rationale for the map’s designations.
- ii. The RDA Plan shows the retention of Old Town Neighborhood #3 with some mixed use transitions along MCG Highway, abutting commercial on S.R. 347



and along Honeycutt Road. The General Plan shows most of this area as Public/Institutional or Medium Density. The Medium Density area is owned by the school district for its bus maintenance facility and district offices. The RDA Plan map shows the school site as School.

- iii. The General Plan shows the Old Town Neighborhoods #1 and #2 as commercial. The RDA shows the existing Old Town Neighborhoods #1 and #2 remaining as residential consistent with the desires of the residents. Not one of these remaining residential areas is 80 acres. Some transition to higher density or mixed use is allowed at the edges of #2.
- iv. According to the economic analysis, only one-third of the RDA’s land designated for nonresidential development will be developed by 2030. Goal 5, Objectives 1 and 2 provide definitions of some of the new land use categories and location criteria.

**Figure 1: General Plan and RDA Plan Land Use Category Equivalency Table**

<b>General Plan Land Use Map Designation</b>	<b>Redevelopment Area Plan Designation</b>
Low Density and Medium Density	Single Family
High Density Residential	Multi-family
Master Planned Community without the nonresidential uses	Mixed Density
Master Planned Community	Master Planned Community
Mixed Use	Mixed Use
Open Space/Park	Open Space/Park
Commercial	Commercial Retail
Employment	Commercial Retail, Hotel, Office, Industrial Park / Heavy Commercial
Public/Institutional	Government Center, Transportation Center, School, Aquatic Center, Institutional

### **Parks, Trails and Open Space Master Plan, conformity**

*“Special Use Parks (p. 15) – Special use parks are a critical element of the open space network. These preserve the history and essence of what makes the City of Maricopa unique. As the city grows, the preservation of this history and character will connect new residents with the long time residents of the areas. The recommendation is to preserve unique farming structures, archeological sites and washes as special use parks.”*

- i. The Plan calls for a Heritage Park incorporating the water tower.

*“Proposed Special Use Parks/ Railroad Heritage Park (p. 46) – The Railroad has a deep seated history in the City of Maricopa. Several remnants of railroad history are intact adjacent to the railroad tracks. These include an observation car from the California Zephyr train and the Old Railroad Water Tower located adjacent to the tracks at the intersection of the Maricopa-Casa Grande Highway and John Wayne Parkway Highway. These two icons of the railroad heritage along with a linear park adjacent to the rail would provide a landmark park for Maricopa. Other potential features in the park could include: recreated train station, which could serve as a chamber of commerce, an information center, paths, observation decks, additional restored train cars and engines, children’s railroad park with a scale train, and a highway rest area.”*

- i. The Plan calls for a Heritage Park on the west side of S.R. 347 that would incorporate these uses. A recreated train station would be located further west in the Transportation Center. It could include a restaurant and night club, with a Chamber of Commerce office located closer to S.R. 347.

*“Community Centers (p. 42) – As community anchors, Maricopa’s Community Centers will be public gathering places that convey a sense of community. The centers will provide recreation, library, meeting space, park and ride, police substations and satellite city hall type services. Specific uses may include: Recreation, Public Meeting Rooms, Aquatic Centers, Library, Senior Center, Children’s After School Programs, and Intersession and Summer Programs, Government Offices, and Park and Ride.”*

- i. The Plan calls for a Government Center, Transportation Center and Aquatic Center to be located in the RDA. If the Government Center with City Hall and a city-wide Aquatic Center are not located here, there should be at a minimum a Community Center with recreational programs for children and families, a mini-city hall, and meeting rooms.

*“Aquatic Centers (p. 43) – Aquatic centers can stand alone facilities or built in conjunction with community centers. The aquatic centers should be themed to provide a unique experience for the users. Potential uses include: Lap Pool, Diving Pool, Zero Edge/Beach Entry Pool, Splash Pad, Wave Pool, Lazy River, Plunge Areas, Slides, Sun Decks and Sun Lawns.”*

- i. The RDA Plan shows four different locations that would accommodate a large Aquatic Center.

*“Washes, utility corridors and buffers as trail corridors (general).”*

- i. The RDA Plan designates washes, utility corridors, buffers, and multi-use paths as the “trail system” linking neighborhoods with parks, schools, and shopping.

*“Town Square Park (p. 52) – This will become an urban core for the city which will be a community wide draw. To provide a truly “hometown” feel and amenity, this plan proposes a “Town Square Park” in the manner of great American community planning traditions. The Town Square Park would provide a “heart” of the city and be the city’s living room surrounded by commercial and civic buildings. While serving as a community as a community gathering place and creating a sense of place, the town square would also be an event space that could host; farmers markets, art fairs, culinary festivals, etc. Facilities in the park would be; a landmark fountain and art piece, a “grand lawn”, community pavilion/amphitheater, public comfort stations, etc. The Town Square Park would be one of the “Chamber of Commerce” photo-ops and a city land mark.”*

- i. The RDA Plan has designated two alternatives for a 10-acre Town Square Park in the center of Government and mixed use buildings. If the Government Center is not built, there is still a need for a 10-acre park in the area to serve existing residents.

### **Public Process to Establish Initial Findings and Establish Boundaries**


In early 2008, City representatives began working to identify methods in which to create a vibrant downtown core and encourage private investment in a manner guided by the needs and wishes of the residents. This project began to move forward in July of 2008 when a legal description and map of an area identified as being in need of redevelopment were drafted and a list of all property owners within the proposed boundaries was obtained from a third-party title company per Pinal County Assessor records. (See adopted resolution, page 43.) Per State Statute, as amended by the recently passed Proposition 207, staff mailed notices to all landowners within the proposed redevelopment district boundaries providing notification that the City Council would soon be considering a resolution for the creation of a redevelopment plan.

Staff presented the redevelopment district boundary to the City Council at the August 5, 2008 Council meeting and made themselves available for private meetings and to address other inquiries from residents or other parties throughout the month of August. On September 2, 2008, a legislative finding and declaration of necessity were declared by the City Council of Maricopa and the redevelopment district boundary was created.



## **Map and Description of Boundaries**

This section identifies the boundaries of the redevelopment planning area. The redevelopment planning area is generally located in the northwest area of the City of Maricopa, comprising a diverse 3.1 square mile area. This section of Maricopa contains the original town site, known as Old Town, and was the commercial, industrial, agriculture and residential center for the larger community. The redevelopment planning area's southeastern boundary is the Old Town area, extending as far south as Desert Cedars Lane and as far east as over a half mile beyond S.R. 347. This entire southeastern area has developed gradually over many years and contains many of the community's identifying markers, cultural resources and oldest structures. The diversity of the land uses in this area also represents the historic diversity of Maricopa's commerce and industry. The redevelopment planning area's eastern boundary generally follows the commercial development along S.R. 347 moving north towards Edison Road where the area is framed by more recent residential development to the north. Approximately a ¼ mile west of S.R. 347 along Edison Road the planning area expands to the north, here the northern boundary is contained by S.R. 238 and the land area is generally vacant or currently used for agricultural purposes. This land composition generally remains constant as the redevelopment moves to the west along S.R. 238. Less than a ¼ mile east of where the railroad and S.R. 238 alignments meet, the redevelopment planning area again extends to the north picking up additional land along Nightengale Drive. From this northwestern limit of the area, the boundary generally follows the Amarillo Valley alignment to the south; in some places including land on both the east and west sides of the corridor. Here along the western boundary of the redevelopment area, the Ak-Chin Indian Community frames the planning area, as the alignment of Amarillo Valley south of Edison Road gives way to eastward moving boundary. A significant amount of active farming land is included in the redevelopment area's southern boundary, this includes the land south of McDavid Road and west of the Green Road alignment. At this intersection and moving to the east, the redevelopment area is here again framed by existing residential development. The redevelopment area east of Green Road is entirely north of McDavid Road until approximately ¼ mile east of Hogenes where the boundary dips again to the south, expanding all the way to the Honeycutt Road alignment.

Figure 2: Boundary Map



Redevelopment District Plan

-  Redevelopment District Boundary
-  Maricopa City Limits



City of Maricopa Disclaimer:  
Information shown on these maps or electronic files are derived from public records that are constantly undergoing change and do not replace a site survey, and are not warranted for content or accuracy. The City of Maricopa does not guarantee the positional or thematic accuracy of this data. The user agrees not to transmit this data or provide access to it or any part of it to another party.

July, 2008 Base Map Information Provided by the City of Maricopa

## **Existing Conditions**

This section identifies and discusses existing conditions in the redevelopment area. This discussion concentrates on those conditions which specifically contribute as obstacles to the redevelopment process and the greater vision of the community for the area.

### *1. Inadequate water and sewer service*

Properties in the RDA receive water through the Maricopa Domestic Water Improvement District (MDWID) and Global Water. Originally a private water company, the MDWID serves an area of approximately one half square mile in the RDA, with an estimated customer base of approximately 200. Within the RDA, the MDWID serves areas outside of its boundaries, such as property within the railroad right-of-way and the Pinal County Housing Complex, where customers pay higher fees than those within the district.


The MDWID system was rehabilitated in 1999 and generally is adequate to provide fire protection for existing single family residential units. In some areas, the MDWID system still utilizes four-inch lines. These areas should be analyzed to ensure that adequate water flow for fire protection can be provided from these lines. There are also problems with fire hydrants spaced too far apart that should be corrected in order to provide an adequate level of fire protection. Most commercial properties within the RDA do not have sprinkler systems.

The MDWID service area is bisected by the railroad tracks. There are only two pipeline crossings of the railroad tracks that serve to interconnect the two service areas. The system would benefit from one and possibly two more crossings of the railroad tracks at strategic locations. On the south side of the railroad tracks, the Maricopa Unified School District provides its own water service for turf irrigation and fire suppression to the high school via a well. An onsite tank provides water storage for fighting fires. Potable water to the high school site is provided by MDWID.

If development and redevelopment occur within the RDA that is more intense than single family residential, additional water storage facilities will likely be needed along with the potential for upgraded piping systems. MDWID does not provide sewer service. Properties served with water by MDWID are generally on septic tanks. Some nonresidential properties receive sewer service from Global Water.

Global Water provides water and sewer service to some nonresidential parcels in the RDA and to a much larger service area outside of the RDA. Expansion of its service area must be approved by the Arizona Corporation Commission. The Global Water system in the RDA is quite new, developed in 2004 and later. While it has agreed to provide sewer service to a few parcels served with water by the MDWID as shown on the map in Figure 3, it generally is not interested in providing sewer service only to individual residential customers, nor is it interested in providing sewer service to the MDWID area on a “master meter” basis. Global Water also charges higher fees for providing services outside of its designated area. Some parcels in the north and west areas of the RDA currently have no designated water and sewer service provider, which will become an issue when those areas develop.

Figure 3: Water and Sewer Service by Provider Map



CITY OF MARICOPA  
Proud History • Prosperous Future  
Redevelopment District Plan  
Water and Sewer Service Areas

Legend

-  Redevelopment District Boundary
-  Maricopa City Limits
-  Global Water (Water and Sewer)
-  \*Water Improvement District (Water only)
-  Maricopa Domestic (Water)/Global Water (Sewer)
-  \*MD Service Area Outside District (Water Only)

\* MD = Maricopa Domestic



City of Maricopa Disclaimer:  
Information shown on these maps or electronic files are derived from public records that are constantly undergoing change and do not replace a site survey, and are not warranted for content or accuracy. The City of Maricopa does not guarantee the positional or thematic accuracy of this data. The user agrees not to transmit this data or provide access to it or any part of it to another party.

Base Map Information Provided by the City of Maricopa



Use of septic tanks on small lots, similar to what now exists within the MDWID area, is not a recommended practice and in many cases is currently not allowed. Septic tanks must be pumped regularly and replaced periodically, necessitating digging up yards. Typically, there is inadequate space for leach fields on lots less than one acre in size.

Development of a separate sewer system to serve the MDWID area would be very expensive. Limited water and sewer capacity has constrained the development and redevelopment potential of parcels in the RDA served by MDWID. Residents and businesses would benefit from improved water and sewer service. Some new business developments were designed to hook into sanitary sewers, should they become available. There are concerns, however, about the ability of existing residents to afford upgraded water and sewer service.

2. *Unscreened junkyards and open commercial uses*

There are two junkyards and one recycling center within the RDA. The oldest is just south of the railroad tracks and contains numerous junked cars and other materials. It has an old wood fence that partially screens views from McDavid Road. It is across the street from multi-family residential development.

**Figure 4: Partially Screened Junk Yard**



A second junk yard appears to have no boundaries or screening and is located behind dilapidated mobile homes on large lots on a dirt road along the future alignment of Loma Drive. It is unscreened from any direction.

**Figure 5: Unscreened Junk Yard**



A recycling center is located adjacent to a wash, farmland and vacant land. To the south is a new single-family subdivision that backs up to McDavid Road. While the recycling center is not a junk yard and has open metal fencing, its contents are still visible from the public street.


Elsewhere in the RDA are open commercial uses and unscreened storage. There are unscreened collectibles, abandoned cars and appliances on some residential lots in the Old Town Neighborhoods and on lower density scattered residential development. Most of this outside activity began prior to incorporation in 2003 and was grandfathered in, excluding it from compliance with citywide codes for outside storage and abandoned vehicles.

3. *Floodplain designation and local drainage*



Approximately 400 acres north of the railroad tracks in the RDA are in Federal Emergency Management Area designated floodplain. This designation requires property owners with mortgages to have flood plain insurance. The City has hired consultants to develop options for constructing flood channels and/or retention basins to carry the water northwest to existing washes to prevent flooding. Once these improvements are completed, the floodplain designation would be removed. While these steps would require acquisition of some vacant and developed land, construction of drainage ways 200 feet wide, and a cost in excess of \$10 million, it would reduce the financial burden on many properties.

The City has also purchased parcels on which to construct retention basins to improve local drainage problems at the northwest corner of Old Town Neighborhood One.






Figure 6: Floodplain Areas Map



Redevelopment District Plan

-  Redevelopment District Boundary
-  Maricopa City Limits

Effective FEMA Flood Zones


-  100 yr floodplain - No base flood elev. determined
-  AE 100 yr floodplain - Base flood elev. determined
-  AO - 100 yr floodplain - Flood depths 1 to 3 ft
-  D - 100 yr floodplain - Flood hazards undetermined but possible
-  X - Areas outside 100 yr floodplain





City of Maricopa Disclaimer:  
Information shown on these maps or electronic files are derived from public records that are constantly undergoing change and do not replace a site survey, and are not warranted for content or accuracy. The City of Maricopa does not guarantee the positional or thematic accuracy of this data. The user agrees not to transmit this data or provide access to it or any part of it to another party.


July, 2008 Base Map Information Provided by the City of Maricopa

Figure 7: Proposed Drainage Way Map



Redevelopment District Plan

-  Redevelopment District Boundary
-  Maricopa City Limits



City of Maricopa Disclaimer:  
Information shown on these maps or electronic files are derived from public records that are constantly undergoing change and do not replace a site survey, and are not warranted for content or accuracy. The City of Maricopa does not guarantee the positional or thematic accuracy of this data. The user agrees not to transmit this data or provide access to it or any part of it to another party.


July, 2008 Base Map Information Provided by the City of Maricopa

**Figure 8: Water Retention in Street in Area Scheduled for Retention Basin**



There are several washes running through the western portion of the RDA. The Green Wash crosses the northeast corner of the most northern parcel in the RDA, the western portion of the Hogenes Dairy, and then follows the Green Road alignment onto the Ak-Chin Indian Community. The Vekol Wash bisects the Southern Dunes Golf Course north of S.R. 238 and then branches out across the western most parcels of the RDA. Another branch of this wash also crosses the western most 160 acres of the RDA.

Figure 9: Present and Future Parks, Open Spaces and Drainageways Map



Redevelopment District Plan

Parks, Open Space & Drainageways

- Redevelopment District Boundary
- Maricopa City Limits
- existing parks
- proposed parks
- Parks and Open Space Master Plan Path / Trail Connection
- Parks and Open Space Master Plan: Signature Street w/ Trail
- Drainageways
- Parks and Open Space Master Plan: Proposed Open Space:



City of Maricopa Disclaimer:  
 Information shown on these maps or electronic files are derived from public records that are constantly undergoing change and do not replace a site survey, and are not warranted for content or accuracy. The City of Maricopa does not guarantee the positional or thematic accuracy of this data. The user agrees not to transmit this data or provide access to it or any part of it to another party.

July 2008, Base Map Information Provided by the City of Maricopa


**Figure 10: Green Alignment Drainage Way**



4. *Neighborhoods, housing and nonconforming uses*



The redevelopment area contains three neighborhoods built over many years prior to the city's incorporation. Typical lots are 60 feet wide by 140 feet deep. Almost all of the homes are single-family detached with a high percentage being single and double-wide mobile homes. There are also frame and stucco homes of various ages.

Figure 11: Neighborhoods #1, #2, and #3 Map



Redevelopment District Plan

Developed Areas with Infrastructure Deficiencies

-  Redevelopment District Boundary
-  Garvey Ave.

