

285	Variance List	MD	1	First paragraph, last sentence: It is not acceptable for MP to supersede all City standards (which is of course why we are going through all these items one by one). Also, the terms detention and retention are not interchangeable. They have similar goals, but are distinctly different methods. Verbiage needs to reflect that concept. The City is amenable to retention as a part of the overall drainage, first flush treatment, and landscaping vision, with the caveat that all such surface storage areas must drain down within 72 hours.
286	Variance List	MD	2	Remove. There is no need to incorporate the DWR MDP into the COP ADMP. The City allows separate master plans for subdivisions. The way in which all the various plans loosely tie together is through enforcement of the GES requirements.
287	Variance List	MD	3	Remove. Detailed analysis is required as development of specific areas progresses, and MDP updates are necessary if any changes to land use or layout will affect other future or previous phases.
288	Variance List	MD	4	OK
289	Variance List	MD	5	This is an exhibit of photos, I suppose that can be in MP.
290	Variance List	MD	6	OK
291	Variance List	MD	7	OK
292	Variance List	MD	8	OK
293	Variance List	MD	9	Combination is okay, but must define what they mean by "very deep", and is still subject to safety barriers
294	Variance List	MD	10	OK
295	Variance List	MD	11	May be okay, but need to clarify what they mean by "alternative grading".
296	Variance List	MD	12	They can make this as a general statement, but there are very few circumstances under which the city would elect to take over maintenance of detention/retention facilities. This statement should be stricken if they believe it obligates the City to take anything at all except at our discretion, which is not likely to happen anyway.
297	Variance List	MD	13	Rejected. Use GES's grading and drainage. We do not use the IBC
298	Variance List	MD	14	OK Ok, Community Development must co-approve variance. All cut/fill, benching will require a design and certification from a Professional Geotechnical Engineer
299	Variance List	CA	15	
300	Variance List	CA	16	ok, no issues. Must be co-approved by Community Development
301	Variance List	MD	17	OK
302	Variance List	CA	18	Rejected. Use GES's grading and drainage. (its all under common ownership)
303	Variance List	CA	19	Rejected. Use GES's grading and drainage. (its all under common ownership)

304	Variance List	CA	20	Rejected. Use GES's grading and drainage. (its all under common ownership)
305	Variance List	MD	21	Change shall to may, clarify what they mean by "alternative". We already allow any widely accepted method with proper engineering analysis.
306	Variance List	MD	22	Remove. All stabilization methods must meet ADEQ CGP requirements, we cannot waive.
307	Variance List	MD	23	OK
308	Variance List	CA	24	Rejected. Use GES's grading and drainage.
309	Variance List	MD	25	Please clarify. This is a statement, not a design standard
310	Variance List	MD	26	Is okay but not needed. Should amend to add City approval since we must sign off on LOMR applications to FEMA. We already allow certain floodplain development via the LOMR process. Lyon Engineering has already prepared and submitted a LOMR for Bottleneck Wash to establish a Zone AE with Floodway.
311	Variance List	MD	27	What is the point of providing a map if all areas are to be disturbable? What about areas slated for preservation? If they are required to submit a map to get the SPC zoning, then surely we intend there to be some limitation on what can be disturbed? What about natural watercourses to remain? Need a lot more clarification on this.
312	Variance List	MD	28	Remove Section 11.5 entirely. All erosion and sediment control must be per GES and City Code Title 16, as amended from time to time. That code is highly dependent upon our cooperation and obligations with ADEQ, so we cannot supersede it with the DWR MP.
313	Variance List	MD	29	Rejected Comply with Section 2.9 of the GES's
314	Variance List	MD	30	OK. We already allow phasing. They need to define what they mean by "stormwater management" in the context of this section.
315	Variance List	MD	31	Probably okay, but need clarification on what they envision as "alternative". We already allow any method that meets the performance requirements, including rainwater harvesting and underground storage.
316	Variance List	MD	32	Is okay as long as they understand that decentralized detention/retention increases the maintenance burden, which will be entirely borne by the private owners.
317	Variance List	MD	33	OK, already allowed.
318	Variance List	MD	34	OK, already required.
319	Variance List	MD	35	OK, already allowed.
320	Variance List	MK	35	All dry wells to be registered with ADEQ as required by A.R.S. 49-332.
321	Variance List	MD	36	Change to "may be permitted by City Engineer when designed as an integral part..."

