



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SESSION MEETING OF THE QUEEN CREEK  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**Wednesday, August 8, 2007 7:00 P.M.**

**Council Chambers, 22350 S. Ellsworth Road, Queen Creek, AZ 85242**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

2. **ROLL CALL**

**Present**

Chairman Ingram  
Vice-Chairman Trapp-Jackson  
Commissioner Atkinson  
Commissioner Brown

**Absent**

Commissioner Perry  
Commissioner Sossaman  
Commissioner Moore

**Staff Present**

Community Dev. Director Condit  
Principal Planner McCauley  
Planner Ramos  
Planner Williams  
Senior Planner Bolduc  
Planning Assistant Moats

**Absent**

Planning Manager Brittingham

3. **CONSENT AGENDA** Matters listed under the Consent Agenda are considered to be routine and will be enacted by one motion and one vote. Public Hearing items are designated with an asterisk (\*). Prior to consideration of the Consent Agenda, the Chairman will ask whether any member of the public wishes to remove a Public Hearing item for separate consideration. Members of the Commission and/or staff may remove any item for separate consideration.
- a) Consideration and Possible Approval of July 11, 2007 Work Study and Regular Session Minutes;
  - b) Consideration and Possible Approval of SP07-085, B&B Solid Surfacing, a request by Brenda Penner of RMA Architects, on behalf of B&B Solid Surfacing, for Site Plan, Landscape Plan and Building Elevation approval for an Office/Warehouse building on Lot 9 of Power Market Place Business Park. The proposal consists of 30,000 square feet of industrial use with existing I-1 zoning, located one-quarter mile east of Power Road, and north of Germann Road.

**Motion:**            **Vice-Chairman Trapp-Jackson**

**To approve the Consent Agenda as presented.**

**Second:**           **Commissioner Atkinson**

**Vote:**              **All ayes. Motion carried (4-0) (Sossaman, Perry and Moore absent).**

4. **PUBLIC COMMENT** Members of the public may address the Commission on items not on the printed agenda. Please observe the time limit of three minutes. Speakers' cards are available at the door, and may be delivered to staff prior to the commencement of the meeting

There were no public comment.

### **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

5. **PUBLIC HEARING, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON PROPOSED REVISION TO THE TOWN OF QUEEN CREEK SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND ADOPTION OF DESIGN STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES MANUAL**

A proposal by staff at the request of the Town Council to update the Subdivision Ordinance to reflect changes in the design, processing and development standards for subdivisions. A proposed new companion document, the Design Standards and Procedures Manual, is also being proposed which would include the technical aspects of construction design, project review and technical specifications.

Project Manager/Consultant Wayne Balmer addressed the Commission, noting this is the first re- write of the Subdivision Ordinance, which has been under review and rewrite for the past year. Mr. Balmer stated some comments from the development community have been solicited, received, and included in the record.

There were no questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Brown expressed his gratitude for the cooperative effort put forward by staff in working with members of the development community and receiving feedback.

Chairman Ingram thanked Mr. Balmer and staff for their hard work on this project.

Chairman Ingram opened the Public Hearing at 7:03 p.m. There were no public comments. The Public Hearing was closed.

**Motion:**                **Vice-Chairman Trapp-Jackson**

**To recommend approval of the revised Queen Creek Subdivision Ordinance and Design Standards and Procedures Manual, as presented.**

**2<sup>nd</sup>:**                    **Commissioner Brown**

**Vote:**                **All ayes. Motion carried (4-0) (Sossaman, Perry and Moore absent).**

6. **PUBLIC HEARING, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON RZ06-122/SD06-123, BARNEY PARK ESTATES** A request by Mario Mangiamele of IPlan Consulting for Rezoning from R1-43 (43,560 square feet minimum lot size) to R1-18 (18,000 square feet minimum lot size), Preliminary Plat and Landscape Plan approval for a 113-lot single family subdivision on approximately 73 acres. The property is located at the southwest corner of Queen Creek Road and 220<sup>th</sup> Street.

Principal Planner McCauley presented the staff report. He stated the applicant is providing a little over double the amount of required landscaping. There will be shared use trails adjacent to Queen Creek Road, and along the southern perimeter of the project site. Access will be provided at Crismon Heights and 220<sup>th</sup> Street. The main entrance is off of Queen Creek Road, and will include a landscaped median. The applicant is providing three play areas (sand volleyball court, basketball court and tot lot). Open space will be provided at the end of the cul-de-sacs along the western perimeter, although, this is not required. Partial view fencing will be provided along the western and southern perimeters, and solid fencing along the northern and eastern portions of the site (Queen Creek Road and 220<sup>th</sup> Street alignment). All cul-de sacs have open end relief, which is heavily landscaped. Staff is recommending that a meandering sidewalk be built along the northern perimeter.

