



Planning and Zoning Board

Staff Report

GP CASE NUMBER: ZON18-00142 (Minor General Plan Amendment)
ZONING CASE NUMBER: ZON17-00247 (Rezoning)
LOCATION/ADDRESS: The 10600 through 11600 blocks of East Williams Field Road (south side) and the 6000 through 6400 blocks of South Signal Butte (both sides).
GENERAL VICINITY: Located on the south side of Williams Field Road from approximately one-quarter mile west of Signal Butte Road to Meridian Road; and located on the east and west sides of Signal Butte Road approximately one-half mile south of Williams Field Road.
GP REQUEST: Minor General Plan amendment to change the Character Type from Employment to Neighborhood.
ZONING REQUEST: Rezone from AG and GI-CUP to a Planned Area Development (PAD) Overlay with underlying RM-2, RSL- 2.5, RSL-4.5, RS-6, RS-7 and RS-9 for 236± acres and LC for 15± acres.
PURPOSE: This request will allow for the development of a master planned community.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: GROH REVOCABLE TRUST; DEMURO PROPERTIES; ASPIRE PROPERTIES LLC.
APPLICANT: Valerie Claussen, Planning Manager, Pew and Lake, PLC
STAFF PLANNER: Wahid Alam, AICP

SITE DATA

PARCEL NO.: Groh Revocable Trust (304-34-017U, 304-34-028, 304-34-31, 304-34-29B, 304-34-29A, 304-34-032A); Demuro Properties (304-34-021V, 304-34-021W, 304-34-021U, 304-34-21Z, 304-34-021X, 304-34-932, 304-34-021N, 304-34-021R) and Aspire Properties LLC (304-34-202, 304-34-056).
PARCEL SIZE: 251± acres
EXISTING ZONING: AG, GI-CUP
GENERAL PLAN CHARACTER: Employment
CURRENT LAND USE: Vacant undeveloped land

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS: Adoption of the Minor General Plan Amendment
Approval of the Rezoning with Conditions

P&Z BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS:

MINOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT: ☒ Adoption ☐ Denial
REZONING: ☒ Approval with conditions ☐ Denial
PROPOSITION 207 WAIVER SIGNED: ☒ Yes ☐ No

SITE CONTEXT

NORTH: Approved residential subdivision within Mesa - Zoned PC and RS-6
General Plan Character Area: Mixed Use Community and Neighborhood: Suburban
Existing homes and vacant undeveloped land in the County - Zoned RU-43
WEST: Vacant (proposed industrial/office development) – currently zoned PEP-PAD
General Plan Character Area: Employment
EAST: (Across Meridian Road) Existing homes and vacant land within Pinal County
SOUTH: Vacant undeveloped land in the county - Zoned RU-43
Vacant undeveloped land in the city - Zoned AG, LI and GI
General Plan Character Area: Employment

HISTORY/RELATED CASES

April 16, 1990: Annexed into the City. (Ord. #2514)
June 4, 1990: Establish City zoning from County Rural-43 to Agricultural (AG) (Z90-025)

GENERAL PLAN HISTORY

Mesa 1982 General Plan: Agriculture/Vacant
Mesa 1988 General Plan: General Industrial
Mesa 1996 General Plan: General Industrial
Mesa 2025 General Plan: Light Industrial and General Industrial
Mesa 2040 General Plan: Employment

REQUEST (MINOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT)

The Mesa 2040 General Plan land use designation for the entire site is Employment. The applicant is requesting that 251± acres of land be changed to Neighborhood, concurrently with the rezoning and PAD overlay with conceptual site plan.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION / REQUEST (ZONING)

This request is to rezone from AG and GI-CUP to a Planned Area Development (PAD) Overlay with underlying RM-2, RSL- 2.5, RSL-4.5, RS-6, RS-7 and RS-9 for 236± acres and LC for 15± acres to allow the construction of a single-residence subdivision along with areas for accompanying multi-resident and commercial development. The property is located on the south side of Williams Field Road from approximately one-quarter mile west of Signal Butte Road to Meridian Road; and located on the east and west sides of Signal Butte Road approximately one-half mile south of Williams Field Road.

NEIGHBORHOOD PARTICIPATION:

The applicant has implemented a Citizen Participation Plan that included contacting all property owners within 1,000 feet, all HOAs within one mile and all registered neighborhoods within one-half mile from the proposed development site.