Infrastructure Needs Areas

-  Old Town 1
-  Old Town 2
-  Old Town 3

Infrastructure deficiencies include: deteriorating pavement, lack of curb & gutter, lack of sidewalk, lack of street lighting, lack of drainage improvements, insufficient water main size for fire-flow.

Properties are on aging septic systems which are beginning to fail. Sewer service is needed.



City of Maricopa Disclaimer:  
 Information shown on these maps or electronic files are derived from public records that are constantly undergoing change and do not replace a site survey, and are not warranted for content or accuracy. The City of Maricopa does not guarantee the positional or thematic accuracy of this data. The user agrees not to transmit this data or provide access to it or any part of it to another party.

Base Map Information Provided by the City of Maricopa



There are a few duplexes and an aging single story multi-family complex at the northeastern edge of Old Town #3. There are also some small businesses at the southern edge of Old Town #3 where lots face the Maricopa-Casa Grande Highway.

The neighborhoods are served water by the Maricopa Domestic Water Improvement District whose offices and a large water tank are just south of Old Town #2. Homes are on individual septic tanks.

Because the neighborhoods have existed for many years, there are mature trees. There are few block walls between neighbors, but also some chain link fences and partially open, decorative walls. There is much outside storage.

#### *Old Town Neighborhood One*

This neighborhood consists of four blocks with 16 lots per block on an east-west orientation. There are two unpaved alleys. A few vacant lots and at least two boarded up mobile homes exist which are located at the northwest corner of the neighborhood. There is one duplex and one church in the neighborhood and possible home occupations. Home occupations are businesses that are run out of homes where residents also live. Depending on their size and characteristics, they may be legal, nonconforming, or illegal. The neighborhood is surrounded by vacant land on all sides except for Interim City Hall on the southeast side. While it is accessed by local streets on several sides—Garvey Avenue, Wilson Avenue, and Hathaway Avenue,- the latter is the most direct path to S.R. 347.

#### *Old Town Neighborhood Two*

This neighborhood consists of two and 1/2 blocks with single and double-wide mobile homes and stick built homes located on three streets. It is between Hathaway Avenue on the north and Garvey Avenue on the south. It backs up on the eastside to commercial uses facing S.R. 347. A new L shaped retail center is at the southeast corner and backs up onto the neighborhood street. Ten homes face Garvey. There are approximately six vacant lots in the neighborhood. Condrey Street is paved. There are no sidewalks or street lights. The west side of the neighborhood backs up the City/County one story recently constructed court building. At the north end are a church and church-related buildings. The vacant land in the immediate north and west areas could accommodate additional homes. The homes fronting on Garvey face a mostly vacant strip of land across Garvey and have views of commercial uses.

#### *Old Town Neighborhood Three*

This neighborhood appears to be the oldest and abuts commercial streets or activity on three sides. It consists of five blocks of various shapes. On the south side are businesses and homes facing Maricopa-Casa Grande Highway, which is two lanes in this area. The homes all face commercial or industrial development across the street or vacant land. In the future this street could be closed at the west end with through traffic diverted up to Honeycutt Road east of the Rotary Park. An overpass on S.R. 347 would also cut off access to S.R. 347. On the east side, the neighborhood is

adjacent to vacant land, part of which is under construction by the Maricopa Unified School District for a district office and bus maintenance facility. On the north side, it abuts commercial development on Honeycutt Road and some vacant land. Some homes have been sold and lots cleared facing Honeycutt Road. Some new owners would like to redevelop for commercial purposes. As redevelopment occurs, Honeycutt Road will be widened from two to four lanes. The area includes more vacant land and abandoned structures than the other neighborhoods. There is one multi-family structure in dilapidated condition at the northeast edge. On the west side a few homes abut commercial development facing S.R. 347. An informal survey of the 31 internal parcels conducted by a property owner of six of them found that 13 are single-family owner occupied, six are rental homes, 11 are vacant parcels, and one is a church. It is possible that some of the interior lots could have new homes built or placed on them. This is less likely on exterior facing lots.

#### *Other Residential Areas*

Other housing is located on large scattered lots or on a single street. There are some homes on the west side of Taft Avenue, south of McDavid Road and facing the high school with heavy on street parking and school buses. Behind the homes on Taft Avenue are a row of homes on Hamilton Avenue facing the rear of a new subdivision. The street is unpaved, and the homes, about 10, are only down part of the street. There are a few mobile homes on Edwards Avenue and a Pinal County multi-family housing complex of 10 duplex buildings. Only the multi-family complex is permanent although there is no near term transition use for the homes on Hamilton Avenue or Taft Avenue. Other homes are scattered on dirt streets north of McDavid Road and are in poor condition.

#### *Types of code violations*

Almost all of the housing in the RDA was built or located prior to incorporation. A majority of the homes would not meet current codes. There are many mobile homes not subject to local government construction codes. Many would not meet current state codes for manufactured housing. There is evidence of structural deterioration, roofs needing repair, inadequate foundations, inadequate electrical service, and inadequate light and ventilation. All observations were made offsite. As previously described, all single-family homes are on septic tanks, many on lots of less than 10,000 square feet.

Housing deterioration is most visible in Old Town #3, the oldest of the neighborhoods. In Old Town #1 and Old Town #2 some block faces have homes in better condition than others and have well maintained yards. There are examples of well-maintained homes and pride of ownership next to rundown properties with dirt yards.

**Figure 12: Old Town Housing with Code Violations**



5. *Unpaved streets and alleys*

The RDA has 19,000 linear feet of unpaved streets and alleys or streets requiring improvements, such as Garvey Avenue. In some cases streets have gravel which helps reduce dust. Alleys have only dirt surfaces. Some homes are located on dirt streets in more remote rural locations in the RDA. The City Council recently approved use of Community Development Block Grant funds of \$140,000 to pave 1/8 mile of Justin Drive in Old Town Neighborhood #2. Plans to pave 1/8 mile of Arizona Avenue in Old Town #3 were deferred.

Replacement of existing streets with new pavement, curb, gutter, and sidewalk would cost approximately \$250 per linear foot, for a total of \$4.75 million.

There are street segments in Old Town #1, #2, and #3 that are only dirt or gravel over dirt. Within Old Town #1, the western quarter of Lexington Avenue, all of Roosevelt Avenue abutting the western edge of Old Town #1 and Madison Avenue west of Taft Avenue are unpaved. In Old Town #2 all of Justin Drive is unpaved. In Old Town #3, Plainview Street on the eastern edge as well as Burkett Avenue and Arizona Avenue are unpaved. Other streets, even when paved, are in fair to poor condition and have a significant amount of surface gravel.

**Figure 13: Unpaved Alleys and Streets**



6. *Lack of sidewalks and streetlights*

Even the local neighborhood streets that are paved lack sidewalks and have only rolled curbs. Street lights are also missing at street intersections.

**Figure 14: Streets without Sidewalks**



7. *Portable and temporary structures, lack of paved parking, landscaping, and screening of undercarriages, façade treatments, and temporary signs*

Within the RDA are various modular constructed commercial, government, and institutional buildings. They are portable and often intended for temporary use. They are characterized by visible undercarriages or screened undercarriages with steps and ramps leading up to the doors. Some have windows. All have flat plain surfaces and a single use of color and materials. They may also lack landscaping and paved parking areas. They do not meet the same design and site improvement standards as stick built construction. Some were placed on sites prior to incorporation; some were not. There are also examples of modular construction with at-grade access and some façade treatment, such as the City/County Courthouse.

Chain link fences along major commercial streets do not screen parking from view and are not consistent with modern design review requirements for solid walls.

**Figure 15: Portable and Temporary Structures**



There are also many portable and temporary signs within the RDA. Some are sandwich boards placed when a business is open and to announce short term specials. Others are on thin wood or metal stakes. Permanent signs are most typically monument signs with a ground base or pole signs with permanent engineered designs and lighting. Temporary sign structures give the appearance of a lack of regulation and long term investment and can depress property values.

**Figure 16: Temporary Signs**




8. *Lack of high speed cable service*

The only high speed internet location served by Orbitel Communications, the cable company serving the portion of the RDA north of the railroad tracks, is Interim City Hall. All residential areas may have Internet service by dial up through their telephone accounts.

9. *Traffic congestion and streets overcapacity*

A major concern of RDA residents and property owners is traffic congestion. Congestion is caused by backups on S.R. 347 when a train is passing. Other delays are caused by long waits to turn onto S.R. 347 from east-west streets at un-signalized intersections, including frontage roads. There is also congestion caused by abrupt narrowing of roadway sections; six-lane roads narrowing to four-lane roads and four-lane roads narrowing to two-lane roads.

Figure 17: Major Street Lanes with Average Daily Traffic Volumes Map



Base Map Information Provided by the City of Maricopa

City of Maricopa Disclaimer:  
Information shown on these maps or electronic files are derived from public records that are constantly undergoing change and do not replace a site survey, and are not warranted for content or accuracy. The City of Maricopa does not guarantee the positional or thematic accuracy of this data. The user agrees not to transmit this data or provide access to it or any part of it to another party.

Traffic volumes exceed design capacity for an acceptable level of service along S.R. 347 between Edison Road and Maricopa-Casa Grande Highway. Within this stretch volumes were 40,400 vehicles per day (vpd) versus a desired volume of less than 29,200 vpd (Level of Service E). Level of Service D, 27,600 vpd, is the acceptable level for a minor arterial with four lanes. A six lane principal arterial should not exceed 46,700 vpd. This information is from the Regional Transportation Plan Update, September 2008 Final Report Table 4.4. and Figure 4.8.

S.R. 347 also carries a heavy volume of truck traffic, between 5,000 and 10,000 trucks on an average daily basis or 7 to 12 % of the traffic on the highway through Maricopa. Some of this truck traffic is connecting from I-10 to I-8.

*10. Railroad crossing delays and safety concerns*

The Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) operates between 40 and 60 freight trains daily through the S.R. 347 intersection with projections of 70 trains by 2011 and 100 daily trains by 2013. This route includes all freight trains traveling from Los Angeles to El Paso. It is Arizona's second busiest rail line with many trains exceeding one mile in length. The railroad is in the process of double-tracking the entire line between Los Angeles and El Paso with completion in the study area by 2011 according to the city's Regional Transportation Plan. Double tracking will allow an additional 60 to 70 trains per day in the next five years. Trains with approximately 100 cars are causing a 10 minute or more delays, forcing long lines of traffic to back-up on S.R. 347 during the daytime. Rail passenger service by Amtrak also causes delays as the crossing is blocked when the train is stopped at the station immediately east of S.R. 347. Delays of 10 to 15 minutes are also caused by repositioning rail cars adjacent to the platform for unloading and reloading.

In addition to traffic congestion and time delays, there are safety concerns due to rail cars carrying hazardous materials. In 2007 there were over 44,000 cars, either partial or full, carrying hazardous materials that traveled through Maricopa. Not only passenger vehicles but many school buses cross this intersection daily. While there have been fatalities in and around this crossing, they have not involved hazardous materials to date.



**Figure18: S.R. 347 and Railroad Crossing**



**11. Historic structures**

The city has no historic preservation ordinance or provision for local designation. Designation on the National Register of Historic Places and the State Historic Property Register would bring eligibility for state and federal rehabilitation funds and lower property taxes. The State Historic Preservation Office can provide information on eligibility criteria. Many potentially eligible properties have been demolished; other properties may have had sufficient exterior alterations that render them no longer eligible. Designation requires owner initiative and entails some costs for application documentation. It is possible for several property owners to hire a consultant to determine potential eligibility and prepare the paperwork. Eligibility criteria consider structural integrity, architectural significance and events that took place at the site. Structures must be at least 50 years old to be considered.

**Figure 19: Headquarters, La Roca, Napa Auto Parts, and Water Tower**



**12. Summary Description of Blighted Conditions**

In order to meet the definition of blighted area, one or more of nine conditions must be found. The RDA meets at least four of these conditions:

- a. "Unsanitary or unsafe conditions"—There is a lack of sanitary sewer systems to serve small lots, outside unsanitary residential and commercial storage, inadequate water volumes and excessive fire hydrant spacing for fire suppression.
- b. "Deterioration of site and other improvements"—There are dirt alleys and unpaved streets, dilapidated or deteriorated structures and fencing.
- c. "Existence of conditions that endanger life or property by fire or other causes"—Traffic delays at railroad crossings of 10 minutes or longer could delay police or fire

responders from reaching major incidents resulting in possible loss of life and increased property damage.

- d. “Faulty lot layout”—Some parcels are very long and narrow or oddly configured to prevent easy development, visibility, or access, and they are in fragmented ownership.

### *13. Summary Description of Slum Conditions*

In order to meet the definition of a slum area, there must be a “predominance of buildings or improvements, whether residential or nonresidential” and “the public health, safety, or welfare is threatened” because of any of four conditions. The RDA meets at least three of these conditions:

- a. “Dilapidated, deteriorated, aging or obsolescent buildings or improvements” - There are some dilapidated or deteriorated buildings or improvements and many aging and obsolescent homes, nonresidential structures and improvements.
- b. “The inadequate provision for ventilation, light, air, sanitation, or open spaces” - Many homes and some businesses are on septic tanks on small lots. There is no public park in the entire RDA and no improved open space other than a small area around the Rotary pool and a few tables at the Amtrak train station. New residential subdivisions dedicate 5 to 10% of their land area for improved open space for their residents.
- c. “The existence of conditions that endanger life or property by fire or other causes”— There are inadequate water volumes to suppress fires. There is development in a floodplain, and there are delays for public safety vehicles in reaching incidents due to lack of grade separated railroad crossings.


## **Existing Zoning and Land Use**

This section identifies the zoning of property within the redevelopment area at the time of plan adoption, and for illustrative purposes, includes an existing zoning map for the RDA. A summary table showing the aggregate acreage for each category of zoning district in the RDA is also provided. This section also identifies land uses existing at the time of adoption and provides an existing land use map as well as a summary table showing the aggregate acreage for each land use category.

### *Existing Zoning*

The zoning of property within the RDA is relatively diverse. The districts reflect the types of zoning categories found in the Pinal County Zoning Ordinance. The breakdown of zoning districts within the RDA follows a logical pattern given the historic development trends in the area. Through the planning area, Maricopa-Casa Grande Highway represents a corridor for industrial zoning (CI-1 and CI-2) as well as rural, low density mixed use zoning (GR). These two districts represent approximately 80% of the land within the planning area. In addition to the highway corridor, these districts dominate the western sub-area as well as portions of the Old Town area west of S.R. 347. Almost all of S.R. 347 through the planning area is flanked by land zoned commercial (CB-1 and CB-2). The large vacant area southeast of the S.R. 347 and Maricopa-Casa Grande Highway is also zoned commercial. The street transportation zoning district generally represents roadways and their associated right-of-way.

Figure 20: Existing Zoning Map



Redevelopment District Plan

Existing Zoning

- Redevelopment District Boundary
- Maricopa City Limits

Zoning

- Street\_Transport
- Open Space
- SR - Suburban Ranch
- GR - General Rural
- CR-3 - Single Residence
- CR-5 - Multiple Residence
- MH - Manufactured / Mobile Home
- CB-1 Local Business
- CB-2 General Business
- CI-1 Light Industry and Warehouse
- CI-2 - Industrial
- Multi Zone



City of Maricopa Disclaimer:  
Information shown on these maps or electronic files are derived from public records that are constantly undergoing change and do not replace a site survey, and are not warranted for content or accuracy. The City of Maricopa does not guarantee the positional or thematic accuracy of this data. The user agrees not to transmit this data or provide access to it or any part of it to another party.

Base Map Information Provided by the City of Maricopa

**Figure 21: Zoning Summary Table**

Existing Zoning	Square Feet	Acres
CB-1	85,988	2.0
CB-2	5,612,096	128.8
CI-1	38,379	0.9
CI-2	61,959,999	1,422.4
CR-3	899,410	20.6
CR-5	30,261	0.7
GR	9,620,189	220.8
MH	618,027	14.2
Multi Zone	2,229,983	51.2
Open Space	12,267	0.3
Street Transport	5,607,562	128.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>86,714,161</b>	<b>1,990.7</b>


*Existing Land Use*

Approximately half of the redevelopment area is comprised of vacant land (over 1,000 acres). These developable areas are scattered throughout the planning area but it is worth noting that quite a bit of the western sub-area is currently vacant land. Approximately one-third of the redevelopment area is actively utilized for agriculture (such as crop production and dairy management); all of the active agriculture is west of the Green Road alignment and straddles both the north and south side of railroad. The remaining 300 acres (about half a square mile) are devoted to a great diversity of uses. Several institutional uses make up the RDA, including churches and schools; as well as several public building and facilities. There are close to 100 acres of residential development in the RDA ranging from larger lot single-family development to manufactured housing and attached multi-family units. Approximately 55 acres in the RDA are devoted to industrial or commercial land uses. While the industrial land uses are tightly connected to the railroad corridor, the commercial properties are more spread out through the area as well as the S.R. 347 corridor. The entire redevelopment area currently has approximately 125 acres of right-of-way for public access and use.