Mr. McCauley noted that staff is concerned by the proposed number of cul-de-sacs and its impact on connectivity. Mr. McCauley pointed out the Ellsworth Estates project, approved two years ago, at which time Council directed the applicant to remove several cul-de-sacs in order to provide better street connectivity. Staff has stipulated the removal of at least two cul-de-sacs with this application. Staff has received no letters of opposition or support, and recommends approval of this project, subject to the conditions of approval set forth in the staff report.

Commissioner Atkinson asked why all the trees are shown on one side of the street, instead of being scattered. Mr. McCauley responded this is based on the street design and the Subdivision Ordinance standards, as well as engineering requirements.

Vice-Chairman Trapp-Jackson questioned if the applicant had provided their feedback on staff's additional stipulation (illustrated in the Addendum to the Conditions of Approval) stating the "applicant shall provide additional detail to the solid fencing along Queen Creek Road and 220<sup>th</sup> Street..." Mr. McCauley responded that the applicant is being represented by Mario Mangiamele of IPlan Consulting, and that he had not received any comment from either Mr. Mangiamele or the applicant.

Mario Mangiamele of IPlan Consulting, 4684 S. Star Canyon Drive, Gilbert, addressed the Commission to make a presentation. He stated he had sent an email to the Commission (through Laura Moats) yesterday. He distributed a letter to the Commission from the property owner before making his presentation.

This is within Town's planning and incorporated boundaries. The site is currently being farmed by the Barney Family. The Town's General Plan classifies this land as medium density residential (2-3 dwelling units per acre). The project proposes 1.45 du/acre. Mr. Mangiamele stated the applicant is lowering the density to take advantage of the rural characteristics of the surrounding land uses. The project includes an extensive centralized trail system and open space of 7.8%. Mr. Mangiamele stated the development is designed around open space elements, which include amenities, tree-lined streets, and a centralized park serving as a primary focal point for vehicular and pedestrian traffic entering the subdivision. The centralized park will also calm traffic as it enters the subdivision. Three points of vehicular access will be provided at: Queen Creek Road, 220<sup>th</sup> Street, and Crismon Heights.

In response to staff's concern regarding cul-de-sac design, Mr. Mangiamele illustrated areas that address the concerns regarding lack of connectivity. The two cul-de-sacs around open space areas do include pedestrian connectivity. There are no open space areas along 220<sup>th</sup> Street, but there are openings from cul-de-sacs to roadway system, for pedestrian access. The applicant is trying to discourage vehicular traffic throughout this development.

Mr. Mangiamele's presentation included the following:

**Cul-de-sac facts:**

- External street connections are minimized;
- Cul-de-sacs minimize road length and calm vehicular traffic;
- Maintains safe emergency apparatus access;
- Response to lot owners desired living environment;
- Reduction in use of additional impervious pavement materials;
- Inclusion of landscape planter island within cul-de-sac additionally reduces impervious paving materials for the subdivision;
- Lush landscape plantings in cul-de-sac islands greatly enhance visual character and livability of the street;
- Many studies have indicated that the reduction in use of impervious materials not only contribute to better storm water mgmt., but also lessens the urban heat island effect;
- Street design will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare of the community.

### **Neighborhood Meeting information**

The applicant held the required neighborhood meeting. Just one neighbor attended. Seventy-seven adjacent property owners were notified of the meeting. No phone calls or letters were received by IPlan from any property owners. The applicant is in agreement to staff's conditions, with the exception of Stipulation #8 regarding the removal of two cul-de-sacs. Mr. Mangiamele noted that earlier submittals included more cul-de-sacs than what is currently being shown. The applicant has removed three cul-de-sacs since the original submittal. In addition, the applicant is not in agreement to Stipulation #9 regarding two-story dwelling units adjacent to arterial and collector roadways. The applicant proposes the Stipulation read, "no **additional** two-story dwelling units shall be permitted along Queen Creek Road and 220<sup>th</sup> Street", as there is already a two-story home under construction in this area that backs to Queen Creek Road.