The Citizen Participation Report submitted by the applicant states two neighborhood meetings were held. Both were at Meridian Elementary School, 3900 S. Mountain Road. The first neighborhood meeting was held on August 21, 2017 and the second on January 18, 2018. At the first meeting 16 people signed the sign-up sheet and 25 at the second meeting. At the first meeting there were general questions about the timing of the development, paving of Williams Field Road, and if there will be a school. At the second meeting there were many positive comments about having residential uses developed instead of employment uses and interest in the commercial area to reduce travel to make purchases.

Staff received comments from Boeing that expressed their concerns on a proposed residential subdivision at this location. Boeing has told staff that they are in communication with city leaders regarding their concern. They want to remain as good neighbor by working with developer, city and the community towards a consensus.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This report covers two application requests. While both are reviewed and discussed below, the first consideration will be with the Minor General Plan Amendment; this request must be approved before the rezoning can be considered. The requested rezoning application uses the PAD option for a two-step process. The first step is this request that will establish the zoning entitlements and a conceptual master plan for the development of the property. Future applications will provide specific site plans and preliminary plats for Planning and Zoning Board consideration.

MESA 2040 GENERAL PLAN:

GP Amendment Review Criteria Summary:

Upon review of the five evaluation criteria for review as outlined in Chapter 15 (pg. 15-1) of the Mesa 2040 General Plan, staff has determined the proposal meets the goals and intent of the General Plan.

1. Is the proposed development consistent with furthering the intent and direction contained in the General Plan?

Staff Answer: *With regards to the requested General Plan Amendment, staff's conclusion is that, on balance, the request will help implement the goals and intention of the General Plan. The request should, however, be amended to include approximately 20 – 30 acres of Mixed-Use Activity District at the intersection of Signal Butte and SR 24. With regards to the requested rezoning, if the General Plan Amendment is approved, the requested zoning is consistent with the requested amendment.*

The jobs chapter of the General Plan (Chapter 5) describes the importance to the City to continue to grow our economic base and increase the number of jobs per household. It also lists several key elements needed to help grow our supply of stable jobs. This chapter starts with a recognition that a strong economic base is one of the key factors in determining the future of our community and includes the statement that: "the City of Mesa will do everything necessary to protect these economic growth areas from residential encroachment, promote them aggressively, and development them to their highest economic potential."

Mesa has historically lagged behind other Valley cities in the jobs available to local residents. A *Ratio of Jobs per Capita* table on page 5-3 of the Plan shows Mesa with only 0.3 jobs per capita compared to a Maricopa County average of 0.45. Mesa must grow the number of jobs in our community to keep our residents from having to travel out of the City to find meaningful employment. Mesa cannot provide employment opportunities if the land is not available for employment growth.

The general plan history above shows this area has long been planned for non-residential land uses since 1988 with an emphasis on employment uses. In 2006 a determination was made that the City would not allow residential land uses south of Williams Field Road. This was done to help protect flight paths in and out of the Airport in general, and more specifically, for Boeing helicopter operations. At that time the exact location of SR 24 had not yet been determined. Now that the City knows where this highway will be constructed and when it will be constructed, there is interest in development in the area between Williams Field Road and SR 24. The question is, what is the optimal land use pattern in this specific area. There are three primary considerations to be made to make this determination:

1. What is the impact of allowing residential uses in this location on operations in general at Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport and are there any specific impacts on Boeing that cannot be reasonably overcome.

As development moves south of Williams Field Road it gets closer to the noise contours associated with air operations. While out of the high noise areas, these properties are subject to the high degree of overflights and general aviation noise associated with being in the Airfield Operations Area 3. For the land that is subject to review in this case, the area is further away from the primary flight path than the residential development that has been approved for Cadence at Ellsworth south of Ray. Standard noise protection measures should address the concerns for residential development in this location as it relates to this activity. With regards to the Boeing helicopter flight activity, the applicant has been working with Boeing on this issue. With the development of SR 24, that route can likely become the designated route for helicopter activity and provide a sufficient corridor for this aircraft.


Staff does not find a significant issue with regards to Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport overflight activity to limit land uses to non-residential uses.

2. How do the land uses in this area impact the City's overall goal to leverage proximity to the Airport and freeway system for economic development?