**Figure 22: Existing Land Use Summary Table**

Existing Land Use	Square Feet	Acres
Vacant	44,082,164	1,012.0
Agriculture	27,138,781	623.0
Right of Way	5,437,003	124.8
Schools, Churches, Institutional	2,282,650	52.4
Medium Density Residential	2,079,575	47.7
Low Density Residential	1,544,852	35.5
Governmental Facilities/Utilities	1,356,345	31.1
Retail/Office/Commercial/Medical	1,345,296	30.9
Industrial	1,056,343	24.3
Multifamily Residential	311,367	7.1
Parks & Open Space	79,784	1.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>86,714,161</b>	<b>1,990.7</b>

Figure 23: Existing Land Use Map



June 2008, Base Map Information Provided by the City of Maricopa

**Resolution Establishing the Area**

**RESOLUTION NO. 08-48**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MARICOPA, ARIZONA, FINDING EXISTENCE OF A SLUM OR BLIGHTED AREA IN THE CITY OF MARICOPA, ARIZONA AND DECLARING THE NECESSITY FOR REDEVELOPMENT OF SUCH AREA.**

**WHEREAS**, Title 36 of the Arizona Revised Statutes provides for redevelopment of slum or blighted areas within municipalities; and

**WHEREAS**, A.R.S. §36-1473 requires that the governing body of a municipality find that “one or more slum or blighted areas exist in the municipality and that the redevelopment of that area or areas is necessary in the interest of public health, safety, morals or welfare of the residents of the municipality” prior to the exercise of the powers granted thereby; and

**WHEREAS**, more than 50 percent of all sites which exist within the boundaries of the area depicted in the map attached hereto as Exhibit A are substandard by reason of poor general site appearance, an unattractive nuisance, or the existence of conditions which endanger life or property; and

**WHEREAS**, sound economic municipal growth and the provision of housing accommodations is substantially retarded or arrested in a predominance of the properties within the boundaries of the map in Exhibit A through a dominance of defective or inadequate street layout in the area; and

**WHEREAS**, these factors are conducive to ill health, juvenile delinquency or crime and are detrimental to the public health, safety, morals or welfare; and

**WHEREAS**, the actions taken to redevelop and revitalize this area will exclude the acquisition of private property through the use of eminent domain for the purposes of economic development in accordance with ARS §12-1131 *et. seq.*; and

**WHEREAS**, the owners of real property that is within the boundaries of the proposed redevelopment area have been notified by first class mail of the Mayor and Council meeting concerning the findings.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Maricopa City Council as follows:

SECTION 1. That a blighted area is hereby found to exist within the corporate limits of the City of Maricopa which constitutes an area where sound economic municipal growth and the provision of housing accommodations is substantially retarded or arrested in a predominance of the properties, and in these properties exists conditions which create poor general site appearance or endanger the life or property of the residents of the City of Maricopa. Such area is delineated on the map in Exhibit A, attached hereto and made part hereof by reference.

SECTION 2. The redevelopment of such area is necessary to preserve the public health, safety, morals or welfare of the residents of the City of Maricopa.

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE Mayor and Council of the City of Maricopa,  
Arizona, this 2nd day of September, 2008.

APPROVED:




\_\_\_\_\_  
Anthony Smith  
Mayor

ATTEST:



\_\_\_\_\_  
Vanessa Bueras  
City Clerk


APPROVED AS TO FORM:



\_\_\_\_\_  
Denis Fitzgibbon  
City Attorney



EXHIBIT A



**Public Involvement in the Development of the Plan**

This plan’s formation, vision and methods for reaching the vision have been guided by the community. Direct mailings have been sent to affected property owners, neighborhood and homeowner associations. Other interested parties within and in proximity to the redevelopment area were notified of public meetings and have been given the opportunity to discuss the planning process at their convenience.

The citizens of Maricopa have taken a great interest in this plan’s development. Nearly 100 community members attended the first meeting to provide input on the goals of the plan. Numerous individuals attended subsequent public meetings, contacted staff, visited the project website or made some other tangible contribution towards the planning process.

**Figure 24: Public Involvement**



In addition to residents and property owners, a number of technical and special stakeholders have been engaged in the process of creating the plan. Ongoing dialogue with the two Indian Communities surrounding the city has taken place. Critical discussions were held with local utility and service providers and the School District. The planning process also included review and input from the City of Maricopa Industrial Development Authority Board.

Finally, the consulting team facilitating the plan development met many times throughout the process with city staff to ensure Maricopa’s leaders and key implementing units of government would have direct input into the planning process.

During the six month planning process, three public workshops were held, drop-in hours were held at Interim City Hall, several presentations were made at public hearings within the City (such as before the Planning and Zoning Commission and the City Council), and smaller, issue-specific meetings were held with a variety of interests and groups affected by the redevelopment planning effort.

Mailings for the workshops were bilingual (English and Spanish) and translators were present at each workshop.

The first public workshop slideshow explained the purpose and benefits of a redevelopment area and presented information on existing conditions using text, maps, and photos. Participants then broke into small groups to discuss their goals for the redevelopment area, their desired land uses, and what they wanted to change and keep about the area. A recorder noted their ideas on flip charts. Then each group chose a spokesperson to present to the reassembled larger group. The small groups encouraged greater discussion and allowed for translators to assist Spanish speaking persons.

At the second public workshop, the slideshow summarized the results of the first workshop and proposed a number of recommendations to respond to what participants said they wanted as well as the input from many interviews in person and by phone. Again there were small group discussions about the recommendations and presentations back to the larger group.

The third public workshop had a brief slide show summarizing the results of the second workshop and went through all six goals and all of the objectives for each goal which is the format of the report. Information on timing and priorities and how development might occur was included. Small groups then discussed the goals and objectives, priorities, and timing and reported back.

After each workshop, the team summarized the public input. City staff then loaded the slide show and the summary onto the redevelopment plan's website which is part of the [www.maricopamatters.com](http://www.maricopamatters.com) website. This website has tracked all steps of the process, kept a calendar of events related and provided information about the team. Having workshop materials on the website has allowed out of town owners and those unable to attend meetings to follow the plan's progress.

The consulting team also received calls directly from property owners and their staff and made calls to owners regarding proposed land use designations for their property. In some cases, owners sent materials regarding their properties and discussed their plans. Team members even met at the businesses of some owners unable to get away.

There has also been press coverage at each workshop and articles appearing soon after the workshops in local news publications, such as 85239.com, the Maricopa Monitor, and The Communicator.

Figure 25: Redevelopment District Plan Website



### **Presentation to IDA Board and Planning and Zoning Commission**

During the planning process, the redevelopment plan was openly discussed at two public meetings before the City of Maricopa Industrial Development Authority Board (IDA) and Planning and Zoning Commission. Both groups were very supportive of the planning concepts and expressed interest in helping to implement the planning strategies following plan adoption.

The Industrial Development Authority Board noted that water and sewer issues were significant in the redevelopment area and that the potential for a tax exempt bonding improvement district should be harnessed so as to deliver the infrastructure necessary to realize many of the plan's objectives. The Board has bonding capability and has already discussed possible projects in the area, including an aquatic center, government center, affordable multi-family housing, office suites, incubator research, manufacturing plants, transportation center, medical facilities, home improvement loans, shared parking garage, Chamber of Commerce office, and visitor center in Heritage Park.

The Planning and Zoning Commission noted their role in ensuring the plan's conformance and relationship to the General Plan as a whole, as well as how this plan should be implemented and its relationship to their overall planning duties.

Both the Planning and Zoning Commission and IDA Board recognized the benefits of the creation of a redevelopment plan and the need to ensure the plan's objectives are qualitatively organized with respect to timing and priorities.

## Goals and Objectives

This section is critical to the overall success of the redevelopment area. In this section, goals and objectives for the refinement of the overall vision are identified. Additionally, the context for realizing that vision is established. Each goal is discussed in terms of specific objectives for reaching the goal, forming more specific policy, and carrying out targeted and strategic actions. The goals and objectives are not presented in any priority order.


- **Goal 1 – Character, Identity and Downtown Destination**  
Maricopa should have an identifiable urban core; this “heart” is the RDA. The RDA celebrates its culture and history through its architecture of public and private buildings, its streetscape, and small town, pedestrian friendly environment.
- Objective 1 – Establish a Railroad Heritage Park and Visitor Center around the water tower and a relocated Zephyr train; encourage historic designation of eligible historic properties nearby.
  - The water tower is unique, visually interesting and a reminder of Maricopa’s identity within the physical environment. This icon can and should serve as the foundation for a destination for both resident and visitor.
  - A Railroad Heritage Park should be developed around the water tower; the facility should include a visitor center for the city with information about what to do and see, as well as historical information and interpretive displays which communicate the area’s rich heritage.
  - As a destination, the park could be supported with private investment and management; the opportunity for small-scale retail services to be incorporated into the park’s design is significant. These opportunities include restaurants and gift shops.
  - The park should also tie in surrounding historic structures and markers and serve as the center point for a greater heritage district. The district should have historic preservation planning components, including specific design guidelines for its development.
  - The Zephyr train’s relocation to the park would provide an instant visual draw while providing a logical complement to the park’s theme.

**Figure 26: Water Tower and Zephyr Train**



- Objective 2 – Rebuild the historic train station as part of the Transportation Center to serve as the Amtrak train station as well as a restaurant and entertainment venue.
  - Before the old train station burned down in 1930, it symbolized the history and architecture of Maricopa. It was two stories with a peaked roof and parallel roof overhangs on the first level. The windows are outlined in darker painted trim that goes to the base of the each story. The building had two chimneys. The telegrapher and station agent and his family lived on the second floor for a time. At times as many as 250 people waited for the train there. The current train station is a single story modular building that is closed most of the time.
  - A replica station could serve not only train passengers, but restaurant and lounge patrons. It could become a destination and eventually serve commuter rail as well. The station would be located on railroad right of way, and its design would have to be approved by Amtrak to meet their needs. It could be a public/private venture.

**Figure 27: Existing Amtrak Station and Historic Train Station**



- Objective 3 – Build gateways at four entrances to Downtown Maricopa to announce arrival and strengthen identity.
  - Gateway features are important features for any corridor or district; the sustaining building block for establishing a unique and identifiable area is the gateway feature that ties the interests and qualities of an area together.
  - The redevelopment area gateway features should, at a minimum, be located on the southwest and southeast corners of Edison and S.R. 347, on the Maricopa-Casa Grande Highway before the cutover to Honeycutt, on S.R. 238 at the western edge of the redevelopment area, and the southwest and southeast corners of Alterra Parkway/ Desert Cedars and S.R. 347. These intersections and corridors, respectively, represent the physical and representative entrances into the redevelopment planning area.
  - Gateway design should echo the western architecture styles envisioned for the redevelopment area; these features should be visually interesting and designed at such a scale so as to stand out from surrounding physical features. Design should also consider viewsheds, such as lines of sight to surrounding mountains, existing and future development, and transportation systems.
  - Gateway features should be constructed of highly durable materials and maintained in a condition representative of the pride citizens have in the redevelopment area. Often times a stone base material is appropriate for its resiliency.
  - Include the community in the design of the gateway features; consider organizing a design competition for the gateway feature characteristics.

**Figure 28: Gateway Example**





- Objective 4 – Develop a consolidated Government Center and Town Square special events park to establish a focal point and destination for residents and to encourage other development.
  - Interim City Hall, a city/county court, and police and fire administration offices are all located in temporary buildings in the RDA. There is no public park within the RDA. All participants in the RDA public involvement process supported the idea of a consolidated Government Center and Town Square to permanently establish the RDA as the historic central place, heart, and government focal point for Maricopa.
  - The Government Center would be close to the Transportation Center and would allow private offices, restaurants, higher density housing and cultural facilities to locate interspersed to create a 24/7 pedestrian environment and maximize use of a shared parking garage. Thus the Government Center would also serve as a catalyst for private development and help support upgraded infrastructure in the area.
  - The longer term needs for the GC are for 40 to 50 acres including a 10 acre park around which public and private uses would locate. A vehicle maintenance facility could be located nearby. There are two vacant parcels south of S.R. 238 adequate to accommodate the Government Center. Access would be from S.R. 238 via Loma, Edison, and Garvey. Both sites could be served by Global, although neither is in any service area now.
  - Buildings should be taller, such as four to five stories, to reflect their importance and need for efficient use of land. There could be a taller tower to serve as visual reference point.
  - The public offices could be developed by the City or through a public/private partnership with long term leases, turnkey, or lease to purchase options. The park could serve residents and employees.

**Figure 29: Interim Public Safety Building & Interim City Hall**



- Objective 5 – Adopt design guidelines to promote use of Western and Agrarian/Railroad related design themes with shade features. This would require the City to adopt a separate amendment to the City design guidelines.
  - Perhaps the most unifying element of any area is the architecture; the City should develop and adopt design guidelines specific to the redevelopment area.
  - The desired architecture for development in the planning area is Western and Agrarian/Railroad.
  - Western architecture should be particularly important in regulating commercial development in the planning area, themes from this style (such as shaded, wraparound porch features and brick facades with timber framing elements) are easily translated into modern office and retail structures.
  - Agrarian/Railroad features (territorial, ranch and bungalow styles are common throughout the southwest’s residential design character) can be easily translated in the design of residential structures, and should be emphasized for this type of development.
  - Locate building walls closer to streets to frame the street, move retail and other new buildings along S.R. 347 closer to street, put parking on side or behind and create stronger corners and intersections to overcome 6 lane streets.
  - Pedestrian scale Government Center and surrounding area; center buildings around a 10 acre park with local street abutting on all four side. Create a mix of uses for 24/7 activity: offices, retail and apartment/condo housing with shared parking. Have one area in the city where people can walk among uses Ex. Verrado Town Center. Provide for shared parking for all except residential owners or tenants’ parking.
  - Encourage climate sensitive design; minimize asphalt parking lots and shade walkways and parking lots to reduce impacts of urban heat island, use white or light colored roof materials and incorporate solar panels where feasible and use overhangs and awnings to promote shade and pedestrian comfort and reduce energy use.
  - Ensure mountain view corridor protection to the west by breaking up building masses.
  - Recognize the importance of building height in defining the central core, height is the most important aspect in calling out the urban heart of the city; allow City Hall to be four to six stories with a tower visible from S.R. 347; promote three and four story offices and mixed use buildings around the 10 acre civic event park; taller buildings should be set back sufficiently from single-family residences to avoid blocking their sun and rear yard privacy.
  - Ensure appropriate ground level physical and visual access for all public buildings. Design public buildings to be entered without steps and with glass windows at ground level so public can see in and feels welcome. Incorporate building entrances from sidewalks and streets, not just parking lots or garages. Minimize blank walls at ground level by incorporating windows and doors and shadow boxes for public art or photos of the city or

announcements when windows are not feasible. Avoid dead space by putting parking structures and parking lots to the side or behind all public and private buildings.

**Figure 30: Example of Western Architecture (Tucson, AZ)**



**Figure 31: Example of Agrarian Architecture (Laveen, AZ)**



*Architectural Character Based on “Reflections of a Desert Town”*

- Little remains of significant buildings from the past in Maricopa and Maricopa Wells, so information on architectural styles is based on photographs in *Reflections of a Desert Town* by Patricia Brock.
- Before establishment of Maricopa, a place called Maricopa Wells was established on cross country stage routes. The main building at Maricopa Wells was a rectangular compound housing the several uses of the stage service activity. The building was constructed of adobe with a pitched roof of rush covered polls with adobe on top. The distinctive feature of the building was a sloped shade structure just above door height with a shingle covering. The adobe wall including a parapet extended above the shade structure.
- When Maricopa was established at its current location the initial buildings appear to be of frame construction – the Hotel Williams and the train station.

Both were two stories. The Hotel has a fake rectangular facade facing the tracks. The train station had a unique design with sloped shade structures extending at both the first level above the door heights and also at the second level over the windows. Both buildings had peaked roofs. Both were lost to fires. The train station might work as a model for a replacement structure or even new City offices.

- The Edwards/McCarthy House was a two story frame with a shaded second story walkway and an open wooden balustrade. The house seemed of a similar style to that common in other parts of the U.S.
- The Goodson homestead appears to be of adobe with wood frame windows with a Spanish Colonial design. Using this detail might be another opportunity for a connection with the past.
- The Maricopa Hotel and Café was constructed after the train station burned down. It had a peaked roof and an interesting walkway on one side. The structure appears to have a stucco surface and some architectural details in the stucco. The walkway was covered with a roof supported by columns and peaked arches.
- The Redbrick School had a peaked roof with arches over the entry doors and side windows.
- The Maricopa Shopping Center South looks like wood frame with peaked shingle roof. The covered walkways with a hitching rail are much like old town Scottsdale.
- The common themes in architectural style are peaked roofs and covered shade structures over walkways adjacent to the buildings. The Maricopa Wells building and the original Maricopa train station provide the best opportunities for picking up characteristic historical elements for use in new buildings. Caution is needed that this doesn't result in a Disney "West's most western town" look.

➤ Objective 6 – Use the railroad overpasses as an opportunity to depict the heritage of Maricopa.