Commissioner Trapp-Jackson asked if the applicant has provided any feedback on Stipulation #17, which was added through the addendum distributed during Work Study. Mr. Mangiamele stated that the applicant will work with staff to address this particular issue, and meet these standards.

In response to Chairman Ingram's request, Mr. Mangiamele stated the two-story home is being constructed on Lot 32 of the site.

Chairman Ingram asked staff if Stipulation #9 could be revised to say no "additional" two-story dwelling units shall be permitted along Queen Creek Road and 220<sup>th</sup> Street. Community Development Director Condit stated this would be acceptable.

Chairman Ingram opened the Public Hearing at 7:25 pm

Jeff Barney, 22448 E. Queen Creek Road, Queen Creek. Mr. Barney is in support of cul-de-sacs in this development. He stated it provides a small community feel; additionally, it slows down traffic. He feels this is one of the best visually appealing communities in Queen Creek.

There were no further public comments. Chairman Ingram closed the Public Hearing at 7:29 pm

Commissioner Atkinson asked staff what their recommendation is as far as which two cul-de-sacs should be eliminated, and how would the developer do this. Mr. McCauley good question, subject to Commission's recommendation, there are many ways of doing this. Staff would do everything they could to help applicant not lose a lot; although, they may in fact lose one or two lots. Any number of CDS along eastern or western perimeter could be removed; however, staff does not have a specific recommendation.

KTJ – stipulation #8: if this statement was revised to say applicant should work with staff to resolve CDS issues, would this be amenable to applicant and staff? Rather than stating two CDS should be removed.

MM- presently #8 – this does state what KTJ has said.

Regular Session

August 8, 2007

Page 6 of 11

KTJ – yes, but do not state that specifically 2 CDS should be removed – do not detail the # of CDS to be removed. Just state staff should work w/applicant. MM – yes, we could make that language change.

Atkinson: length of streets even w/eliminating CDS traffic should not really move any faster since streets will be the same length. Has a problem with this subdivision looking like a checkerboard. Would like to see connectivity to subdivision to the northwest – this would eliminate 1 CDS. Was hoping staff would have a plan in mind for which 2 CDS to eliminate.

Ingram – does not see advantage of losing 2 CDS.

Atkinson – what is the purpose of the loop to the north: MM: initial submittal, applicant opted to remove northern CDS and third one at the south. That loop is a result of staff asking them to remove 2 CDS at the beginning.

Atkinson: what does staff think about connecting to property along northwest perimeter? MM – ideal would be to provide connectivity with adjoining communities, such as they did with Crismon

Heights. Unfortunately, staff not sure what will be developed (or when) along western perimeter. This is why staff did not pursue asking for connectivity in this area.

Atkinson: does that property have access to ?? or just one? MM – just one – but that could be incorrect. Mario – it is two.

Mario addressed Commission – shows immediate access at QWC and Crismon along the west.

**Motion: Commissioner Brown**

**To approve with removal of COA #8 – amending COA #9 to add additional language that no additional 2-story dwelling units shall be permitted, and the amendment of Stipulation #12, w/language provided by staff, w/respect to half-street ROW dedication. Also, include all verbiage on hand-out – notice by CC&Rs and plat that is adjacent to dairy farm and applicant shall provide additional detail on fencing**

**2<sup>nd</sup>: Commissioner Atkinson**

**Vote: All ayes. Motion carried (4-0) (Sossaman, Moore, and Perry absent).**

7. **PUBLIC HEARING, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON RZ07-126/SP07-077, “CORTINA CROSSING”**, A request by SKD Architecture, Inc. on behalf of Glenwood Development, LLC for rezoning from C-1 (Light Commercial) C-1 with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay, Site Plan and Landscape Plan approval for Cortina Crossing, a retail and office plaza on 6.1 acres, located on the southwest corner of Germann and Rittenhouse roads.

Senior Planner Bolduc presented the staff report. Shared driveway (already built) at northwest corner of project, at Cortina Twin Homes. Access of Germann Road through pre-existing

driveways. Two retail buildings totaling 11,360 square feet, and office condos totaling 32,081 square feet located at the southwest corner of Germann and Rittenhouse roads. Request is for 9 buildings totaling 43,441 square feet with parking for 238 cars. The PAD Overlay request is for parking in front of buildings along Rittenhouse and Germann roads. Additional L/S and buffering will flank Rittenhouse Road. SP meets town standards. Staff recommends approval subject to conditions of approval set forth in the staff report.