As the Airport continues to develop, the main terminal building will be moved to the east side of the runways and one of the direct access routes into the Airport will be Williams Field Road. This will drive airport and employment related land uses east along Williams Field Road. The concept of an airport city, or aerotropolis, is that these primary corridors are used for a variety of non-residential airport related uses. Locations that have access to Williams Field Road and SR 24 will be prime locations for non-residential development. This demand, will however, begin to diminish as you move further east.

In the applicant's project narrative, they have referred to SR 24 as a good barrier between the residential uses that would be allowed on the north side of the freeway and the industrial uses to the south. This freeway can also, however, be viewed as an important corridor that provides visibility and access that is important for development of non-residential uses.

As shown in the map below, most of the largest employers and employment centers in the Valley are located along freeways. This is less true in Mesa where we have not protected our freeways from residential encroachment. While most of the activity at the interchanges, there are locations where the employment uses happen all along the freeway even between the interchanges. Given the strategic location of this area this could easily happen with Williams Field Road.



Much of the area to the south of this proposal along Mountain Road is currently developed with intense industrial uses. A consideration is how close residential uses should be allowed and whether or not the freeway provides a sufficient buffer from these uses. To date staff has not received any concerns from the industries with regards to the proposed development.

The area between Williams Field Road and Germann Road, from Ellsworth Road to Meridian Road is six square miles. Of this area, the only current development is industrial uses that are south of the further SR 24 and east of Signal Butte Road, covering about 1.5 square miles. If the approximately one square mile of area between Williams Field Road and SR 24 is allowed to develop with residential uses, there will still be 3.5 square miles of area that is available for employment uses in this area.

On balance, staff finds that the amendment of the Plan to allow SR 24 to serve as a border between the employment and neighborhood uses is supportable.

3. What land uses are needed in this area to help provide a balanced, sustainable community?

The current General Plan character designation for the area is employment. Because it has not developed, the actual sub-type has not yet been established. Given the proximity of this area to the residential uses to the north, and the designation in the sub-area plan for mixed-use

community, staff would expect actual development based on the current designation to be in the Business Park and/or Employment Core sub-types.

The Signal Butte corridor to the north of this property has approximately 6 square miles of area that have been developed almost exclusively with single-residences uses of a similar lot size. In comparison to other areas of the city, this area has a very limited range and mix of uses. People who live here will always have to travel several miles to find services, go to work, or shop. This is not an appropriate or sustainable development pattern. While we could not expect this area to solve this issue, it should not aggravate the issue by providing more of the same types of uses. Simply designating the area for Neighborhoods might not provide for the needed mix. Retaining some employment area and possibly designating some area as Mixed-Use Activity District would better ensure an ultimate mix of uses.


While the accompanying rezoning request does include a variety of residential districts and a small area of commercial development, staff would suggest that the application be amended to actually show an area designated as Mixed-Use Activity District along Signal Butte Road. This would allow for a larger area to receive the commercial designation in the future. Another option would be to also provide an area designated as Neighborhood Village near the Williams Field and Signal Butte intersection to provide more local serving uses.

2. Is the proposed development consistent with adopted sub-area or neighborhood plans?

Staff answer: *Yes, in that the Mix-Use Community District allows for residential development, but it would be more consistent if the residential uses were at a higher intensity and if there is a larger area of non-residential use along the freeway. (adopted December 8, 2008, Resolution #9425)*

The subject site is located in the Mixed-Use Community District portion of the Gateway Strategic Plan. This District is intended to provide a wide range of uses from single-residence to employment. It recognizes that it is important to have residential uses within area is important to achieve a sustainable balance of land uses in the area. There is, however, also a recognition of the need to take advantage of the freeway frontages and access to provide higher intensity uses.

The goals within the Mixed-Use Community District promote development that is more urban in character as opposed to the standard suburban development model. The Mesa 2040 General Plan states that where new neighborhoods are developed, they need to utilize the Neo-traditional Neighborhood development forms. While there is some confusion with differing statements in the project narrative and design guidelines regarding whether the applicant intends a suburban or neo-




traditional neighborhood, the majority of the concepts included with the application point to the intention to utilize the neo-traditional approach. As will be discussed below, staff recommends a few modifications to the rezoning request to ensure the neo-traditional neighborhood development characteristics are followed.

3. Is the proposed development consistent with the standards and guidelines established for the applicable character type(s)?