- Rather than building merely functional concrete overpasses, the City has the opportunity working with state and federal funding agencies to incorporate public art into the surfaces in a way that reflects the history of Maricopa and makes them an attraction and point of pride. Possible funding sources could be a local Percent for the Arts program, using 1% of all bond funding for a facility, or an Overpass Mitigation Bond Fund designed to mitigate any negative impacts on surrounding properties. Designs could be developed through a juried competition that could involve local students working with artists. There are many examples in Arizona of successful incorporation of art into freeway over and underpasses.

**Figure 32: Freeway Overpass Art**



- Objective 7 – Promote an enhanced streetscape along S.R. 347 within the RDA boundaries to improve the image most viewed by residents and visitors.
  - Like the grand boulevards of countless European cities, S.R. 347 should function not only as means for regional circulation into and out of the redevelopment area, but it should also incorporate features for comfortable, attractive, and safe pedestrian circulation and enjoyment. This notion has the side benefit of ensuring motorists have a positive impression from the Parkway.
  - Specific design guidelines which should be considered include the use of detached 5 ft. sidewalks and low water use trees south of Edison Road to Alterra Parkway or Honeycutt Avenue; the control of sign clutter and sandwich boards; and the requirement for double tree lined streets leading to the Government Center from all directions.
  - Shade features are critical to promoting S.R. 347 as a multi modal corridor and ensuring pedestrian usage.
  - Perimeter walls fronting S.R. 347 should have architectural embellishments to ensure visual interest and help frame the roadway.

**Figure 33: Edison Road Streetscape**



- Objective 8 – Improve the appearance of temporary modular buildings and their sites.
  - There are public, institutional and private temporary, modular buildings in the RDA. Some have stairs and ramps to access the entrances; some have minimal façade treatment and are basic boxes. Some sites have no paving, or if paved, no landscaping. It is possible to add a façade treatment that makes the buildings look more like standard construction with stucco surfaces, multiple colors, ground level access, and varied roof lines. Loans and grants should be sought to help owners of existing temporary buildings improve their appearance, if they are legal and there are no plans for replacing them in the near future.
  - Portable buildings: do not allow at grade access, lack multiple plains, finishes and color differentiation. They imply temporary development and lack of long-term commitment to the site, or they are an attempt to avoid the time and cost of more permanent development. Even when intended to be temporary, they often can remain for many years. It is hard to set a time limit and then evict a business or demolish or remove structures.
  - The City should ensure that building permits are processed in a timely manner so that delays in reviewing stick built development are not an excuse for choosing modular buildings. Enforcement of codes should be pursued if temporary buildings are not legal. Future temporary looking buildings should be prohibited or strongly discouraged.

**Figure 34: Maricopa City / County Courthouse**



**Figure 35: Modular Buildings with Façade Treatment, Casa Grande, AZ**



- Chain link fences should be prohibited in all new developments in the RDA except where not visible from any public street or residential development. All fences should require a building permit to ensure proper placement and materials.
- Chain link fences tend to locate at property lines, do not screen outside storage, or vehicles, and do not signify quality development. Block walls or wrought iron fencing are better alternatives. Hedges provide visual screening, also.
- Require shade trees, shrubs and some plant material for ground cover in addition to decomposed granite. Decomposed granite as a predominant surface material, sometimes called moonscape, is hot and unattractive even in mounds with boulders. Lack of trees and other live landscaping materials causes increased urban heat island impacts and higher utility bills.
- Require that all new signage be monument style in the RDA, not sandwich board or ground signs on poles. Portable and temporary signs, either sandwich boards or temporary signs on poles, are unattractive and tend to block the right of way. A row of ground level signs distracts drivers, causes

sign clutter and can block sidewalks. Quality commercial development uses monument signs and wall signs to identify tenants and business names.

- Scattered site mobile homes should not be permitted on land designated for other uses in the redevelopment area. Outside of existing neighborhoods where they have been present for many years, they become isolated from a residential environment and lack a permanent feel. Modular housing or mobile homes with at grade entrances, façade treatments and landscaping should be considered subject to some design review.

- **Goal 2 – Adequate Infrastructure**

The infrastructure of the area, including streets, sidewalks, street lights, retention basins, and water and sewer systems, should be improved to current standards without creating unaffordable burdens on existing residents.

- Objective 1 – Explore affordable options to provide adequate and reliable water volumes and sewer service to all parcels in the RDA not adequately served.

- There are at least three possible options for providing adequate water and sewer service in the RDA to customers of Maricopa Domestic Water Improvement District (MDWID). It is assumed that Global will pick up water and sewer service in most of the undesignated areas; however, there are some areas that are of interest to MDWID.

*Option (1) Assist MDWID in obtaining federal funds to upgrade its system by adding additional storage tanks and hydrants. If it appears that the cost impact would be too great on existing residents, the City should consider selling bonds to fund an improvement district with some percentage paid by residents and some through Community Development Block Grant funds or other sources. This option still leaves the existing neighborhoods without sewer service. It is not feasible for MDWID to build a sewer system to serve so few customers. The only feasible option is to connect to the Global system. Global is not interested in providing sewer service to residential customers when they do not provide water service because of concern about nonpayment and inability to shut off service. The option of owners' buying insurance to cover nonpayment or the City creating a fund to reimburse Global could be explored.*

*Option (2) Third party purchase of MDWID by Global Water or some other entity. This would require the purchaser to pay back MDWID's federal debt which is through the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)-Rural Development. MDWID has reported that Rural Development will require a private, non-governmental purchaser of the MDWID system to payback all federal loans and grants, totaling approximately \$2.4 million. The purchaser could also incur costs to upgrade the system to improve storage volumes, hydrant spacing, and pipe capacity.*



*Option (3) The third option is purchase by the City of Maricopa. The City could then subcontract with Global to operate the system. While the City would not have to pay back the grants as ownership would remain in public hands, they would still need to repay the federal Rural Development loans totaling approximately \$400,000, and find funds to upgrade the system as well as pay any additional costs to purchase the system. The total cost of purchasing the system as well as funding options to upgrade the system should be explored. It could be a combination of revenue bonds, general obligation bonds, and federal funds.*

- Objective 2 – Develop a plan to pave all unpaved streets in the RDA.
  - The City is already using Community Development Block Grant funds to pave streets in Old Town neighborhoods. They should continue this practice to complete approximately one mile of remaining interior or bordering streets. Other dirt streets are more likely to be paved with redevelopment.
- Objective 3 – Determine the cost to install sidewalks and street lights at intersections and determine resident interest.
  - The issue of retrofitting sidewalks and streetlights in existing neighborhoods is very important to the community.
  - The City should devote resources to studying this issue in depth and facilitating an ongoing dialogue with residents until the desired improvements can be planned and constructed.
  - Through this process, the City needs to determine the specific costs associated with these improvements so that the best, most appropriate, financing tools can be determined.
  - As financing options are determined, community input will again be critical so that priorities and phasing can be identified based on needs and balanced by fiscal realities.
- Objective 4 – Develop a program and funding to remove portions of the RDA north of the railroad tracks from a FEMA flood plain designation.
  - The City has contracted with engineering consultants to develop alternatives to solve the flooding problem as described under “Existing Conditions”. The least expensive solution involves taking the water underneath the railroad tracks and carrying it via a 200 foot wide channel to the wash along the Green alignment. Cost estimates exceed \$10 million.
  - This would impact a few developed properties within the RDA although most of the land is vacant. The drainage way could become a recreational trail system when dry.
- **Goal 3 – Existing Neighborhood Protection**

Existing neighborhoods should be upgraded and preserved for the benefit of those who wish to continue living in them.

- Objective 1 – Establish land use policies and designations to protect existing Old Town neighborhoods, #1, #2, and #3 for continued residential use and to support replacement of single-family homes with new or upgraded ones by existing owners or those developing on vacant lots.
  - The land use plan in the Redevelopment Area Plan and the General Plan Land Use Plan should show the neighborhoods as single-family to protect existing residents who want to remain as shared through public input in the development of this plan. There are a few vacant lots in both #1 and #2 that would accommodate new single-family stick built or mobile homes.

**Figure 36: New Home in Old Town #2**



- Objective 2 – Adopt transition policies to allow more intense uses at the southern edge of Old Town #2 and at the northern and southern edges of Old Town #3 or by block face or block with resident support in #3.
  - The southern edge of #2 includes lots that face Garvey Avenue, which will carry more traffic in the future. They face nonresidential development and vacant land as well as train traffic. Any transition should not leave individual homes isolated or make major character changes while residents remain in homes.
  - There have already been some land assemblages on the northern edge of #3 along Honeycutt Road. Homes have been cleared. Some rezoning is also in progress behind the La Roca, near S.R. 347. The need for widening the road to four lanes when the overpass from Maricopa-Casa Grande Highway is completed may result in acquisition of land for right of way by the City or dedication by developers on the south side. All south side lots face new commercial development or vacant land on the north side of Honeycutt.
  - Both homes and businesses face Maricopa-Casa Grande Highway on the southern edge of #3. The south side of that road is vacant land, open storage, industrial uses or stores. Transitional uses could include stores,

offices or higher density housing. New open commercial uses should be avoided to protect the existing residents. Any nonresidential use should be screened and buffered with walls and landscaping from single-family uses.

- There have also been some internal assemblages that include most of a block face. Any transition to higher density, office or other nonresidential use that does not use existing structures should not be done on single lots but should require a minimum of a block face to protect existing residents from living on orphan lots. Nonresidential uses should take place within enclosed buildings.

**Figure 37: Transitional Land Along Honeycutt Road**



- Objective 3 – Demolish abandoned and boarded up homes or structures and provide assistance with periodic neighborhood cleanups.
  - The City should continue its previous efforts to coordinate and provide the tools necessary for neighborhood cleanup efforts; the City has successfully utilized neighborhood cleanup programs to address visual nuisances in the area.
  - The City should proactively engage absentee land owners with structures which are dilapidated or vacant lots which are properly secured and maintained.

**Figure 38: Abandoned Mobile Homes**




- Objective 4 – Identify loans and grants to help residents upgrade their housing.
  - There are numerous opportunities for residents to seek assistance with housing improvements. The City should provide easily accessible information on these programs and designate a point of contact for all inquiries from the community.
  - The City should maintain a comprehensive listing of available grants on its website.
  - Examples of the tools available include the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HUD Title I Home Improvement Loans, HUD Section 108 loans, HUD 203 (k) Rehabilitation Program, HUD HOPE VI, HUD HOME programming, EPA Community Wide Assessment, Arizona Department of Housing Low Income Tax Credits and Housing Fund program, and USDA Rural Development Housing Program.
  
- Objective 5 – As properties redevelop, require conformance with all citywide codes, ending grandfathered exemptions.
  - Many areas within the redevelopment district are exempt from portions of the zoning ordinance and city code regulations addressing property maintenance and neighborhood welfare.
  - As properties redevelop, a condition of approval should be full compliance with these regulations.
  - In addition, near term solutions should be discussed with property owners who do not wish to redevelop (these solutions may include the voluntary cleanup efforts discussed previously).

- It is important for the entire redevelopment area to be maintained in a safe condition which communicates the pride community members have in this special area.
- **Goal 4 – Improved Traffic Circulation**

Traffic circulation should be improved by providing overpasses for the railroad crossings and upgrading streets to remove safety hazards and bottlenecks.
- Objective 1 – Overpass design should consider the eventuality of four tracks and the need for multiple overpass points.
  - As described under “Existing Conditions”, delays of 10 minutes or longer are not uncommon multiple times per day as freight trains pass through the city. Train traffic will only increase with the completion of the double tracking and the addition of a third and fourth track at some point in the next fifteen to twenty-five years.
  - A study of potential alignments was completed in August 2007 and is now being considered by the Arizona Department of Transportation. Although no alignment was selected, the most likely option showed the realignment of S.R. 347 to be a continuously direct north-south roadway at the overpass. This realignment would enable the existing pavement south of the railroad tracks to serve as a frontage road providing access to the properties on the west side of S.R. 347 thereby eliminating direct access to S.R. 347 and easing congestion on S. R. 347.
  - The cost of the S.R.347 overpass could exceed \$100 million. To pursue federal funding based on concerns about safety issues previously described; the City of Maricopa hired a well known lobbying firm to represent their interests in Washington on this issue.
  - A second overpass along the Loma alignment or extension of Hogenes Boulevard would provide a second crossing and direct link to S.R. 238. Hogenes Boulevard connects back to S.R. 347 via Honeycutt Avenue and Bowlin Road. The Loma overpass would be less expensive due to less costly land acquisition and a four lane width versus a six lane width for S.R. 347.


**Figure 39: Future Overpass Locations, Option E Map**



- Of the numerous options considered and the five final options studied for this plan, Option E minimizes changes to the street system, utilizes existing collector streets, minimizes overpass costs, and eliminates two intersections that would no longer exist with the overpass for S.R. 347. The existing Edwards intersection with S.R. 347 south of the railroad tracks would be eliminated. The existing extension of Honeycutt Road immediately north of the railroad tracks would also be eliminated. (Need to revise the map) Closure of MCGH on the east side will occur with construction of the bypass to Honeycutt Road. Elimination of the current Edwards intersection on the west side will require purchase of additional right of way to extend it south to intersect with Honeycutt Avenue. This realignment would be necessary sooner if the adjacent properties were to redevelop prior to the overpass construction. This option avoids encouraging more traffic along Taft Avenue which currently has homes on the west side and the high school's main bus access on the east side.

- Objective 2 – Develop additional collector and arterial streets to serve proposed development.
  - The development of a concept for extending collector and arterial streets to serve the larger vacant parcels west of the Green Alignment, including the westernmost 160 acres which abut the Ak-Chin reservation on three sides, is critical. These road locations are not adopted as precise alignments but indicate a hypothetical, well-designed system. Collector streets are shown passing through the dairy when it is redeveloped. All alignments are designed to allow 90 degree angles at intersections.

**Figure 40: Access to Westernmost 160 Acres within RDA Map**



- Objective 3 – Limit curb cuts along S.R. 347 wherever possible by diverting site accesses to side streets that have signalized intersections (traffic lights) or by combining several commercial properties’ accesses into one shared access.
  - The purpose of this objective is to ensure safer access onto S.R. 347 minimizing left-turns into and from accesses across an eventual three lanes of traffic and long backups.

- Objective 4 – Develop a Transportation Center in the RDA. Co-locate multiple types of transit options and provide support service and transit oriented development, providing more options to reduce auto dependence and usage.
  - A multi-modal transportation center in the heart of the redevelopment area will provide a mechanism for ensuring the city’s sustainability as well as a catalyst for high quality urban development.
  - The transportation center should be located in close proximity to the future governmental center. However, if the government center is not located in the planning area, the redevelopment area should still be considered for the location of the transportation center because of existing infrastructure benefits and the future intensities and densities expected in the RDA.
  - The center should include a Park n Ride lot, structured parking for cultural facilities which could also serve as park-n-ride during the day and overflow parking for special events, the relocated Amtrak station, a local bus station for in town service, regional service to Tucson, Casa Grande, etc., a local bus station for in-town shuttles, and opportunities for connectivity with bike trails coming in from washes as well as the railroad corridors.
  - The transportation center should also project the rich transportation heritage of the area through its architecture and public art.

**Figure 41: Tempe Transportation Center**



- Objective 5 – Develop a trail system using streets already designated for trails, washes, and retention areas to connect with a regional trail system and allow pedestrians and bicyclists to access schools, parks, other public facilities, and shopping.
  - Trail access design should be a standard component of the land planning and development review process.




- Trail systems planning should occur at a very detailed level for the entire redevelopment area so that future opportunities and connections are realized.
- Trailheads should be designed and installed which reflect the uniqueness of the redevelopment area.
- The redevelopment area should have a diversity of trail system types, ranging from the natural open space orientation to the urban network; each trail context should have distinct amenities.

**Figure 42: Santa Rosa Wash Trail System**




- **Goal 5 – Greater Variety of Land Uses**  
The redevelopment area should attract a greater variety of housing, medical, cultural, recreational, entertainment, shopping, civic, office and industrial uses to serve the needs of the residents, businesses, and visitors of the city.
  - Objective 1 – Adopt a Land Use Map that includes a greater variety of urban land use categories and shows potential locations for uses requested by stakeholders to include in the RDA. The proposed land use plan provides more detail and a greater mix of urban uses than the General Plan.

Figure 43: Existing General Plan Future Lane Use Map



Redevelopment District Plan  
2006 General Plan Future Land Use


- Redevelopment Area
- Special Planning Area Boundary
- State Land
- Ak-Chin Indian Community
- Future Land Use**
- R - Rural (<1 du/ac)
- L - Low Density Residential (1-2 du/ac)
- M - Medium Density Residential (2-6 du/ac)
- MU - Mixed Use
- HD - High Density Residential (>6 du/ac)
- MPC - Master Planned Community
- C - Commercial
- P - Public / Quasi Public / Institutional
- OS - Parks / Open Space
- AG - Agriculture
- E - Employment / Industrial
- LI - Light Industrial
- RD - Research / Development



City of Maricopa Disclaimer:  
Information shown on these maps or electronic files are derived from public records that are constantly undergoing change and do not replace a site survey, and are not warranted for content or accuracy. The City of Maricopa does not guarantee the positional or thematic accuracy of this data. The user agrees not to transmit this data or provide access to it or any part of it to another party.