Atkinson: what is height of wall on west side and distance between two walls? PB- wall is 2 ½ foot tall (pony wall). Will not be a narrow landscaped alley-way.

Sean Lake of Pew and Lake, 1930 E. Brown Road, on behalf of Glenwood Development and Kobe Development (check this for accuracy???), addressed the Commission.

Retail buildings are small buildings on corner of Germann and Rittenhouse Roads, and balance of site is less intense office buildings. Applicant is in agreement w/staff to all stipulations. Several people attended the neighborhood meeting. No concerns were raised. Two phone calls of inquiry.

KTJ – trash enclosures at southwest and southeast – do not see comfortable access to trash enclosures, except to the northern. Sean – three total: one is a double enclosure. Developer is an experienced developer. They are more concerned with providing more parking spaces, than additional trash enclosures. There is adequate distance and volume of capacity for the trash enclosures. The furthest point will be no more than 200 feet approximately. This will not be a major building for the office building or cleaning personnel. Finding that the bulk of trash is being shredded by a separate service, or off-site. Ultimate owners of the condos would rather have additional parking spaces.

KTJ – would applicant be agreeable to working w/staff as to adding a trash enclosure to the southern perimeter of the site. This would result in loss of only one or two parking spaces. Just asking for them to look at feasibility of locating a trash enclosure on the south. Sean Lake, yes, applicant can agree to look at this – but may not agree to this in the end. They will check with waste providers as well, and work with staff between now and Town Council meeting.

Atkinson: any tenants lined up yet, or do they know who's coming in? Accounting, chiropractic, dental and title company. Retail: vet hospital and a couple sandwich shops.

Public hearing opened at 7:51 p.m. no public comments. Hearing was closed.

KTJ – question for staff – how would staff like to see stipulation regarding trash enclosures.

Phil – just ask that staff works with applicant to re-examine location and number of trash enclosures. MM – add: details to be resolved prior to council intro/final action, or permitting phase.

**Motion: KTJ**

**Approve, subject to COA on staff report with addition #9 staff will work applicant on # and distribution of trash encl. with details to be resolved prior to Town Council Introduction.**

**Vote: All ayes. Motion carried.**

8. **PUBLIC HEARING, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON RZ07-109, THE PECANS AMENDMENT TO PAD ORDINANCE FOR ENTRY GATES** A request by Sean Lake, on behalf of The Pecans and the Pecans Homeowners' Association for modification of Condition of Approval #3 of Ordinance #295-04 (Pecans PAD) to allow for gated entries to all entrances to the subdivision. The project is located south of Chandler Heights Road and extends from Hawes Road on the west to Ellsworth Road on the east. **Continued from 7/11/07 Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting.**

Planner Williams presented the staff report. Original stipulation stated this project shall be revised to comply with the GP, Goal 3, Plicy 3a, discouraging gated communities. This project shall not (go to Power Point) (1996 GP)

2002 GP – clarified gated communities stating: except where TC finds unique and community value-added circumstances that are not in direct conflict...(go to PP)

Encourages new neighborhoods to be designed to open up to the surrounding community by discouraging the use of perimeter walls...(go to PP).

Currently have only one gated community at Pegasus Airpark due to unique safety concerns related to aircraft, fueling operations and runway itself.

Applicant requesting This project shall be permitted to have gated access (go to PP).

Staff does not support the request and is recommending denial. Should commission approve, staff has included stipulations in the staff report.

No questions from Commission.

Ingram: Stipulation #3 – when originally presented for approval, assuming they were asking for gates to begin with? Williams: yes – and it was specifically stipulated at that time that they would not be allowed to have gates.

Sean Lake, 1930 E. Brown Road, Mesa, on behalf of Pecans Homeowners' Association and Pecans Development. Here at request of lot owners and homeowners of pecans community requesting they come before the Town to ask why can't they have gates.

Gates are already installed – would I install additional gates to incorporate entire community within these gates. Going forward with original plan submitted to staff.

Illustrated all streets within Pecans to be developed, stating they are all private streets, developed, owned, cleaned and maintained by the HOA within Pecans Development. Private streets.



Gates are appropriate if the Council finds appropriate or unique value added ...