Staff answer: The proposed development is in conformance with the Neighborhood character type the applicant is requesting through the Minor General Plan Amendment to change the designated character type to neighborhoods. There are a few adjustments that need to be made to fully bring the proposal in to conformance, those will be discussed below in the review of the rezoning application.

4. Will the proposed development serve to strengthen the character of the area by:

- **Providing appropriate infill development;**
Not applicable.
- **Removing development that is deteriorated and/or does not contribute to the quality of the surrounding area;**
Not applicable.
- **Adding to the mix of uses to further enhance the intended character of the area;**
The proposed land use mixture does not fully meet the General Plan goals for providing the needed mix of uses in this area. The area lacks high density multi-residence, office, commercial, employment, and retail uses. The proposed minor general plan amendment submitted shows residential land use for 236 acres with only 15 acres of commercial. The maps and illustrations provided by the applicant show additional commercial uses in the area. These are labeled as “potential” because they have not yet been requested or approved. Further, all the commercial areas designated are oriented to the freeway system and do not provide as good an opportunity for neighborhood serving businesses that may be needed on a daily basis.



The existing land use map below left was created based on Maricopa Association of Governments Land Use Explorer. It shows the entire area between Ellsworth and Meridian (County boundary) and between Elliot and Germann Roads, an area of 15 square miles adjacent to the Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport predominantly covered with residential subdivisions.



The Development Land Use map above right shows how the situation is getting more and more tilted towards only residential developments, potentially making no room for the growth of the existing and future businesses, airport and limits the attraction similar employment type land uses. As of now no substantial employment and services have developed in these 15 square miles. The majority of this area is detached single-residence homes in suburban-style subdivisions. The applicant's project narrative attempts to address this by showing expansive areas in the Cadence and Eastmark areas for non-residential uses (see page 6, Figure 4). These areas are overstated, but even if they were true, it would still mean people in the areas along Signal Butte traveling several miles for virtually all their daily shopping and service needs.

Amending the request to provide an area designated as Mixed-use Activity District along Signal Butte Road would help address this issue.

- **Improving the streetscape and connectivity within the area;**

The applicant's proposed conceptual master plan is a well laid out, single-residence subdivision for more than 735 lots with detached product with pocket parks. The connectivity within residential development is well designed. The connectivity to the multi-residence and commercial land uses are not well connected with the proposed residential subdivision. This is further discussed below in the review of the rezoning.

The Williams Field Road streetscape is designed as a typical residential subdivision with limited vehicular access. Currently the area is undeveloped and vacant, so future development is expected to improve the streetscape and connectivity within the area.

- **Meeting or exceeding the development quality of the surrounding area;**

The application includes a set of design guidelines that will be used to review specific development proposals. The design guidelines submitted with the application include quality development standards that will set an appropriate level of quality for the area.

5. Does the proposed development provide appropriate transitions between uses? In more urban areas these transitions should generally be accomplished by design elements that allow adjacent buildings to be close to one another. In more suburban locations these transitions should be addressed through separation of uses and/or screening;

The General Plan states that new developments such as this should be designed as neo-traditional developments rather than the typical suburban style subdivisions. The neo-traditional pattern of development is for smaller blocks, a rectangular grid pattern of streets, a mix of development types a long a street, and direct access between residential and non-residential areas. For the most part, the conceptual site plan and design guidelines provide for appropriate transitions between the varying residential densities and other proposed land uses consistent with this design objective. The one place the concept is not followed is with the connectivity through the proposed multi-residence and commercial areas.

REZONING REQUEST

This property is zoned as AG and GI-CUP. The rezoning request is for Planned Area Development (PAD) Overlay with underlying RM-2, RSL- 2.5, RSL-4.5, RS-6, RS-7 and RS-9 for 236± acres and LC for 15± acres, to accommodate a master planned community with primarily a single-residence subdivision. The PAD portion of the request has been made for two reasons:

- To take advantage of the opportunity to receive the zoning entitlement approval without specific site plans or plats thus allowing flexibility to refine the specific development over time within the allowance established through the PAD; and,
- To accommodate modifications to the minimum lot area and lot width for a predominate number of the lots in the RS-6 and RS-7 districts.