Base Map Information Provided by the City of Maricopa

Figure 44: Proposed General Plan Future Land Use Map



Base Map Information Provided by the City of Maricopa

*Residential categories*

- The RDA plan map has only one single-family category which is 6 units per acre or less. Single-family development is not expected to be a major use by itself in this area. The designation is limited to one parcel currently designated M or 2 to 6 units per acre in the General Plan and zoned CI-2, and the existing Old Town three neighborhoods to reflect the predominant use in them.
- The proposed Mixed Density (MD) category allows a mix of densities and products that would be determined through site plan approval at the time of rezoning. There is no minimum or maximum density for any project within the category and no overall density limit. A height limit of four stories and parking requirements would effectively set some limit on density. Density limits beyond the single-family level are arbitrary. Two one-bedroom units of 1,000 square feet each and one two-bedroom + den unit of 2,000 square feet take up the same amount of space. The two bedroom unit may require more parking, but its trip generation is a function of the number of residents and vehicles owned. However, the two one-bedroom units would be counted as double the density. The MD designation is used for sites of 40 acres or more generally to allow a greater mix of housing types. Mixed Density products could include apartments, condos, townhomes, live/work units, offices and affordable housing.

*Residential and Mixed Use Categories*

- The Plan uses the same Master Planned Community (MPC) as does the General Plan and places it on the entire 773 acre parcel in single ownership south of the railroad tracks. According to the General Plan, this category requires a minimum of 160 acres and allows a range of residential densities as well as supporting schools, churches, and neighborhood facilities. The overall density for the residential dwellings would be 3 to 10 units per acre. This category does allow for some unspecified amount of supportive commercial and employment uses.
- The RDA plan's Mixed Use category (MX) is intended to allow on site or adjacent horizontal and vertical integration of higher density townhomes, condos and apartments with offices, shops and restaurants. There are no minimum or maximum densities or intensities. This category is ideal for pedestrian and transit oriented development that has no or minimal yards, build to lines with wide sidewalks, shared parking garages and three to four stories in height. The practicalities of the market, including the need to provide adequate parking, will determine the appropriate density. It should be located so as not to impact the views or privacy of existing single-family homes. This urban district is intended to allow a mix of uses that are compatible in use and scale characteristics. It should be considered for a new mixed use zoning district to be developed as part of the City's update of its zoning ordinance.

### *Specific Use Categories*

- The RDA plan shows potential locations for hotels, offices, a Government Center, a Transportation Center, and an Aquatic Center. The purpose is to provide guidance as to desirable locations, but not to preclude other uses. This is appropriate for an area plan covering only 3 square miles, but is not applicable to the General Plan as a whole.

### *Multiple designations*

- The RDA plan shows two locations for a Government Center and two for a Transportation Center. In both cases only one site is needed. If the Council chooses to locate the Government Center outside of the RDA, there are alternative designations shown for both parcels. It is likely that one of the Transportation Center sites will be chosen. Other sites may show multiple designations that could work for any or all of the uses listed in any configuration or amount.

### *Open Space/Park*

- This category is intended for public open space not open space required by subdivisions as part of site plan approval and intended for use only by the residents of the development. The approximate 10 ac. Open Space shown on the Government Center sites would be for a public park to be developed by the City in conjunction with the Government Center or as a public park to serve a higher density residential area. It is not intended to require a private owner to dedicate or develop a park separate from any normal open space requirements for site plan approval.

### *School and Institutional Categories*

- The RDA plan distinguishes between Schools and Institutions such as churches and clubs because of the small scale of the plan and the importance of the high school in the area. For the same reason, the Government Center, Transportation Center, and Aquatic Center are called out specifically rather than being lumped under “Public/Institutional” as is appropriate for a citywide General Plan.

### *Commercial and Industrial Only Categories*

- The plan’s use of Commercial (C) is intended for primarily retail uses, but it would not preclude office uses or a hotel. It is not meant for residential or industrial uses.
- The category Industrial Park/Heavy Commercial is intended for manufacturing, research and development, warehousing, and large or outside commercial uses not appropriate to be located with housing. Sites designated could include railroad sidings, large trucking operations and uses that need some buffering from residential areas. It includes categories shown on the General Plan as Employment, Light Industrial and Research and Development. Preferred uses include lighter industrial uses such as light

manufacturing and business park development, also professional offices, including medical facilities, clinics and associated office support services. Retail, office and even hotel uses could be included, but would not be the main focus.

*Symbols*

- The RDA plan also uses symbols for future overpasses and gateway markers as well as a green dashed line for proposed multi-use paths and trails based on the City's adopted Open Space Plan.

- Objective 2 – Consider land use criteria when locating retail, office, hotel, multi-family, government offices, and industrial uses in the RDA.

*Retail development criteria*

- Access/visibility to arterial streets
- Close to housing and employment
- Particularly vertical mixed use arrangement
- Easily accessible parking
- Encourage parking variety; on-street, metered, surface, structured
- Ground level space with high quality streetscape
- Freestanding buildings on at least one acre
- Encourage larger structures with multiple users

*Office development criteria*

- Access to collector or arterial streets
- Shared parking model opportunity or parking at 1 space/300 sq. ft.
- Close to restaurants, shopping, and hotels
- Vertical mixed use (multi-family residential) desirable
- Close to transit

*Hotel development criteria*

- Visibility from arterial streets
- Insulate from heavy industrial operations
- Close to/integrate restaurants and shopping
- Close to employment centers, including government
- Encourage shared parking with some commercial uses
- Minimum parcel size of 1 acre with larger sites for full service hotels

*Multi-family residential development criteria*

- Access/visibility to arterial streets
- Close to transit, recreation, shopping and services
- Set back/ buffered from railroad, industrial and noise
- Minimum size parcel of 3 acres

*Future government center development criteria*

- Create core/identity

- Public investment triggers infill and infrastructure
- Enable safe and diverse 24/7 pedestrian environment
- Establish critical density/intensity for shared parking and transit
- Achieve efficiency through consolidated public services

*Industrial development criteria*

- Close to arterial streets and rail
  - Close to hotels and restaurants
  - Close to transit service
  - Set back from residential
  - Use retail services as buffer
  - Encourage co-location of similar industrial types
  - Plan for unique infrastructure needs
- Objective 3 – Allow greater heights, intensities, and densities in the RDA with sufficient buffers from single-family homes to create a more urban environment and act as an incentive to attract development in the RDA.
- The redevelopment area is to be the core of the city. Density, intensity and height minimums are critical to achieve the desired look, feel and function of a vibrant, attractive and active core.
  - Medium to high multi-family densities allocated vertically over ground floor commercial services is the key land use pattern. This arrangement provides assurances that commercial services can flourish during non-event, non-peak hours and periods during the year.
  - Taller buildings provide the added benefit of shade and street framing. Both these qualities contribute to a comfortable and desirable pedestrian environment.
  - Mixed use development with higher density and intensity also sustains transit service and provides for greater diversity in mode choices.
- Objective 4 – Market the RDA for the list of land uses desired by stakeholders with use of appropriate financial and development incentives and assistance.

*Residential*

- Townhouses
- Condo
- Senior housing
- Affordable housing
- Live/work units
- Existing housing upgrades

*Commercial*

- Hotels and resorts
- Automobile sales, services and repair
- Day care
- Movie theaters
- Bowling alley
- Ice rink
- Water park
- Local mom & pop stores
- Clothing stores
- Furniture stores
- Grocery stores
- Restaurants
- Health club

*Medical*

- Hospitals
- Clinics
- Offices

*Public*

- Municipal complex
- Neighborhood parks
- Regional park
- Town square
- Dog park
- Sports complex
- Aquatic center
- Large post office
- Cemetery
- Transit center
- Community college campus
- Large high school campus
- Library
- Museums
- Art walk
- Senior center
- Teen center
- Youth center
- Trails



**Figure 45: Aquatic Center**



- Objective 5 – Encourage less intense land uses as a buffer adjacent to the Ak-Chin Indian Community.
  - Although there is a recommendation in the General Plan calling for a 300 foot buffer of very low density housing or open space, this recommendation would have too great an impact on some small properties. It is recommended that land owners abutting the Ak-Chin reservation work with city staff and reservation planners to fit compatible uses that work well adjacent to Ak-Chin farming on their sites to the extent feasible. Proposition 207 passed by Arizona voters in 2007 requires local governments to compensate any owner whose property values have been diminished by new regulations, such as zoning or planning requirements.
  
- Objective 6 – Ensure respectful treatment of Indian reservation land and proper notification of artifacts uncovered during excavations.
  - In discussions with members of both the Ak-Chin and Gila River Indian communities concern was expressed about correctly following proper procedures if burial grounds or artifacts from earlier civilizations are uncovered during construction. The land base for the City of Maricopa was once the ancestral land base of the O’odham and all areas of the RDA have potential for inadvertent discoveries. The Ak-Chin Cultural Resource Office is the registered contact for the Arizona State Museum in this Land Management Area. Developers and anyone excavating shall follow proper procedure for compliance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. Maricopa is also governed by state law ARS 41-844 and

ARS 41-865 and, pursuant to state law, if human remains should be discovered, work at the discovery is to stop, the location is to be secured, and the Arizona State Museum must be contacted immediately.” Anyone who uncovers artifacts while digging should immediately contact the City of Maricopa Planning Division, 520-568-9098, for names and numbers of the proper authorities to notify. Developers, residents, businesses and visitors are also reminded that dumping on, trespassing on, or accessing reservation lands by other than established roads are illegal under the Ak-Chin Tribal Code.

- Development and redevelopment of land in the RDA should not alter, impede or restrict the flow or capacity of any wash or wetland abutting or flowing into the Ak-Chin community.

- **Goal 6 – Improved Property Values and Economic Activity**

The plan should provide ways for the City and property owners to obtain grants and loans to improve the area through development of new facilities, jobs, and uses and should create incentives to attract investment to the area.

- Objective 1 – Synchronize the RDA Plan with the city’s economic development plans, policies, and work program.

- It is envisioned that a holistic approach towards refining this plan’s strategies and executing development objectives will take place. To achieve this holistic approach, economic development planning and implementation must inform how this plan is carried out. Economic development is an ongoing process, able to swiftly adapt to the changing needs of the community and the dynamic nature of the economy.
- This plan provides a general framework for the types of development that will benefit the RDA over the long term. Near term actions, in carrying out this plan’s objectives, need to be driven by the most current data and understanding of trends and conditions. Synchronization of this plan with ongoing economic development activity is the means for ensuring the benefits of sound, long range planning are harnessed through informed, near term decision making.
- Based on the economic analysis conducted for this plan, it is possible to develop estimates for targeting development. Strategies for targeting development should consider the projected development scenarios contained in the following tables. Ongoing analysis and data tracking should be conducted so that annual, or more frequent, reports on build out can be analyzed. It is envisioned that this frequent review of conditions will enable a more dynamic approach to economic development activities.
- The following forecast was developed to serve as a baseline for future economic development coordination. Anticipated development trends are provided by land use in terms of square feet, except for residential development which is expressed in terms of units. The first series shows the RDA forecast, the second series shows the city forecast.

**Figure 46: RDA Development Forecast for New Development Table**

	Redevelopment Area (RDA)				
	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030
<b>Projected population</b>		451	3,016	5,826	8,655
<b>Projected supportable SF</b>					
Neighborhood and community retail	-	58,521	107,991	177,465	271,830
Regional retail	-	9,757	18,970	33,066	53,876
Total industrial space - including owned	-	58,892	137,114	308,194	721,573
General Industrial	-	29,446	68,557	154,097	360,787
Incubator/R&D/Flex	-	11,778	27,423	61,639	144,315
Warehouse/Distribution	-	17,668	41,134	92,458	216,472
Total office space - spec only	-	12,505	29,688	68,507	166,201
Medical offices	-	13,548	27,612	43,757	67,012
Single family residential (1)	-	55	821	1,615	2,371
Multi-family residential (1)	-	127	395	734	1,119
<b>Total SF, non-residential</b>	-	<b>153,222</b>	<b>321,376</b>	<b>630,987</b>	<b>1,280,492</b>
<b>Total # of units</b>	-	<b>182</b>	<b>1,216</b>	<b>2,349</b>	<b>3,490</b>

**Figure 47: Citywide Development Forecast for New Development Table**

	City of Maricopa				
	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030
<b>Projected population</b>		<b>13,992</b>	<b>29,773</b>	<b>45,494</b>	<b>60,931</b>
<b>Projected supportable SF</b>					
Neighborhood and community retail	9,030	243,706	548,212	897,220	1,286,610
Regional retail	752	39,620	95,670	166,726	252,060
Total industrial space - including owned	3,760	230,486	692,884	1,569,166	3,188,159
General Industrial	1,880	115,243	346,442	784,583	1,594,079
Incubator/R&D/Flex	752	46,097	138,577	313,833	637,632
Warehouse/Distribution	1,128	69,146	207,865	470,750	956,448
Total office space - spec only	749	48,723	150,045	349,147	730,337
Medical offices	2,257	67,364	153,715	254,958	369,933
Single family residential (1)	119	4,988	10,461	15,754	20,796
Multi-family residential (1)	13	653	1,544	2,590	3,773
<b>Total SF, non-residential</b>	<b>16,548</b>	<b>629,899</b>	<b>1,640,525</b>	<b>3,237,217</b>	<b>5,827,098</b>
<b>Total # of units</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>5,642</b>	<b>12,005</b>	<b>18,344</b>	<b>24,569</b>

- Objective 2 – Promote the RDA as a “favored” but non-exclusive place for important new development.
  - The RDA should have favored status so that developers first consider this area, and property owners have incentives that help them overcome the disincentives of being in an area with older uses and utility systems. Favored but non exclusive gives property owners in the RDA an advantage but not a monopoly.

- Objective 3 – Develop a tool bag of incentives to help residents, business owners, and potential developers upgrade and expand existing businesses and attract new ones.

Three types of tools are proposed: financial, public investment, and regulatory.

*Financial Tools*

- Tax abatement for larger projects: On an individual project basis, near and long term benefits should be evaluated with respect to project impact on tax revenues, catalyst effect on other types of desired development, project performance with regard to addressing critical community needs and services, and other factors as determined. Where projects are judged to be beneficial to the long term welfare of the community and redevelopment area, tax abatement should be used to ensure the project is economically feasible and realized. Through the designation of this planning area, the City has the ability to offer certain abatement action, such as the Government Property Lease Excise Tax program. Projects that will build up the synergy of the redevelopment area include offices, hotels, retail services and higher density housing opportunities.
- Partially funded Improvement District for infrastructure adequate to support dense urban development: As discussed earlier, it is possible to sell revenue bonds or general obligation bonds for an improvement district to upgrade water and sewer lines. The bonds could be paid back over a 10 to 20 year period from property owner monthly charges, City contributions, and federal grants. The time frame and percentage property owner contribution would be determined based on property owner support for the district and ability to pay. Examples of owner percentages could be 30, 50 or 70 percent with a differential for businesses which can expense the amount. Actual contributions are based on amount of lineal feet per owner. All resident owners would pay the same percentage while landlords and business owners could pay a higher percentage. Typically a high percentage of owner support is required to approve a district as once it is approved, participation is mandatory. In addition, with water and sewer districts, owners would also be responsible for connections from their properties to the water and sewer lines in the public right of way or easement.
- IDA tax exempt bonds: The Maricopa Industrial Development Authority has the ability to sell tax exempt bond for projects such as affordable and senior housing, manufacturing plants, offices, incubator research spaces, business rehabilitation and expansion loans, repairs and construction of homes, a shared use parking structure, and public facilities such as an Government Center and Aquatic Center with some privately run functions. The key is that the proposed project must be determined to generate sufficient revenue to pay back the bonds and pay for the administrative costs. IDAs derive their authority under State Statutes. The Maricopa IDA is seeking projects that create jobs and projects that create benefit for the city. The bonds pay an interest rate that is attractive to high tax bracket individuals living in Arizona, as the interest is federal and state tax exempt.

