



COURT S. RICH
6613 N. Scottsdale Road, Suite 200
Scottsdale, AZ 85250
Phone +80.505.3937 Fax +80.505.3925
CRich@roselawgroup.com
www.roselawgroup.com

March 28, 2014

SENT BY ELECTRONIC MAIL

rmiller@coolidgeaz.com

Rick Miller
Growth Management Director
City of Coolidge
131 W. Pinkley Avenue
Coolidge, Arizona 85228

RE: Proposed Comment/City's Draft 2025 General Plan

Dear Rick:

Please accept the following comments on the City's Draft 2025 General Plan (the "Plan") submitted on behalf of Walton Development and Management ("Walton"). Initially, Walton notes that it is supportive of the land use designations proposed over its lands and would like to be informed and have an opportunity to comment and provide feedback if the City considers proposing changes to its parcels prior to presenting the Plan to the Council for consideration.

While supportive of the land use designations relating to its property, Walton has identified one important ambiguity that should be fixed. Page 28 of the Plan sets out the uses permitted in the Urban Neighborhoods designated areas. Specifically, with regard to commercial uses the Plans says it permits, "neighborhood and community commercial and service development on single sites up to 30 acres" and indicates that, "single commercial sites of up to 30 acres shall be designed in such a way as to represent an appropriate neighborhood human scale." (Emphasis added).

The use of the words "single" and "sites" together creates inconsistency between the singular and plural. It appears the intent is to allow commercial uses that do not exceed 30 acres per site within the Urban Neighborhoods designation and Walton is supportive of this goal. However, the use of the word "single" (suggesting just one site) is inconsistent with the use of the plural word "sites" (suggesting multiple sites) which could lend to an interpretation of the section that would forbid, for example, the development of two separate 5 acre commercial parcels in the same community without seeking a General Plan Amendment. The first 5 acre parcel would be a "single" site and would be under 30 acres and therefore permitted. The second 5 acre parcel would, if permitted, mean the community no longer had a "single" commercial site and instead had multiple sites. The ambiguity should be eliminated to save landowners and the City time down the road.

In order to eliminate this ambiguity we suggest revising the above quoted sections by simply eliminating the word “single” in each case. Nothing is lost by eliminating this word and all ambiguity is removed. The revised language would appear as follows on Page 28:

- Permit neighborhood and community commercial and service development on ~~single~~ sites up to 30 acres.
- ~~Single~~ Commercial sites of up to 30 acres shall be designed in such a way as to represent an appropriate neighborhood human scale.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this important document and are hopeful that this comment can be incorporated into the final draft. Please let us know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Court S. Rich', with a stylized, cursive flourish at the end.

Court S. Rich