TWO-STEP PAD PROCESS

Section 11-22-5 B of the Zoning Ordinance provides for Conceptual and/or specific plan approval with the adoption of the rezoning. For large developments such as this, the conceptual approach is often used to receive the zoning entitlements while still leaving flexibility to adjust the specific site plans in response to market changes over time. Requests for conceptual plan approval must be accompanied by a set of guidelines that include, at a minimum, generalized plans describing land uses and development themes, and ranges of intensity of development described as ratios of activity, such as floor area ratio or dwelling units per acre. Prior to development, the applicant must submit a specific plan for approval. The approved conceptual plan is used when reviewing future specific plans to ensure the development is consistent with the range of intensity and other applicable descriptions of development documented on the approved conceptual plan.

With this approach the conceptual plan which includes the project narrative and design guidelines (referred to in the document as the Community Vision Guidelines) are critical documents for future implementation of the development. The project narrative and design guidelines submitted with this case are well done and provide a firm foundation for ensuring a quality development. There are, however, a few adjustments and modifications necessary to clarify the controlling standards that are being approved with this PAD, as described below. These modifications are also included in the stipulations listed as a condition of approval.

Project Narrative and Community Vision Guidelines

- Add a statement in both documents that the illustrations are conceptual only and other solutions that are consistent with the requirements and guidelines are also acceptable (e.g. school site might move, street layout might not be exactly as shown, etc.); and,
- A specific list of the minimum requirements (e.g. a minimum of 36 acres of open space at least 10 acres of which will be in community parks, a ___ acre site for a school, an east-west boulevard street connecting between the two primary community parks). (Condition #5 and b)

Project Narrative:

- Modify page 12 to say that the proposal “is consistent with the ‘Neo-traditional Sub-type’ This is important because it affects the review on the following pages regarding consistency with the General Plan. In particular, on page 14, the length of blocks and block perimeters need to be reduced to 600’ and 2000’, respectively. This is repeated on page 16 of the project narrative. (Condition #5 c)
- Include a list of amenities to be provided within the parks and a statement whether this list is a representative list and the actual could vary in type and/or number. The statement needs to provide a clear understanding of the park requirements in order to monitor future development for consistency with the PAD. (Condition #5 d)
- Add a range of intensity of development for each of the parcels listed on page 22. (Condition #5 e)

- Remove any reference to a proposed PAD modification for a modified street section. Engineering standards such as this cannot be approved through a PAD, but are subject to separate review and approval by the City Engineer. (Condition #5 f)

Community Vision Guidelines

- Community Activity Core. This section needs to include information on the minimum number and size of the “Community Activity Core” vs. other types of open space. (Condition #6a)
- A Range of Recreational Opportunities. It is suggested that the sizes of the proposed parks be generalized rather than sizes so specifically. Currently it states Community Park A will be 3.35 acres in size, this would not allow it to be any smaller or larger. Generalizing it to state between 3 and 3.5 acres would give some flexibility with the final design.
- Create a Mix of Uses Compatible with the Area and Define a System of Entry Treatments to the Project. As part of this guideline, the applicant makes a commitment to “Promote linkages from the residential portion of the project to the retail/commercial section of the community.” To develop consistent with the neo-traditional neighborhood character, there needs to be a strong vehicular and pedestrian connection between residential and retail/commercial areas. Examples of what this might look like include the follow:



Further detail needs to be added to one, or both, of these sections to ensure the connectivity between the residential and commercial areas will be direct and functional without requiring residents to go out to the arterial street for access. (Condition #6 b)

- Diverse Housing Types. These appear to all be detached single residence homes, which is not a real diverse range of housing types. Further, this does not provide any examples for the types of multi-residence product envisioned. In addition, there are no specific design guidelines for the quality of the design or materials to be used. On page 20, Neighborhoods with Distinctive Character and Sense of Place, there is further reference to encouraging “the use of different building materials as well as building elevations in each neighborhood.” There are no standards provided with regards to the commercial development. In addition to the illustrations provided, guidelines need to be provided giving an indication of the use of materials and design standards; there is not sufficient information in these sections for staff to be able to judge when the guideline has been meet. (Condition #6 c)

PAD OVERLAY MODIFICATIONS – MZO Article 3:

The purpose of the PAD is to allow more freedom and creativity in subdivision design. In return for allowing deviations to the standard code requirements, there needs to be added features that provide for a higher quality development. The applicant has requested a PAD overlay to accommodate reduced lot width. The other standards of the RS-6 and RS-7 districts will be met. For instance, the minimum lot depths for RS-6 will exceed the minimum 90 feet requirement with a depth of not less than 115 feet, and in the RS-7 districts the lot depth will exceed the minimum 94 feet and not be less than 120 feet deep. The justification in seeking the modified lot width is for the ability to create deeper lots.