- **Infill Incentive District designation:** The City could designate the Redevelopment Area as an Infill Incentive District under State Statutes as it is eligible based on meeting four of six eligibility criteria: 1. Vacant older dilapidated buildings or structures, 2. Vacant or underused parcels or property with obsolete or inappropriate lot or parcel size or environmentally contaminated sites. 3. Large number of nuisances. 4. Absences of development and investment in comparison to other areas of the city. The City may designate desired types of development to receive these incentives:

  - ✓ Fast track development and assignment of a project manager from staff
  - ✓ Lower fees than other areas of the city
  - ✓ Different development standards than other areas—possible different standards could be greater height and density, shared parking credits, on-street parking credits, and “build to” lines for pedestrian environment
- **Grants and loans:** Numerous funding opportunities are available for projects that will contribute to the redevelopment area’s success. A number of federal, state and local funding sources give deference to projects that are based in a redevelopment area because this designation signals the importance of the project and the commitment of the community to utilize the funding appropriately and for the greatest benefits. Examples include the Greater Arizona Development Authority and Water Infrastructure Financing Authority program administered by the State of Arizona; both of these projects consider whether or not projects benefit a redevelopment district. Additionally, multiple programs administered by the Economic Development Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Housing and Urban Development Agency, and many other federal agencies, view a project involved in a redevelopment area as being more competitive and in need, relative to non redevelopment area projects. Redevelopment and infill growth is a key tenet of Smart Growth, as such; increasingly both state and federal funding programs will recognize the importance of this designation.
- **Local rehabilitation low-interest loans and grants for façade improvements:** The City could sell housing bonds to upgrade or replace temporary structures and to fix up existing housing for low and moderate income households. These loans could be combined with use of Community Development Block Grant funds for partial or further subsidized interest as federal money is not subject to gift restrictions of the Arizona Constitution.
- **Partial sales tax rebates for major new generators of sales tax revenue or assistance with public infrastructure or public parking structure:** Cities are allowed to rebate sales taxes to developers when they provide infrastructure or facilities that are of community benefit. This right is currently being subject to challenge in a lawsuit before the Arizona Supreme Court whose decision could change what is allowed under recently amended State Statues. Sales tax rebates have been used to attract large shopping centers, large hotels and auto dealers, all of which generate significant sales tax revenue. In

these situations, sales tax revenues have been split for a number of years until a cap has been achieved. Specific use of sales tax rebates should await the court decision.

- Sale of City-owned land in RDA: The City owns a small amount of land in the RDA that could be sold for desired uses such as affordable multi-family housing or mixed use development in conjunction with a Transportation Center, an Aquatic Center, or other development all or partially owned by the private sector or a non-profit. The City could also purchase land for public facilities or facilities benefitting the public. The City would use a request for proposal process that includes a list of desired uses and benefits, and design criteria. Interested developers would submit applications describing their projects, their capabilities and experience and how they best meet the City's guidelines.
- Updating of the city's recently completed Arizona Smart Growth Score Card: The State recently began administering the Smart Growth Score Card program. Through this program, the Arizona Department of Commerce evaluates all local governments in the State for consistency with Smart Growth principles. Those communities scoring the highest in this evaluation will receive preferential treatment in certain grant programs as well as specialized loan rates for other state funding programs. Through this redevelopment plan, the City of Maricopa becomes one of the few jurisdictions in the entire state capable of scoring in the highest score card category. The Score Card has several measurements that are satisfied by this plan. This means that various programs through the State departments of Environmental Quality, Commerce, Transportation, Parks, Tourism, Health Services, and Housing are either currently, or will be, available for the City's utilization in a manner more affordable and more lucrative than that provided to other growing areas in the region. The card should be updated annually and should reflect adoption of the RDA plan.

#### *Public Investment Actions*

- Government Center location: Construction of the Government Center in the RDA would stimulate co-location of other private sector uses such as offices, multi-family housing, restaurants and other supportive retail and would enable construction of a multi-purpose parking garage sooner in conjunction with the Transportation Center.
- Construction of shared parking facilities: Unlike sprawling suburban development where the cost of providing parking areas is very low and limited only by storm water management and overall development area size; urban infill development parking can be difficult to plan, expensive to construct, and requires unique management and maintenance. In offsetting these issues, publicly driven parking structures have been a proven technique in stimulating urban development. Through public parking opportunities, shared parking models for use can be developed and parking allotments can be distributed among non-competing land uses for the parking supply. When

programmed effectively, parking is utilized throughout the day and therefore yields the highest return on the public's investment. A public parking structure is a key part element in serving office, retail and public facilities in relation to the proposed transportation center.

- Transportation Center and enhanced transit service in RDA: The transportation center's potential impact on the redevelopment area is considerable. The existing railroad corridor and plans for future expansion provide an opportunity for the City to coordinate local, state and federal resources as well as the private sector, in maximizing the potential benefits to the community. Relocation of the train station to an area within the redevelopment area where the station can be integrated into a multi-modal, multi-use service and employment center will create a domino effect in the surrounding area. The potential for this domino effect to expedite quality, attractive and sustainable urban infill development and economic growth is why the transportation center is so critical to the future welfare of the redevelopment area and the implementation of this plan's objectives.
- Public-Private Partnership for developing Aquatic Center or Government Center: The City could explore the economic feasibility of developing an aquatic center with the private sector to run revenue generating services such as restaurant, day care, swim lessons and coaching, a physical fitness center, and massage therapy. The same concept could be considered for the Government Center with private office space, a restaurant/coffee shop, and multi-family housing with shared parking structure and possibly multi-purpose meeting space.
- Streetscape improvements and gateway signage: The redevelopment area gateway features should, at a minimum, be located on the southwest and southeast corners of Edison and S.R. 347, on the Maricopa-Casa Grande Highway before the cutover to Honeycutt, on S.R. 238 at the western edge of the redevelopment area, and the southwest and southeast corners of Alterra Parkway/ Desert Cedars and S.R. 347. These intersections and corridors will be identifiable markers for the unique experience envisioned for the redevelopment area. Land development opportunities around these markers will be very strong; these areas should be able to capitalize on the aesthetic resources provided by the gateway features. Another improvement that will provide both economic and social benefit is the upgrade and installation of streetscape improvements. Street furniture such as benches, bicycle facilities, oasis areas, shade trees, colorful vegetation, interesting public art, and other types of improvements provide for an attractive and functional pedestrian environment. A usable pedestrian environment benefits commercial development as well as residential development; the benefit is also seen in the reduction of automobile use and the development of strong, unified identity for the area.
- Public meeting space in RDA: Construction of public meeting space within the RDA, in or adjacent to a Government Center would meet a community

need and encourage traffic to the area, supporting restaurants and convenience shopping.

- Removal of FEMA flood plain designation for approx 400 acres in RDA: This action would save money for property owners that could be used for infrastructure improvement district payments and housing and business upgrades.
- Open space amenities: Construction of open space amenities such as through a heritage railroad park and structures to create identity, a civic event park space and linear trails and connectors increase property values and encourage investment and visits to the area. Including attractive wayfinding signage, lighting and shaded benches further upgrade the streetscape and create an unified identity.
- Percent for arts program: Dedicating 1% of all bond fund or other budgeted funds to enhance the attractiveness and functioning of public improvements and facilities in RDA and citywide is a public investment that creates a more attractive environment and promotes pride in the community. It is important that the art enhancements be visible not only to users of the facility and improvement, but as wide an audience as possible. The Government Center or an Aquatic Center would be good opportunities.

#### *Regulation and Policy*

- Height and density: Zoning provisions which allow increased building heights and residential densities are needed to promote the urban core concept for the redevelopment area. These provisions need to address context, quality, function and other urban design considerations. Height and density are important because they reduce the real costs of infrastructure upgrades (a critical need in the redevelopment area), they ensure the viability of mixed use, vibrant activity areas, and they attract specific types of services and land uses that are desired by the entire community but will only locate where a certain level of density is attained and building height is allowed.
- Pedestrian and transit oriented design standards: This plan recommends that zoning provisions which allow for transit and pedestrian oriented design be established to ensure a quality and sustainable urban environment within the planning area. Examples of these standards are reduced setbacks and mixed use development, wider sidewalks, shade and street furniture requirements. These types of regulations have many benefits, these include:
  - ✓ Increased Revenue - Local governments profit from increased sales tax and property tax revenue generated by development near transit as well as a more efficient use of public services and infrastructure.
  - ✓ More Transportation Choices - More mobility choices are created; young people, the elderly, people who prefer not to drive and those who don't own cars have the ability to get around.
  - ✓ More Affordable Housing – Costs for land and housing structures can be significantly reduced through more compact growth patterns.



- Transit Oriented Development can supply more affordable and more easily accessible housing.
- ✓ Reduced Pollution and Energy Consumption – By reducing the use of automobiles, households significantly reduce their rates of air pollution and energy consumption.
  - ✓ More Disposable Income – Next to housing, transportation is the second largest household expense. By driving less, especially with the escalating price of gasoline, parking, tolls, etc., thousands of dollars can be saved annually by each household.
  - ✓ Safer and Healthier Community – Walkable and bikeable communities promote healthy lifestyles for residents and a more active “eyes on the street” safer environment throughout the day and evening. Properly designed pedestrian facilities also increase safety by decreasing accidents involving pedestrians and automobiles.
- Shared parking provision: This plan recommends that development in the redevelopment area be allowed to reduce parking through a shared parking-modeling program. Parking reductions save money, increase development feasibility, reduce the urban heat island effect, retain developable land for more beneficial and desirable purposes and lead to safe traffic operations because motorists are not burdened or confused by scattered, disconnected parking areas. Shared parking models should recognize uses which not-competing parking demand functions as well as parking provisions such as on-street and tandem parking arrangement in satisfying minimum parking arrangements.
- Objective 4 – Eliminate or completely screen junkyards and monitor them for health and safety hazards.
- The presence of visible junkyards is a disincentive for adjacent property owners to upgrade their properties to any uses other than open storage and open industrial uses. It also sends a message to anyone passing by that this is not a desirable part of town. The distinction between open, unfenced commercial storage and discarded materials and vehicles is sometimes a fine line. The status of each area should be determined as to nonconforming, conforming or illegal. Those uses that are legal should be considered for loan assistance for improving the exterior appearance through taller, block walls with exterior landscaping if possible. Illegal uses should be removed. Zoning standards should be reviewed or modified to ensure no new uses can be established.
  - Junkyards should be kept in an orderly manner with requirements for pest control services. Participants in the Redevelopment Area Plan development process expressed concerns about health hazards and vermin related to commercial outside storage.

**Figure 48: Partially Screened Junk Yard**



**Figure 49: Unscreened Junk Yard**



- **Goal 7 – Citizens Advisory Committee**

The City Council should appoint a Citizens Advisory Committee consisting of residents, property owners, business owners, and other nearby stakeholders.

- Objective 1 – The CAC should monitor progress toward achievement of the plan, champion specific projects, provide an annual report on implementation progress to the Council, suggest amendments as necessary, and develop a logo for the RDA to be used on all signs posted on all properties receiving any city assistance or action.

- It is important to capitalize on the enthusiasm shown throughout the planning process for the development of the plan and harness this energy to help implement the plan.

- Members could help plan events in the area such as periodic cleanups, painting parties, or gateway art contests.
- Members could also pick projects to work on that excite them such as involvement in the next steps to develop a Railroad Heritage Park and Visitor Center.

## **Implementation Priorities**

Those participating in the interviews and public workshops want to see action quickly on their priorities. While some objectives, such as building a S.R. 347 overpass and solving the water and sewer problems won't happen quickly, they want to know what is being done to work toward solutions.

It is important to also tackle soon easier objectives such as demolishing City-owned abandoned structures and then posting a sign indicating this as part of implementing the Redevelopment Area Plan. Not only accomplishing the objective, but publishing its accomplishment by an on-site temporary sign and on-line on the City's website are important steps to show progress and action.

Adoption of new City policies and ordinances can also be done within a year, but may not be visible until actions are taking using them.

Residents also expressed an interest in seeing new forms of housing, such as apartments, be developed soon. These could be options for people losing their homes to foreclosures and young households not able to qualify for mortgages or not interested in home ownership. Industrial Development Authority Board involvement in mixed income or senior housing would be another visible way to promote new housing types.

### **2010-2015**

- Develop Railroad Heritage Park to preserve water tower and create visitors' center
- Funding for Overpasses
- Solution for adequate water and sewer system
- Government Center with Town Square Park
- Improved appearance of temporary buildings
- Western/Railroad/Agrarian design guidelines adoption
- Cost analysis for sidewalks and street lights
- Funding for removal of FEMA designation
- Policies to protect residential character and upgrade housing
- Adopted land use map amending General Plan
- Promotion of new types of housing
- New zoning rules for pedestrian and transit oriented development and gateway entrances and S.R. 347 landscaping
- Use of financial incentive tools to promote development
- Encouragement of less intense development adjacent to the Ak-Chin reservation and promotion of policies respecting Indian lands
- Establishment of Citizens Advisory Committee for RDA

### **2016-2020**

- Begin construction of Transportation Center with rebuilt historic train station and shared parking garage
- Upgrade all inadequate water volume service and connect all properties to a sanitary sewer system
- Relocate Amtrak station into multi-purpose replica of historic train station
- Construction of four gateway entrances
- Begin construction of S.R. 347 and Loma overpasses with Maricopa heritage theme art

- Funding and construction of enhanced streetscape along S.R.347 where missing
- Construction of floodway channel to remove floodplain designation
- Development of proposed collector and arterial street system
- Limited curb cuts and use of side streets with lights and cross access easements to improve S.R.347 safety
- Develop more new types of housing
- Develop an Aquatic Center
- Eliminate or screen all junk yards and commercial outside storage

### **2020-2030**

- Complete construction of Transportation Center for all forms of transit
- Expand shared parking garage
- Complete construction of S.R.347 and Loma overpasses
- Develop pedestrian and transit oriented mixed use village near Transportation Center
- Complete development of trails system using washes and sidewalks

### **Ongoing**

- Require demolition of all vacant and boarded up buildings with no plans for reuse after a specific time period
- Sponsor periodic neighborhood cleanups
- Control sign clutter and unauthorized temporary structures
- Continue use of economic analysis data and tools to target feasible uses desired by the RDA community
- Phase out grandfathered exemptions to citywide codes with redevelopment

## **Analysis of Implementation Costs and Benefits**

The Goals portion of the Redevelopment Area Plan (RDA) outlines several infrastructure improvement projects that are required to make it a success. These improvements include the Government/Transportation Center, resolution of the water/sewer service supply, street improvements (including pavement, curb, sidewalks, and streetlights) in the three (3) RDA neighborhood areas, sewer/water system improvements in the existing neighborhoods, two (2) railroad overpasses, flood control, and several other miscellaneous projects.

The timing and conceptual nature of the RDA precludes a precise determination of costs for the various improvement projects. Land acquisitions, actual extents of sewer/water/street improvements, size and/or location of the government/transportation center, and engineering costs are variables that were unknown at the time of preparation of the RDA. The City of Maricopa will specify project costs as part of the RDA budget and program process.

Some estimated costs to provide these improvements are as follows:

### **Streets**

- To construct local residential streets estimated construction cost can be expected to range from \$225 to \$300 per lineal foot.
- Arterial streets would have an estimated construction cost that should range from \$275 to \$350 per lineal foot, exclusive of land costs, if any.

### **Sanitary Sewer**

- Sanitary sewer collection systems will generally costs from \$40 to \$75 per lineal foot to construct depending on pipe size, depth, and other conditions affecting installation. As homes are transferred from septic systems to sanitary sewer, each home may experience charges ranging from \$3,000 to \$5,000 per home to make the conversion.

### **Potable Water**

- Potable water distribution systems will generally costs from \$40 to \$75 per lineal foot to construct depending on pipe size and other conditions affecting installation.

### **Variables**

- Additional construction/engineering costs will be encountered to address conditions that will vary depending which area the improvements are intended. This may include drainage improvements to correct flooding concerns, providing for utilities such as electric, gas, cable, etc., soil conditions that require additional corrective measures, and whether adequate fire protection is available.
- As wastewater treatment facilities and potable water distribution systems become mandated then these cost will be estimated and may be born jointly by the City and developers.
- All estimated costs are based on 2009 dollars.

Funding for these projects will come from public sources, private development, or public/private partnerships. These funding options would include the following:

- Federal funds and grants
- State funds and grants
- Intergovernmental Revenues from other governmental entities
- Private funding
- Industrial Development Authority Financing for qualified projects
- City revenues generated within the project
- Improvement Districts for benefited projects
- Grants and other funds received by the City for qualified projects
- Any other source of funding available to the City for use for redevelopment projects

Maricopa has been very successful at growing as a bedroom community to the Metro Phoenix area. Because of its clear separation with the urbanized region, capturing its fair share of employment activity, and even retail development, has been problematic. In spite of having sizable neighborhood shopping centers, the city still lags in retail development according to a recent study<sup>[1]</sup>.

The city's existing employment base is largely due to its agricultural roots. Although Maricopa's highway connections are good, it is not on a major or loop freeway, as are many of the other Phoenix-area suburbs.

- Maricopa's Employment and Multifamily Base
  - Employment and Land Uses
    - Maricopa's employment base will expand along two distinct paths: 1) Jobs at local-serving, and locally based, retail and service establishments; and 2) Jobs at establishments that provide goods or services to "the outside world," although this might include Maricopa as well. In economic development terms, the second category generally involves "basic" or money-importing businesses, which are typically sought-after for their contributions to the local pool of wealth. The first category in contrast does not add to the community's wealth but could detract from it if not fully represented in the community.
  - Maricopa's 2008 retail study showed that the city experiences significant levels of "trade leakage," on the order of \$57 million in sales annually, because it is lacking a number of retail/service providers that could in reality be supported by local residents. Approximately 1/3 of that leakage is in automotive and other vehicle and parts sales. Based on the study's figures, Maricopa could support substantial additional square feet of non-vehicle-related retail. Maricopa might be able to

---

<sup>1</sup> The report data were prepared by Buxton; report date is December 2008.

capture some additional sales and jobs related to vehicle dealerships, but a major auto dealer will probably not come to the city in the near future.

