

| <b>ARTICLE 8: LAND DIVISION AND SUBDIVISION STANDARDS – DISPOSITION REPORT</b>     |                   |                               |  |
|--|-------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Title</b>   | <b>UDC Sec #</b>  | <b>LUC Sec #</b>              | <b>Significant Revisions/Comments</b>  |
| <b>Purpose</b>   | <b>8.1</b>        | <b>4.1.1</b>                  |  |
| <b>Definitions</b>   | <b>Article 11</b> | <b>4.1.2</b>                  |  |
| <b>Applicability</b>   | <b>8.2</b>        | <b>4.1.3</b>                  |  |
| <b>Land Division</b>   | <b>8.3</b>        | <b>4.3</b>                    |  |
| <b>Subdivisions</b>  | <b>8.4</b>        | <b>4.1</b>                    |  |
| <b>Block Plats</b>   | <b>8.4.1</b>      |                               | Staff proposes clarifying the Block Plat procedure and to be consistent with Arizona Revised Statutes.   |
| <b>Residential and Non-Residential Condominium and Condominium Conversion Plat</b> | <b>8.4.2</b>      | <b>4.1.9</b>                  | Staff proposes clarifying the Block Plat procedure and to be consistent with Arizona Revised Statutes.   |
| <b>Minor Subdivision</b>   | <b>8.4.3</b>      | <b>4.2</b>                    |  |
| <b>Tentative Plat</b>  | <b>8.4.4</b>      | <b>4.1.6.1, 23A-33</b>        |  |
| <b>Final Plat</b>  | <b>8.4.5</b>      | <b>4.1.6.1, 23A-33</b>        |  |
| <b>Review Periods and Expiration Dates</b>   | <b>8.5</b>        | <b>4.1.7, 4.2.5</b>           |  |
| <b>General Requirements for Subdivisions and Minor Subdivisions</b>                | <b>8.6</b>        | <b>4.1.4</b>                  |  |
| Acceptable Forms of Assurances   | 8.6.2.B           | 4.1.4.1                       | Assurances (third-party land trusts) will no longer go to the Mayor and Council as long as the applicant uses the forms in the Technical Manual.   |
| <b>Subdivision Design Standards</b>  | <b>8.7</b>        | <b>4.1.8</b>                  |  |
| <b>Streets, Access, Alleys, Easements Required, and Hydrology</b>                  | N/A               | <b>4.1.8.1, 2, 3, 4 and 7</b> | These design standards are being relocated to either Article 7 (Development Standards) or the Technical Manual. These standards apply to more types of development applications than just land divisions and subdivisions, and therefore, should be located where they will have more general applicability. |
| <b>Flexible Lot Developments</b>   | <b>8.7.3</b>      | <b>3.6.1</b>                  |  |
| Regulations for FLD Projects   | 8.7.3.D, 8.7.3-I  |                               | The unresolved issues with density currently in the LUC have been carried over into the UDC. Should these issues be resolved now?  |
| Natural Undisturbed Open   | 8.7.3.F.3 &       | 3.6.1.4.D.3.a                 | These provisions apply to all development  |

| <b>ARTICLE 8: LAND DIVISION AND SUBDIVISION STANDARDS – DISPOSITION REPORT</b> |                  |                  |  |
|--|------------------|------------------|--|
| <b>Title</b>   | <b>UDC Sec #</b> | <b>LUC Sec #</b> | <b>Significant Revisions/Comments</b>  |
| Space and Detention and Retention Basins                                       | 8.7.3.G          | & b              | that have NUOS and detention/retention basins and can be relocated to Article 7 (Development Standards) or the Technical Manual where it will have more general applicability.   |
| Project Amenities and Site Improvements  | N/A              | 3.6.1.4.C.1      | The Project Amenities and Site Improvements section (LUC Section 3.6.X) is proposed for deletion because the section is redundant, and in some ways, conflicts with the Assurance requirements. Deletion of this section does not reduce or negate a developer's responsibility to construct or provide a certain amount of a project's amenities prior to the sale or release of any residences.  |
| FLD Submittal, Review, and Decision – Tentative Plat                           | 8.7.3.P.1        | 3.6.1.3.B        | Staff is proposing to revise the FLD tentative plat review process to no longer require a neighborhood meeting and notice of application for the following reasons: 1) the FLD is much more prescriptive than the RCP, and, therefore, review and consideration for approval of proposed FLD projects is much more objective and much less subject to staff interpretation; 2) the FLD standards provide greater protections to adjacent property owners; and, 3) the additional notice requirements create a mistaken perception among interested parties that they can influence the PDSD Director's decision when, in fact, the decision is based on a project's compliance with all applicable criteria. |