	<i>PAD Modification</i>			
	RS-6 Standard	RS-6 PAD (Proposed)	RS-7 Standard	RS-7 PAD (Proposed)
Minimum Lot Width (FT)—Interior Lot	55	50	65	60
Minimum Lot Area (SF)	6,000	5,750	7,000	7,000

AIRFIELD OVERFLIGHT AREA

This property is within the Airfield Overflight Area 3 (AOA 3) associated with Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport. Section 11-19-5 of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance establishes specific requirements for aviation easements, notification, disclosures, and noise level reductions in these areas. The Conditions of Approval include steps to meet all of these requirements. (Conditions #7 - 10)

CONCLUSION:

Minor General Plan Amendment. While there is a significant need in Mesa for development of substantial areas of employment and the freeway system near Gateway Airport is a prime location for such development, staff finds that given the development pattern in this area and the overall goals and direction from the General Plan, we can support the Minor General Plan Amendment. Staff sees benefit to modifying the current request to include additional area for non-residential uses along Signal Butte by changing the request to include an area for a Mixed-Use Activity District Designation. Should the Board and applicant agree, the case would need to be continued to allow new notice that would include the additional character area designation.

Staff recommends adoption of the Minor General Plan Amendment.

Rezoning.

Staff's review of the rezoning has found many positive aspects. The applicant has worked closely with staff to develop a plan that incorporates many of the neighborhood development features staff believes to be important to the establishment of high quality neighborhoods. As identified above, Staff has identified some modifications that are needed in the project narrative and design guidelines to ensure

development consistent with the PAD. If the Board recommends adoption of the Minor General Plan Amendment, would recommend the conditions of approval listed below.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative and accompanying Community Vision Guidelines document and conceptual development plan (without guarantee of lot yield, building count, lot coverage), except as modified below.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations, except as modified by the approval of this PAD.
3. Dedicate the right-of-way required under the Mesa City Code at the time of application for a building permit, at the time of recordation of the subdivision plat, or at the time of the City's request for dedication, whichever comes first.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Technical Review Committee.
5. Prior to submission for site plan review of the first parcel, update the project narrative for Planning Director review and acceptance to include:
 - a. A statement that informs a reader that the illustrations are one example but other solutions that are consistent with the requirements and guidelines are also acceptable (e.g. school site might move, street layout might not be exactly as shown, etc.); and,
 - b. A specific list of the minimum requirements for the development which includes but is not limited to open space, community parks, school, connection between parks.
 - c. Update all references in the project narrative to remove references to the Suburban Neighborhood Sub-type and replace it with Neo-traditional and adjust wording, comments, and development objectives consistent with that sub-type.
 - d. Clarify the specific amenities that will be provided, examples of the types of amenities that could be provided, and the minimum number of amenities that will be provided.
 - e. Revise the Table on page 22 to include a range of densities for each parcel.
 - f. Eliminate the reference to the modification to City street standards.
6. Prior to submission for site plan review for the first parcel, update the Community Vision Guidelines for Planning Director review and acceptance to include:
 - a. Information on the minimum number and size of the "Community Activity Core."
 - b. Additional detail on how pedestrian and vehicular access will be provided between the residential and commercial portions of the development to provide safe and convenient access for residents without going out to the arterial street.
 - c. Additional details on the design guidelines that will be used to ensure high quality architecture on the structures built within the community to include minimum architectural detailing and use of materials.
7. Owner granting an Avigation Easement and Release to the City, pertaining to Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport which will be prepared and recorded by the City (concurrently with the recordation of the final subdivision map, prior to the issuance of a building permit).
8. Written notice be provided to future residents, and acknowledgment received that the project is within 1 mile(s) of Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport.

9. Provide a 4-foot x 4-foot sign at the entrance to the sales office for this development, with notice to all prospective buyers that the project is within an Overflight Area for Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport as specified in Section 11-19-5 of the Zoning Ordinance.
10. A building permit cannot be issued until a registered Professional Engineer or registered Professional Architect has certified that Noise attenuation measures have been incorporated into the design and construction of the buildings to achieve a noise level reduction of 45 db as specified in Section 11-19-5 of the Zoning Ordinance.