- City officials have expressed the hope that developers and retailers will “catch up” with the actual demand in Maricopa, which had previously been growing faster than commercial demographic-data providers could document the change. The current lull in growth could allow everyone involved in the development pipeline to reassess the potential. As the city grows, the retail space should expand at a rate higher than the rate of population growth; it will achieve new thresholds for additional goods and services not currently available. However, retail leakage will persist to some degree, at least 15 percent of full sales potential, until a regional shopping center comes to Maricopa.
- If Maricopa wishes to attract employers in the basic category, which would be in keeping with its economic development strategy “centered on building a sustainable city – one that features an economy characterized by diversity, competitiveness and success in the global economy,” [2] the City will need to take a decidedly proactive position.

➤ **Development Model**

- The City of Maricopa Development and Fiscal Analysis model was constructed for two purposes: 1) to provide a framework for estimating development activity over time in both residential and nonresidential uses; and 2) to estimate the fiscal and employment benefits of retail, industrial, office, medical office and institutional (i.e. hospital) and residential space to the city from development within the designated redevelopment area.

*The estimates of development activity were derived from a three-fold process:*

- Per capita factors were derived from employment and population data[3] by industry for a series of case study non-suburban cities and from Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) data.
- Changes in per capita ratios for major land uses over time were calculated based on a starting point in 2009 and ending point in 2030, and an assumption that the change in ratios would follow either a straight line or growth-curve pattern. The growth curves, shown on Figure 50, generally reflect the first stage of a “S” curve typical of growth patterns in which growth occurs slowly at first and becomes more pronounced in later years. Because Maricopa is assumed to be growing well beyond the projection period of this report, the “S” curve does not reflect the later stages of growth during which the growth rate gradually levels.
- The model estimates development activity for the entire city, or for a portion thereof by varying the “capture rate,” or an estimate of the amount of

2 City’s website at [http://www.maricopa-az.gov/city\\_manager/economic-development/index.php](http://www.maricopa-az.gov/city_manager/economic-development/index.php).

3 County Business Patterns, 2006




development activity that could be expected to occur, in this case in the RDA. The capture rate estimate is based on the location, size, and characteristics of property within the RDA, the proposed uses, and alternative development areas for various uses within the city.

*For this exercise, the capture rate remains relatively flat throughout the projection period, for the following reasons:*

- Early in the redevelopment process, the area will have to overcome the depressed image and various functional (primarily infrastructure) disincentives to development.
- Over time, the redevelopment area will become increasingly attractive, but simultaneously other parts of the city will emerge as desirable locations, as overall growth continues. Multifamily is to some extent an exception, in that few locations will be more suitable than the RDA (aside from its most remote portions) for this kind of use, especially early in the city’s growth cycle and if the Government Center is developed in the RDA.

**Figure 50: Land Use Per Capita Growth Curves Chart**



Source: McClure Consulting, LLC

*Development Model results and key assumptions are shown on Figure 51 below. The table figures indicate that by 2030:*

- Approximately two-thirds of the residential land in the RDA could be developed.
- Approximately 30 percent of the nonresidential land, in retail, industrial, business park, etc. could be developed.
- The absorption sequence in 5-year increments is summarized by major land use categories in Figure 51.

**Figure 51: Development Model Summary Table**

**NEW Development after 2009, in sq. ft. (top table) and acres except as noted**

	Redevelopment Area (RDA)					City of Maricopa				
	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030
<b>Projected population</b>		451	3,016	5,826	8,655	<b>38,377</b>	<b>51,496</b>	<b>66,647</b>	<b>81,740</b>	<b>96,561</b>
<b>Projected supportable SF</b>										
Neighborhood and community retail	-	58,521	107,991	177,465	271,830	9,030	243,706	548,212	897,220	1,286,610
Regional retail	-	9,757	18,970	33,066	53,876	752	39,620	95,670	166,726	252,060
Total industrial space - including owned	-	58,892	137,114	308,194	721,573	3,760	230,486	692,884	1,569,166	3,188,159
General Industrial	-	29,446	68,557	154,097	360,787	1,880	115,243	346,442	784,583	1,594,079
Incubator/R&D/Flex	-	11,778	27,423	61,639	144,315	752	46,097	138,577	313,833	637,632
Warehouse/Distribution	-	17,668	41,134	92,458	216,472	1,128	69,146	207,865	470,750	956,448
Total office space - spec only	-	12,505	29,688	68,507	166,201	749	48,723	150,045	349,147	730,337
Medical offices	-	16,257	30,321	50,458	78,365	2,257	67,364	153,715	254,958	369,933
Institutional (hospitals)	-	32,453	59,660	88,208	88,208	1,505	85,677	208,001	364,105	552,400
Single family residential (1)	-	55	821	1,615	2,371	119	4,988	10,461	15,754	20,796
Multi-family residential (1)	-	127	395	734	1,119	13	653	1,544	2,590	3,773
<b>Total SF, non-residential</b>	-	<b>188,385</b>	<b>383,745</b>	<b>725,897</b>	<b>1,380,053</b>	<b>18,053</b>	<b>715,576</b>	<b>1,848,526</b>	<b>3,601,322</b>	<b>6,379,498</b>
<b>Total # of units</b>	-	<b>182</b>	<b>1,216</b>	<b>2,349</b>	<b>3,490</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>5,642</b>	<b>12,005</b>	<b>18,344</b>	<b>24,569</b>
<b>Projected supportable acreage</b>										
Neighborhood and community retail	-	6.1	11.3	18.5	28.4	0.9	25.4	57.2	93.6	134.3
Regional retail	-	1.0	2.0	3.5	5.6	0.1	4.1	10.0	17.4	26.3
Total industrial space - including owned	-	3.9	9.0	20.2	47.3	0.2	15.1	45.4	102.9	209.1
General Industrial	-	1.9	4.5	10.1	23.7	0.1	7.6	22.7	51.5	104.6
Incubator/R&D/Flex	-	0.8	1.8	4.0	9.5	0.0	3.0	9.1	20.6	41.8
Warehouse/Distribution	-	1.2	2.7	6.1	14.2	0.1	4.5	13.6	30.9	62.7
Total office space - spec only	-	0.8	1.9	4.5	10.9	0.0	3.2	9.8	22.9	47.9
Medical offices	-	1.1	2.0	3.3	5.1	0.1	4.4	10.1	16.7	24.3
Institutional (hospitals)	-	2.1	3.9	5.8	5.8	0.1	5.6	13.6	23.9	36.2
Single family residential	-	13.8	205.2	403.7	592.8	29.6	1,247.1	2,615.2	3,938.5	5,199.1
Multi-family residential	-	8.4	26.4	48.9	74.6	0.9	43.6	103.0	172.7	251.5
<b>Total Non-residential</b>	-	<b>15.0</b>	<b>30.1</b>	<b>55.8</b>	<b>103.1</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>57.9</b>	<b>146.2</b>	<b>277.5</b>	<b>478.1</b>
<b>Total Residential acreage</b>	-	<b>22.3</b>	<b>231.6</b>	<b>452.7</b>	<b>667.4</b>	<b>30.5</b>	<b>1,290.6</b>	<b>2,718.1</b>	<b>4,111.2</b>	<b>5,450.6</b>


Note: 1. Residential elements are expressed in number of units

**Key model assumptions:**

Based on periodic absorption of, for most non-residential uses, 60% of available absorption, every 3 years, or a general 20% annual capture rate, within the RDA. Figures for the entire city are provided for comparison.

FARs: 0.22 for retail, 0.35 for other non-residential; residential single family at 4 units per acre; multifamily at 15.

**Figure 52: Percent of Land Absorbed by Major Land Use Category, 5-year Intervals Chart**



Source: McClure Consulting LLC development model.

- Recreation and other special uses
  - The development model does not address recreation and other special uses, and we have generally indirect means of estimating recreational business (and hotel, for this exercise) activity. One way of approaching these estimates is to compare numbers of recreation establishments to populations in large areas, such as the state of Arizona or the US.

*A review of this type, using US Census County Business Pattern data, yields the following results:*

- Figure 53 estimates of the number of selected recreational establishment types, and hotels, supportable in Maricopa.
- Note that the Business Pattern definition of “fitness & recreational sports centers” is rather broad: “establishments primarily engaged in operating fitness and recreational sports facilities featuring exercise and other active physical fitness, conditioning, or recreational sports activities such as swimming, skating, or racquet sports.” The table shows that, by 2030, a bowling facility and a cinema could be developed in Maricopa. Both of these could be located in the RDA. Several fitness and recreational sports centers could also be supported in Maricopa, and one or more of these could be in

the RDA. The city should be able, according to this simple analysis, to support more than one hotel immediately, and several more by 2020-2030.

**Figure 53: Other Supportable Uses Table**

NAICS code	Use	Persons/ establishment	# supportable in Maricopa		
			2010	2020	2030
713940	Fitness & recreational sports centers	10,000	3.8	6.7	9.7
713950	Bowling centers	100,000	0.4	0.7	1.0
512131	Motion picture exhibition	80,000	0.5	0.8	1.2
72110	Hotels (excpt casino)	10,000	3.8	6.7	9.7

- The community has expressed a specific interest in an aquatic center. Details on similar projects are shown on Figure 54. Although limited, these data suggest that the concept could be feasible for Maricopa.


**Figure 54: Aquatic Center Characteristics Table**

Facility	Location	Yr Built	2000 Population	Features	Funding
Holland Aquatic Center	Holland, MI	1999	35,211	- Water playground w/ slides - Diving - 50 meter pool - Zip line - Instructional pool - Spa - Therapy pool	The total cost of the project was \$12.5 million and was acquired through the sale of tax-free municipal bonds. The bonds are being paid via a portion of property taxes. Their annual operating budget is \$2 million, with roughly 50% coming from admission rates, rentals and other concession and the other 50% coming from property taxes.
Surprise Aquatic Center	Surprise, AZ	2002	30,866	- Zero depth play area - Slides - Whirlpool - Competition pool - Diving	Total cost of the project was \$3.2 million. Unable to locate where the funding came from, however, a city official stated that some of the funds were generated from a 'new home' tax.
Sierra Vista Aquatic Center	Sierra Vista, AZ	2002	37,287	- 36,500 SF facility w 11,347 SF of water surface - 8 lane lap pool - Beach-style entry - Kids slide/lagoon - Diving	Revenue bonds were issued to finance the \$6.7 million facility. The project was of no cost to the tax payers, however not sure if tax payer dollars come into play for the annual operating budget.

Source: Aquatic center information was derived from various City and developer websites; in addition to speaking with Tom Boss, Director of the Holland Aquatic Center, and Holly Brower, Manager of the Surprise Aquatic Center.

- Progression of development
  - With the redevelopment plan in place, including plans for addressing fundamental infrastructure issues, the residentially planned parcels are likely to be the first areas in the RDA to develop and to absorb most quickly. This is particularly the case for the infill residential parcels fairly close to the city center and to existing development. In general, inclusion of the Government Center in the RDA should substantially accelerate development and redevelopment of all RDA properties. Absorption of industrial property will likely require strong promotional efforts by an economic development team. Figure 56 provides additional observations on the likely development sequencing of uses and major specific parcels.

Figure 55: Vacant Land by Parcel Study Number Map



Redevelopment District Plan

Vacant and Agricultural Parcels  
5 Acres or More

- Redevelopment District Boundary
- Maricopa City Limits

Total = 1582 Acres

- 1 = 55 Ac
- 2 = 6 Ac
- 3 = 10 Ac
- 4 = 40 Ac
- 5 = 141 Ac
- 6 = 10 Ac
- 7 = 15 Ac
- 8 = 10 Ac
- 9 = 25 Ac
- 10 = 51 Ac
- 11 = 80 Ac
- 12 = 110 Ac
- 13 = 7 Ac
- 14 = 5 Ac
- 15 = 81 Ac
- 16 = 773 Ac
- 17 = 11 Ac
- 18 = 9 Ac
- 19 = 43 Ac
- 20 = 40 Ac
- 21 = 8 Ac
- 22 = 52 Ac



City of Maricopa Disclaimer:  
Information shown on these maps or electronic files are derived from public records that are constantly undergoing change and do not replace a site survey, and are not warranted for content or accuracy. The City of Maricopa does not guarantee the positional or thematic accuracy of this data. The user agrees not to transmit this data or provide access to it or any part of it to another party.

Base Map Information Provided by the City of Maricopa

**Figure 56: Projected General Progression of Development in the RDA Table**

Use/parcel	General timing/sequence	Factors supporting or accelerating expected timing	Factors that could hinder timing
<b>Residential</b>			
Parcel 16: MPC	Not likely to begin until the housing market has substantially recovered. Pace of development may not be as rapid as other land communities in Maricopa in the past.	Overpass at Loma and other street improvements or planned improvements that improve access to the MPC	Areas of the city where clusters of master planned communities exist, are under development, or planned have a competitive advantage because of retail and other supporting development occurring nearby
Parcels 4, 11, and 20	Development will probably be integrated with the adjacent MPC.	Pace of development will be dependent on the progress of adjacent MPC	
Parcel 5	Being somewhat isolated at present, parcel's pace of development will depend heavily on what occurs on adjacent land	In general, other areas of the city are more immediately attractive for residential development	Relocation of dairy is probably essential
Parcels 12 and 22	These infill properties will be most attractive when the dairy relocates	Development of the government center and/or transportation center	
Parcel 6	Residential portions could develop in the near future	Beginning or impending development of the adjacent MPC; Loma overpass	If government center goes in to the north, that (GC) area will be more competitive
Parcel 10	Competitive for near-term development	347 overpass will add to the viability of this area, especially for higher density residential	Adjacent new industrial uses need to be generally compatible
Parcels 13 and 14	Competitiveness of this location is fairly dependent upon the presence of the government center	Adjacent transportation center would spur development	Existing neighborhood to south must show some signs of improvement
<b>Retail</b>			
On John Wayne Parkway	These parcels are viable immediately. The ones on the east side of 347 have the advantage of being mostly vacant and larger.	Overpass on 347 would accelerate development of the parcels south of MCG highway	Existing development of lower quality could be a detriment to some parcels
On 238	Longer-term prospects	Timely development of adjacent or nearby residential	
<b>Industrial Park; Office</b>	Sites closest to center of city will have best prospects. Absorption could take many years and individual lot-development projects should be scaled accordingly.	Community internal needs will require some space in the near future	For extensive, large-scale development, City or other economic development entity must promote Maricopa as a location for employment

- Fiscal Benefits
  - Figure 57 summarizes the generation of new sales taxes and property taxes, and full-time employment, resulting from the development sequence projected in Figure 55. For this draft, the table does not reflect any incentive programs that might affect or offset tax receipts for the RDA.
  - Figure 59 provides a broad indication of the range of land prices potentially supportable with a redevelopment program in the RDA. The critical pricing factor for landowners to consider is the extent to which properties in the RDA must compete with other sites throughout the city and on the neighboring Native American communities. Based on current programmatic assumptions, the RDA properties will be competing in an “open market” in which developers, including public entities, will seek out the best value for properties, regardless of RDA status.

**Figure 57: Estimated Fiscal Benefits – Redevelopment Area Table**

<b>NEW employment and annual and one-time tax generation</b>					
	<b>Redevelopment Area (RDA)</b>				
	<b>2010</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2025</b>	<b>2030</b>
<b>Annual receipts as of dates shown</b>					
Retail sales taxes (limited to retail establishments)	\$0	\$460,877	\$856,987	\$1,421,080	\$2,198,516
Property taxes					
City	\$0	\$259,096	\$1,058,456	\$2,049,174	\$3,370,694
School District & other local /1	\$0	\$619,411	\$2,338,052	\$4,519,763	\$7,535,625
<b>Full-time Employment as of dates shown (no constr.)</b>	0	307	637	1,221	2,414
	<b>\$2,010</b>	<b>2011-2015</b>	<b>2016-2020</b>	<b>2021-2025</b>	<b>2026-2030</b>
<b>One-time total construction tax receipts for the time period shown</b>	\$0	\$1,206,419	\$5,606,583	\$6,393,203	\$7,230,195
Note: 1. Generally excludes county-wide tax levies, and excludes special districts					



**Figure 58: Estimated Fiscal Benefits – City of Maricopa Table**

<b>NEW employment and annual and one-time tax generation</b>					
	<b>City of Maricopa</b>				
	<b>2010</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2025</b>	<b>2030</b>
<b>Annual receipts as of dates shown</b>					
Retail sales taxes (limited to retail establishments)	\$66,031	\$1,912,453	\$4,346,202	\$7,181,634	\$10,386,022
Property taxes					
City	\$18,349	\$4,210,357	\$9,230,650	\$14,785,048	\$21,208,748
School District & other local /1	\$45,720	\$8,777,474	\$19,396,326	\$31,396,791	\$45,639,244
<b>Full-time Employment as of dates shown (no constr.)</b>	35	1,283	3,275	6,319	11,120
	<b>\$2,010</b>	<b>2011-2015</b>	<b>2016-2020</b>	<b>2021-2025</b>	<b>2026-2030</b>
<b>One-time total construction tax receipts for the time period shown</b>	\$0	\$30,229,508	\$35,471,510	\$36,609,716	\$38,304,806
Note: 1. Generally excludes county-wide tax levies, and excludes special districts					

**Figure 59: Realistic Supportable Land Price Ranges (2009 dollars)**

Use	Price/square foot range		Price/acre range	
Retail	\$5.00	\$12.00	\$217,800	\$522,720
Hotel	(note 1)			
Office (low-rise)	\$4.00	\$10.00	\$174,240	\$435,600
High density residential (not hi-rise)	\$3.50	\$7.50	\$152,460	\$326,700
Industrial/business park	\$3.00	\$6.50	\$130,680	\$283,140
Residential (2)	\$1.03	\$1.61	\$45,000	\$70,000

Source: Loopnet listings; Trent D. Rustan, Senior Vice President, Cole Investment Advisors; McClure Consulting LLC

Assumptions that apply to these price estimates include the following:

- “Normal” economic conditions.
  - Well-located properties in competitive locations for desired uses.
  - The timing for development is close at hand.
  - Properties are a minimum of 1 acre in size.
  - Upper end of range represents best-located, optimally sized properties for targeted uses.
- (1) Price range is similar to or higher than retail and location need not be as prime.  
 (2) Planned and entitled property.