Why is Pecans unique? This project is one of the most unique communities in the valley – one of the finest in the East Valley because of many things. Streets are very narrow, due to wanting existing mature pecan trees lining the streets. Ribbon curve along the streets. Curvilinear. Primary need: homeowners want them; also finding as development occurs, problems happening with people who are unfamiliar with this subdivision are tearing up streets, landscaping and trees. Applicant feels they are satisfying uniqueness. Pegasus' gates were put in for safety, not uniqueness. Second issue is does it add value to the community? Yes, this project has added value to the community. High-end development. Held out amongst development community and community of QC as high-end product. This has also added value from a financial standpoint, as well as a uniqueness standpoint. The GP test: are they unique and have they added value to the community? Answer to one or both questions, if yes, should mean this subdivision should be allowed to have gates.

Neighborhood meeting was held. Has worked w/staff. No opposition to this project from people who attended neighborhood meeting, or from surrounding property owners.

Requesting modify condition #3 to allow Pecans to have gates.

Questions:

Ingram: how many people at neighborhood meeting: Sean: 6.

No further questions. Presentation done at 8:07pm

Public Hearing opened at 8:08 p.m. No public comment. Public Hearing was closed.

Atkinson: very nice subdivision. Nothing unique about it though. Just trying to preserve Pecan trees, and curvilinear streets were designed that way to save trees. No gates were to be allowed when this subdivision was developed and when people moved in. No community value to allowing gates. Should be left the way it is.

Jeff Brown: complimented Sean on talking about unique and community – but that was separated in Sean's presentation. Jeff puts both together – meaning community value added or unique value added. Certainly Pecans is unique, but looking at unique value added or community value added, does not add to value of entire town of QC. Could add value to community of Pecans, but he is looking at broader scope.

Ingram – agrees it is unique – very nice. But closing w/gates – with rest of community locked out, no one can see inside. Just on the outside looking in.

KTJ – when you start looking at residential communities, need to sustain openness.

Atkinson: moves to recommend denial to Town Council.

2<sup>nd</sup>: Jeff Brown Mike perry in

Discussion; Ingram – denying change to Stipulation #3.

Motion: All ayes. Motion carried. 4-0.

**ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS (if not done during Work Study)**

9. **REVIEW** of next month's agenda items.

Done during Work Study

10. **REPORT** on Town Council Action by Tom Condit.

**July 18**

- Risk Management Award given to Town for 2005 and 2006 given by Southwest Risk Management;
- Approved Site Plan Text Amendment
- Approved CUP and SP for Schnepf farms Wedding & Reception Center
- Approved Design Services Contract \$264,000 with Dibble Engineering for sewer improvements and concept design of streets on Sossaman and Ch. Hts. To Riggs.
- Approved extension of contract with mark Vinson – architectural review consultant.
- Approved design services contract with Kimley-Horn for traffic signal on Ellsworth and Cloud.
- Approved job order contract 212,000 for ts at Ch. Hts. And Hawes.
- Approved job order contract for temporary ts at Riggs/Ellsworth
- Approved minimum tax levy of \$1.95/\$100 assessed value in relation to fire service study and subsequent vote.
- Approved Bell Estates single family subdivision.
- Approved Rezoning, CUP, SP for Power and Riggs Center (Bruno) – added stipulation re: safety gates and landscaping.
- Directed staff to begin 60-day public review period on 2007 Major GP Amendments.

**August 1**

- Approved professional services contract w/Eubanks consulting
- Approved Ordinance (Vestar/Westcor projects – affecting TC businesses) establishing an additional .25 % sales tax towards TC area.
- Approved work order for \$50,000 northbound left-turn lane at Ch. Hts. And Hawes
- Approved SP for McDonalds at QC Fiesta
- Approved Magnolia at Ch. Estates DR project
- Approved reappointment of Atkinson, KTJ, MP and MM
- Adopted revised wastewater development fees and procedural ordinance effective 11/5/07

increasing development fees for residential and commercial. – being done on an annual basis.

- Adopted new green building policy encouraged LEED certified buildings.

11. **COMMUNICATION** from members of the Commission and Staff.

12. **ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion:** **Commissioner KTJ**

**To adjourn.**

**2<sup>nd</sup>:** **Commissioner Atkinson**

**Vote:** **All ayes. Motion carried (6-0).**

**The meeting adjourned at 8:20 P.M.**

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

---

Steve Ingram, Chairman

---

Laura Moats, Planning Assistant

\*\*\*\*\*

I, Laura Moats, do hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the foregoing Minutes are a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the August 8, 2007 Regular Session of the Planning and Zoning Commission. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and that a quorum was present.

Dated this 9th day of August, 2007.

Passed and Approved this 12th day of September, 2007.