322	Variance List	MD	37	May be okay, but generally why would you want to? It vastly increases the storage volume burden which would take up otherwise usable land. It may be unacceptable from State or prior water rights standpoint, but I am not familiar with those laws.
323	Variance List	MD	38	Delete. All stormwater quality requirements must remain under GES and City Code Title 16.
324	Variance List	MD	39	OK, already allowed.
325	Variance List	MD	40	OK, already acceptable.
326	Variance List	MD	41	Delete. 35 feet deep basins are too deep to give blanket permission on. If they intend to create a lake to capture and store that much water for irrigation, it should be evaluated specifically and may be subject to prior rights beyond the control of the City. They would not be able to use a berm since it would constitute a dam at that height, so it would have to be a hole in the ground. We need a lot more specifics on what they envision.
327	Variance List	MD	42	OK, already allowed.
328	Variance List	MD	43	OK, but they must be privately maintained along with all the landscaping.
329	Variance List	MD	44	Need to amend to include frequency and depth restrictions. GES does not allow the use of parking lots for primary storage requirements, but we could allow some overflows for 100-year events as long as depths do not exceed something like 6 inches. We don't need cars getting damaged during design storm events.
330	Variance List	MD	45	OK
331	Variance List	MD	46	OK, already allowed
332	Variance List	MD	47	Define "regional" and the implications of that term.
333	Variance List	MD	48	This wording looks vaguely similar to what we have now in GES but different enough that they could be interpreted differently. What does the applicant really want a variance on? Also, they need to clarify what they intend to accomplish by locating the security fence below the 100-year water elevation.
334	Variance List	MD	49	Generally this is not acceptable for a publically maintained sidewalk from a maintenance perspective. The use of a scupper is preferred to allowing surface flow over the sidewalk. It could be allowed for a pathway that is more like a trail and privately maintained.

335	Variance List	MD	50	Revise to remove the word "stored". See previous comments about potential conflicts with surface water rights.
336	Variance List	MD	51	OK, but the devices mentioned are pretty standard. What makes them "alternative"?
337	Variance List	MD	52	Need to define "alternative" in this context. We do not restrict channel designs as long they meet performance requirements of GES 3.4. Perhaps the applicant can clarify what they had in mind.
338	Variance List	MD	53	Clarify that parallel channels must be outside the road ROW template.
339	Variance List	MD	54	The wording of this item seems contradictory. We already allow alteration of natural channels subject to the requirements of GES 3.4.
340	Variance List	MD	55	This is currently prohibited by GES 3.5.2.H. Any such crossings, if allowed, must be subject to depth limitations for traffic safety. Need City traffic engineer (Ian) to review this item also. The summary spreadsheet provided by the applicant mentions secondary access, but the wording of 11.9.E does not reflect that.
341	Variance List	MD	56	OK
342	Variance List	MD	57	OK
343	Variance List	MD	58	OK
344	Variance List	MD	59	Material other than riprap around and over the top of the pipe is acceptable as long as it provides a similar level of erosion resistance. Revise wording.
345	Variance List	MD	60	OK
346	Variance List	MD	61	OK
347	Variance List	MD	62	OK
348	Variance List	MD	63	Please clarify. This seems contradictory to the aesthetic and environmental goals expressed elsewhere
349	Variance List	MD	64	OK
350	Variance List	MD	65	Other types of barriers may be permissible, but since they are installed for safety reasons, they must be fully functional from the start, not when plants mature. It is already allowed to make changes within a property when it is still under common ownership of developer, but you cannot make major alterations that would affect properties already sold. Please revise to clarify that previously developed and conveyed areas must not be adversely affected either.
351	Variance List	MD	66	All such facilities must be privately maintained.
352	Variance List	MD	67	OK
353	Variance List	MD	68	OK. It is generally allowed already as long as detention requirements are otherwise met.
354	Variance List	MD	69	100-year flow cannot be allowed to leave ROW except under controlled conditions. The intent is to provide reasonable protection from flooding for all structures adjacent to the road ROW. If the flow escapes the ROW, where is it going to go?
355	Variance List	MD	70	