### **Amendment Procedure**

There are several State law provisions affecting amendment of a redevelopment area plan. If the plan is modified after sale or lease of property in the redevelopment area and that plan change affects a property purchased or leased after adoption of the plan and prior to the change, the change must be approved by the redeveloper(s) of the affected land. This is to prevent harm to an investor who has proceeded in reliance of language or map designation in the plan. If a proposed modification to the plan will substantially change the redevelopment plan as previously approved, it shall be considered a new plan and subject to all notification, advertising, comment and hearing requirements as if it were the initial adoption. Since no criteria are provided to define a substantial change, it is recommended that amendments be infrequent and only when a substantial change is needed to avoid legal challenges as to improper procedure. When an amendment is necessary, the procedure is that used for the initial adoption of this plan, or as specified by Statute at the time of application.

The RDA Plan is a policy plan, and it is expected that timeframes and priorities will change and that small deviations from the land use map will occur. Any General Plan major amendment affecting the area should be treated as a substantial change.

## **Statutorily Required Planning Statements**

Arizona Revised Statutes (ARS § 36-1479) requires that the following planning statements be provided in the approved redevelopment area plan. The following list has been included to ensure compliance with this requirement; the list provides an itemized listing of each required statement followed by a response how the approved plan complies with the requirement.

1. *Statement of the boundaries of the redevelopment area.*

The boundaries of the RDA are described and mapped on page 17.

2. *Map of the existing uses and conditions.*

A map of existing land uses is shown in on page 42. The conditions of real property are described in this section under existing conditions. Almost all development in the area occurred prior to incorporation in 2003. Much of the housing is older single and doublewide mobile homes which are regulated by the state. Most of the housing whether factory built or site built is aging and obsolete. Some housing has deteriorated, and some is dilapidated. The absence of sanitary sewer service for all housing is a health and safety hazard.

3. *Land use plan showing proposed uses.*

A future land use plan for the area is shown on page 71.

4. *Proposed standards for population densities, land coverage and building intensities.*

The land use map shows areas for single-family and multi-family density. Single-family densities are those equal to or less than 6 units per acre. Multi-family densities will be established at the time of rezoning or site plan approval through the Planned Area Development process. Mixed density residential will follow the same process and is intended to allow a mix of higher density single-family homes and townhomes with some apartment developments in the same area without establishing arbitrary density limits. Mixed use development will allow apartments or condos to locate on the same site, adjacent or vertically integrated with retail and office.

The plan calls for new zoning districts or use of Planned Area Developments in which the goal is pedestrian oriented and transit oriented development. This type of development focuses on streetscape with wider sidewalks and reduced setbacks. It is most appropriate near the Government Center and near the Transportation Center although it is not restricted to those areas. Encouragement of three and four story development in the core areas will also increase densities and intensities.

5. *Proposed changes, if any, in zoning ordinances or maps, street layouts, street levels or grades, building codes or ordinances.*

Adoption of the Plan will not change the zoning on any property. It will not require any property owner to rezone. The City may require conformity with the plan's goals, objectives and maps to receive financial incentives. Implementation of this Plan shall be incremental, and changes to the above shall be made as necessary during the administration of this Plan. Figures 44 and 40 show proposed land uses and street layouts. It is possible that the plan may be amended over time to reflect new opportunities and market conditions.

Discussion of more urban types of housing and mixed use development may work best with new zoning districts to facilitate them.

6. *A statement as to the kind and number of site improvements and additional public utilities which will be required to support the new land uses in the area after redevelopment.*

Goal 2 has established objectives for adequate infrastructure. Options will be explored to upgrade water volumes available and provide sanitary sewer service where not currently provided. The City is working to pave all unpaved roads in existing neighborhoods and those needs have been identified in the section on Existing Conditions. Installation of sidewalks and streetlights in neighborhoods not served will be dependent on the interest and financial capability of residents to participate in improvement districts. If these neighborhoods are redeveloped in the future by the private sector, they would be required as a condition of building permit approval.

The City of Maricopa is developing plans to remove land within the area from a federal floodplain designation. The cost will exceed \$10 million to acquire land and build drainage channels. No funding sources have been identified as yet.

Goal 4 has objectives for improving traffic circulation; funding for arterial streets is shared by developers and the City, partly through use of development impact fees. Collector streets are usually funded by developers in new areas. They will be upgraded using City funds in developed areas as needed. Funding for railroad overpasses will be sought from state and federal sources. Figure 39 shows the locations for proposed overpasses and generalized future locations for major and collector streets. These locations will be refined through alignment and engineering studies, and may be modified as result of new traffic forecasts and modeling.

Additional information on improvement costs found in the section [Analysis of Implementation Costs and Benefits](#)

7. *A statement of the proposed method and estimated cost of the acquisition and preparation for redevelopment of the redevelopment project area and the estimated proceeds or revenues from its disposal to developers.*

Since the adoption of Proposition 207 by Arizona voters and preceding court cases, it is clear that cities cannot buy land using condemnation for anything other than a public use. It is possible that the City may purchase land within the area using City reserve funds, state and federal loans or grants, bond funds, and sale of City lands or funds obtained through tax abatement to develop public projects or to request private developers to build desired public uses. Financing of each project will be considered on a case by case basis considering market conditions and the City's financial resources and priorities.

8. *A statement of a feasible method proposed for the relocation of families to be displaced from the redevelopment project area.*

Families would only be displaced involuntarily for a public use project. Given the amount of vacant land within the area, no involuntary relocation is projected at this time, unless it involved a street widening or flood control facility. If federal funds are used, the requirements of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970 or its successor will be followed in the same manner as in any city location. Any involuntary relocation not involving federal funds would follow State Statutes in the same way it would in any city location.

9. *A statement summarizing comments gathered from stakeholders regarding the potential incorporation of municipal facilities such as City Hall, Public Safety facilities, parking structures, etc. into the redevelopment area.*

Based on public workshops and interviews with key stakeholder and property owners, it is clear that there is a desire for municipal facilities to be located in the area to give it an identity, a central focus, and a reason to be downtown. It is also believed that locating permanent municipal facilities in the area would help solve the infrastructure problem and encourage other types of desired land uses such as offices, higher density housing, restaurants, entertainment and cultural facilities, and transit services to locate nearby.

**Resolution of Adoption**

**RESOLUTION NO. 09-24**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MARICOPA, ARIZONA, APPROVING A REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE MARICOPA REDEVELOPMENT DISTRICT AREA.**

**WHEREAS**, The City of Maricopa City Council on September 2, 2008, adopted Resolution No.08-48 finding that a blighted area existed within the Redevelopment Area and declaring it necessary in the interest of the public health, safety, morals and welfare of the residents of the City to redevelop such area, and

**WHEREAS**, a General Plan for the development of the City of Maricopa has previously been prepared and approved by the Council of the City of Maricopa, and

**WHEREAS**, Title 36 of the Arizona Revised Statutes requires that the City must prepare and adopt a Redevelopment Plan for a redevelopment area prior to the exercise of powers granted thereby, and

**WHEREAS**, City staff have created and referred this Redevelopment Plan to the Council of the City of Maricopa for review and approval, and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Maricopa Planning and Zoning Commissions has previously reviewed such Redevelopment Plan and has submitted its written recommendations regarding the proposed Redevelopment Plan to the Council of the City of Maricopa.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Maricopa City Council as follows:

**SECTION 1.** Pursuant to A.R.S. §36-1479(G), the City Council finds that the Maricopa Redevelopment District Plan attached hereto as Exhibit A is feasible and in conformity with the General Plan for the development of the City of Maricopa as a whole.

**SECTION 2.** Pursuant to A.R.S. §36-1479(G), the City Council also finds as follows:

1. A shortage of housing of sound standards and design, adequate for family life, exists in the municipality.
2. The need for housing accommodations has been or will be increased as a result of the clearance of slums in other areas under redevelopment.


3. The conditions of blight in the area and the shortage of decent, safe, and sanitary housing cause or contribute to an increase in and spread of disease and crime and constitute a menace to the public health, safety, morals or welfare.

4. The development of the area for predominately residential uses is an integral part of and essential to the program of the municipality for the elimination of the slum or blighted area.

**SECTION 3.** The Maricopa Downtown Redevelopment Plan is hereby approved and adopted.


PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE Mayor and Council of the City of Maricopa, Arizona, this 7<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2009.

APPROVED:



Anthony Smith  
Mayor


ATTEST:



Vanessa Bueras  
City Clerk



APPROVED AS TO FORM:



Denis Fitzgibbons  
City Attorney



**RESOLUTION NO. 09-25**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MARICOPA, ARIZONA, DESIGNATING AN AREA AS THE SINGLE CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT OF THE CITY OF MARICOPA.**

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to A.R.S. §42-6209, a government lessor shall abate the Government Property Lease Excise Tax for a limited period on a government property improvement that is located in a single central business district in a slum or blighted area established pursuant to title 6, chapter 12, articles 3 of the Arizona revised statutes and is subject to a lease or development agreement entered into after April 1, 1985 and the government property improvement resulted or will result in an increase in property value of at least one hundred percent; and

**WHEREAS**, establishing a Single Central Business District helps to identify and promote key areas to provide opportunities for reinvestment, growth and development; and

**WHEREAS**, the Mayor and City Council of the City of Maricopa recognize the need for an economic development strategy to promote and generate investment in support of existing businesses, new businesses, and development; and

**WHEREAS**, establishing a Single Central Business District supports identification of existing resources and new opportunities to brand and promote the City of Maricopa; and

**WHEREAS**, the Mayor and City Council of the City of Maricopa find that the designation of a Single Central Business District is in the best interest of the City of Maricopa.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Mayor and City Council of the City of Maricopa, Arizona, that the area described on the map attached hereto as Exhibit A and in the legal description attached hereto as Exhibit B is hereby designated as the single central business district within the City of Maricopa, for the purpose of pursuing the benefits set forth in A.R.S. §42-6209.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE Mayor and Council of the City of Maricopa, Arizona, this 7<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2009.**

## **Appendix: Public Comment Summaries**

# Maricopa Redevelopment Area Plan

## Summary of First Public Workshop, February 12, 2009

### **Redevelopment Plan Goals**

- 1. Character and identity:** Maricopa should have an identifiable heart of its city in the RDA, which celebrates its culture and history through its architecture, streetscape, and small town pedestrian friendly environment.
- 2. Adequate infrastructure:** the infrastructure of the area—streets, sidewalks, street lights, retention basins, and water and sewer systems--should be improved to modern standards without creating unaffordable burdens on existing residents.
- 3. Existing neighborhood protection:** existing neighborhoods should be upgraded and preserved for the benefit of those who wish to continue living in them.
- 4. Improved traffic circulation:** traffic circulation should be improved by providing overpasses for the railroad tracks and upgrading streets to remove safety hazards and bottlenecks.
- 5. Greater variety of land uses:** the Redevelopment Area should attract a greater variety of housing, medical, cultural, recreational, entertainment, shopping, civic, office and industrial uses to serve the needs of all residents of the city.
- 6. Improved property values and economic activity:** the Plan should provide ways for the city and property owners to obtain grants and loans to improve the area through development of new facilities, jobs, and uses, and should create incentives to attract investment to the area.

### **Desired Land Uses: not in priority order**

#### **Residential**

- Apartments
- Existing homes improved
- Senior housing
- Affordable housing

#### **Commercial**

- Hotels
- Medical offices, clinics, and a hospital
- Restaurants
- Entertainment: movie theatres, bowling, skating rink
- Stores: clothing, furniture, small independent stores
- Car wash
- Day care
- Recreation: water park
- Cemetery
- Grocery store south of the railroad tracks
- Auto repair

## **Industrial**

- light industrial areas with jobs

## **Public and Open Space**

- Arts and cultural uses including museums
- Community centers for teens and seniors
- YMCA
- Central park with open space for civic events
- Central location for government offices or municipal complex
- Central Arizona College facilities
- Smaller parks
- Sports complex
- Walking and bike paths
- Transit facilities for local and regional travel
- Library
- Larger Post Office
- Large public pool
- Larger high school
- Dog park
- Art Walk

## **Desired Changes**

- Improve street, water, and sewer infrastructure
- Support home improvements and provide revitalization assistance
- Beautify streetscapes and add landscaping
- Create historic and cultural district eligible for grants
- Construct railroad overpasses
- Relocate dairy and livestock, but others desire to protect dairy jobs
- Add transit services locally and regionally
- Decrease traffic congestion
- Move Amtrak station
- Create more parks and open spaces for youth and pets
- Enforce zoning ordinances regarding uses allowed in neighborhoods
- Finish Garvey Street
- Reduce traffic problems on Honeycutt Avenue during school arrival and departure times
- Improve traffic safety, possibly with speed bumps
- Keep backyards clean
- Encourage green development

## **Desired Preservation**

- History and culture
- Existing residential homes and neighborhoods
- Black water tank with improvements
- Small town feel
- Cows and jobs
- Rotary park and pool
- Existing local businesses
- Gardens and animal sheltering in existing neighborhoods

## **Summary of Public Input from Workshop #2**

### **Land Use Map Designations**

**There was general support for the land use designations as shown with some desire to improve infrastructure, remove flood plain designation, build the 347 overpass and remove unhealthy conditions in the short term.**

### **Heritage Park Concept and Location**

**There was general consensus on the importance of the heritage park concept as proposed with the uses and structures, although one group expressed concern about train noise.**

### **Government Center as shown on two potential sites**

**All groups supported keeping the Government Center in the Redevelopment Area. Some also wanted to keep the 10 acre park shown in the middle of the mixed density area even if the GC is not built. There was a priority expressed by some first to upgrade the infrastructure and make the neighborhood improvements.**

### **Recommendations for Old Town Neighborhoods**

**There was consensus on improving the water, sewer, streetlights, and sidewalk infrastructure and solving drainage problems. Some favored compatible architecture and using urban design tools, and one group wanted to keep single-story homes. There was much concern about affordability of Global water and sewer service, if it were provided, and how to pay for it. No recommendations were rejected. Residences south of the high school just outside of the RDA would like access to new sewer systems when provided.**

### **Architectural Styles Preference for Commercial Areas**

**After reviewing pictures of many architectural styles used in the West and Southwest, there was a preference for Western styles and the shade and depth features of Territorial. One group liked a mixture of Western, Santa Fe, and Agrarian.**

### **Location of Commercial Buildings Close to Street to Frame Street with Parking to the Side or Rear**

**This concept was discussed by three of the four groups. There were concerns expressed about loading and ease of customer access.**

**Summary of Third Public Workshop  
for the Maricopa Redevelopment Area Plan  
April 14, 2009**

**Participants supported the objectives under the six goals with these suggestions:**

- **Update the objectives as needed, possibly every five years, and monitor progress**
- **Start multi-family housing as soon as possible**
- **Protect views of existing residents when building higher density housing**
- **Incorporate way finder signage into the design guidelines**
- **Develop immediate action objectives, short-term doable projects so homeowners will see benefits of the plan**
- **Protect existing equestrian rights of homeowners**
- **Promote public involvement and communication about how the plan is being implemented and how people can be involved**

**Participants supported the financial tools, public investment actions and regulatory actions with this suggestion:**

- **Make sure funding is being actively pursued for infrastructure projects and that appropriate city departments are involved**

**Participants supported the five-year increment priorities for action with these comments:**

- **Begin multi-family housing now**
- **Only improve the appearance of temporary buildings that are not scheduled for replacement**

**Several participants volunteered to serve on the Citizens Advisory Committee recommended to be appointed by Council to help monitor progress and carry out the plan.**