356	Variance List	MK	70	By establishing the ROW at back of curb it could decrease the City's obligation to maintain the ROW landscape and stormwater features/bioswales.
357	Variance List	MD	71	Ok
358	Variance List	MD	72	Similar to comment for item 70, 100-year flows can only exceed ROW under controlled conditions with a clear overflow pathway.
359	Variance List	MD	73	Such elements are acceptable but must be privately maintained.
360	Variance List	MD	74	Ok
361	Variance List	MD	75	OK
362	Variance List	MD	76	OK
363	Variance List	MD	77	Delete or reword. The requirements of GES 3.6.4.A are intended to get flow off the road at those points for traffic safety reasons. Although the wording says catch basins, other capture devices are permissible to achieve that goal. If the intent is to get the runoff for landscaping use, you can do that with a scupper into a bioswale rather than using a catch basin.
364	Variance List	MK	78	Cattle guards can be constructed to be bicycle friendly. Use of cattle guard only acceptable when its bars are perpendicular to the direction of travel. Trench drains would be preferred.
365	Variance List	MD	79	OK, already in GES
366	Variance List	MD	80	OK, already in GES
367	Variance List	MD	81	Already revised by applicant?
368	Variance List	EB	82	No. The City will welcome a discussion for modification to some standards, if reasonable to the area, but we will not allow this Master Plan to change any of our standards without discussion.
369	Variance List	CD	83	See comments on Master Plan and Master Reports relative to this variance.
370	Variance List	EB	84	Delete exception No. 1 and No. 2 from Paragraph B. The developer will absolutely construct all facilities that need to be upsized because of this development.
371	Variance List	CD	85	See comments on Master Plan and Master Reports relative to this variance.
372	Variance List	EB	86	No. Each parcel within the development will comply with Section 4.7.1.B and 5.5.2.H regarding the installation of facilities along the entire length of frontage.
373	Variance List	EB	87	Parallel mains shall not be allowed.
374	Variance List	CD	88	See comments on Master Plan and Master Reports relative to this variance.
375	Variance List	EB	89	Change 12.3.A to, "Water mains shall not be located within ten (10) feet of a building or retaining wall per City GES 4.7.3.B"
376	Variance List	EB	90	Change 12.3.B to "shall be removed or capped and sealed in place, as directed by the City."
377	Variance List	EB	91	Delete 12.3.C. City GES 4.7.3.E.2 adequately covers a curvy road scenario by saying, 'to the maximum extent possible.'
378	Variance List	EB	92	Delete 12.3.D. It is understood that not all streets will have a water main, but water mains will be required by the City for adequate system redundancy, so the people that buy in this community will at least have reliable water service.

379	Variance List	CD	93	See comments on Master Plan and Master Reports relative to this variance.
380	Variance List	CD	94	See comments on Master Plan and Master Reports relative to this variance.
381	Variance List	EB	95	Remove 12.3.G. The City GES Standard 4.7.8.B doesn't say anything about not being screened from view and the City will work with the developer on this as long as it is in compliance with 4.7.8.B.
382	Variance List	EB	96	Change 12.3.H to, "Curbs adjacent to a vault or PRV shall be rolled curb per City Standard Detail 220Q-1 Type 'C' or Type 'D' when an alternate point of access (driveway) is not provided."
383	Variance List	CD	97	See comments on Master Plan and Master Reports relative to this variance.
384	Variance List	CD	98	See comments on Master Plan and Master Reports relative to this variance.
385	Variance List	EB	99	The smallest allowable City Box is a No. 2, which is 16-inches in width. If they're placed right next to each other and the service lines are run parallel to the main they will be 16-inches apart, so specify in section 12.3.K that the horizontal spacing will be 16-inches, minimum.
386	Variance List	CD	100	See comments on Master Plan and Master Reports relative to this variance.
387	Variance List	CD	101	See comments on Master Plan and Master Reports relative to this variance.
388	Variance List	CD	102	See comments on Master Plan and Master Reports relative to this variance.
389	Variance List	CD	103	See comments on Master Plan and Master Reports relative to this variance.
390	Variance List	EB	104	Change 12.4.A. to, "Existing sewer main stubs and service lines adjacent to a proposed development that are not used shall be removed or capped for future use, at the direction of the City."
391	Variance List	CD	105	See comments on Master Plan and Master Reports relative to this variance.
392	Variance List	EB	106	Delete 12.4.C. City Standard 5.9.3.B shall remain in its entirety with no exceptions.
393	Variance List	EB	107	Delete 12.4.D. City GES 5.9.6.A adequately covers a curvy road scenario by saying, 'to the maximum extent possible.'
394	Variance List	EB	108	Delete 12.4.E. It is understood that not all streets will have a sewer main, but sewer mains will be required by the City for adequate system coverage and to the extent to comply with City Standard 5.5.2.H.
395	Variance List	CD	109	See comments on Master Plan and Master Reports relative to this variance.
396	Variance List	CD	110	See comments on Master Plan and Master Reports relative to this variance.
397	Variance List	EB	111	Delete 12.4.H. Not allowed per 5.9.12.C.