



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

Tuesday, November 7, 2006 7:00 P.M.

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

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

2. **ROLL CALL**

Present

Chairman Schweitzer
Vice-Chairman Shifman
Commissioner Atkinson
Commissioner Ingram
Commissioner Perry
Commissioner Sossaman
Commissioner Trapp-Jackson

Absent

Staff

Present

Community Development Director Tom Condit
Planning Manager Brittingham
Senior Planner McCauley
Planner Williams
Planner Ramos
Planner Chambers
Sr. Administrative Assistant Perez

Absent

Planning Assistant Moats

3. **CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES**

- There are no minutes to approve at this meeting.

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 comments.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

5. **PRESENTATION ON COMPOSITE REPORT FOR 2006 MAJOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS**

Planning Manager Brittingham presented a history of the General Plan and a brief overview of the annual General Plan Amendment process. Mr. Brittingham also provided a brief summary of each of the proposed cases, with staff recommendations as follow:

GP06-001

- Staff recommends 18 units per acre and the build out be 8 units per acre; Staff also recommends decreasing the transit buffer along major roadways.

GP 06-002

- Staff recommends: approval of this application (this will require annexation). This site will be the second commercial site at this corner. Staff feels that allowing commercial at this site will benefit the residents surrounding this area.

GP 06-003

- Staff recommends: Denial of this request.

GP06-004

- Staff recommends: Denial of this request.

GP06-005

- Staff recommends: Denial of this request.

GP06-006

- Staff recommends: approval of this request.

GP06-007

- Staff recommends: approval of this request.

GP-06-008

- Staff recommends: Denial of this request.

GP-04-007

- The applicant has withdrawn this request.

6. **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON GP06-001 MAJOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT**

Location: Northwest corner of Meridian Road and Riggs Road

Total Acreage: 500 acres Requested Change: Text Amendment to the “Regional Commercial Center” land use designation within the land use element of the General Plan. The Text Amendment would allow densities up to 25 dwellings per acre for any residential or mixed use project and up to 10 dwelling units per acre average over the entire site as calculated based on the available residential land in the project. Additionally, the applicant has requested to remove the 660- foot transitional residential land uses and includes a provision that exempts any residential dwelling units in a mixed use environment to be counted against the 60% maximum land available for residential. The Regional Commercial Center for which this text amendment is requested is located at the Southwest Corner of the Future Riggs Road alignment and Rittenhouse Road and extends to the Signal Butte Alignment to the west encompassing approximately 500 acres.

Ralph Pew addressed the Commission in behalf of the applicant. Mr. Pew discussed in further details of the possible options of having horizontal mixed uses.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH REVISIONS. Staff believes that allowing higher density at this location is consistent since the RCC is considered a “Secondary Town Center Area” and should anticipate additional density to support the intensity of commercial and hospital uses indicated in the RCC. Staff partially supports eliminating the transitional density buffer. We recommend eliminating the buffer when the site is separated from adjacent residential by a major arterial street, road of regional significance or a railroad or other major transportation element. We propose to retain the buffer when the RCC site is immediately adjacent to residential (not separated by the above noted roads).

Chairman Schweitzer opened the Public Hearing.

1. John Byran, 21055 E Orchard Lane Queen Creek. Mr. Byran stated that since this area is currently zoned as low density and then changing it to a higher density why are we trying to change it. I think that our plan should be consistent, and keep this area as a low density area.

2. Kyle Robinson, 18557 E Ranch Road Queen Creek. Mr. Robinson wrote “Please disapprove this request!! As explained in the Town meeting, as I recall, the quantity of homes would go from approx. 900 to 2,000 residences. This proposal would increase the burden waste water, traffic control and other Town resources. The Town cannot afford to upgrade water systems, sewer systems and roads to accommodate housing and developments that exceed the current planned capacities. I doubt the developer will volunteer to upgrade the Town’s infrastructure to support the increased demand caused by this proposed development. My family and I feel strongly that the existing General Plan should not be modified. The existing voter approved plan provides an excellent balance of housing, industry and recreation areas. This proposal would have a negative impact on the unique environment of our community (average 1.4 homes/acre).
3. Steve Drehobl, 21290 E Pegasus Parkway Queen Creek. Mr. Drehobl is in opposition to this. This will cause safety issues and noise issues.
4. Heather Solomon, 22221 E Merlot St. Queen Creek. In opposition. The General Plan has always been geared to maintaining rural character Goal #1. I do not believe this proposition upholds this goal. I believe surrounding communities Anthem, Johnson Ranch, and neighboring subdivisions have enough density to support the “mall”. Twenty-five dwellings per acre are way too much – higher density equals higher crime.
5. Warren Solomon, 22221 E Merlot St. Queen Creek. Mr. Solomon stated that he is in opposition. Having apartments in this area would not be good. Apartments are good for a couple of years but then go bad.
6. Paul Reese, 24712 S. Signal Butte Queen Creek. Mr. Reese stated that the problem that he sees is the density will make an impact on our highways and the community that is already there. The County has already stated that they will not do anything along Riggs and Rittenhouse. These traffic issues need to be addressed; there are already problems due to the population in the Johnson Ranch area.
7. Sylvia Centos, 26226 S Hawes Road, Queen Creek. Mrs. Centos stated that the idea of having a hospital and having an apartment complex near it to house the hospital staff would be a good thing. Queen Creek needs to have affordable living. We need the additional revenue. Mrs. Centos is in favor of GP06-001.
8. Natalie Lamb, 22207 E Nacoma Dr. Queen Creek, Mrs. Lamb is in opposition. Opposes change in already passed and acceptance density allocation the people already spoke. We purchased land based on the zoning and do not agree with changing it.
9. Chea Lamb, 24502 S 221st Place, Queen Creek, Mrs. Lamb is in opposition. Oppose this change. It will congest our neighborhood with unwanted traffic and crime. It will completely change the face of our community and ruin our quality of life. We approve low density, not commercial.

10. Ken Creager, 21134 E Excelsior Ave Queen Creek, Mr. Creager is in opposition. We do not need additional residential use in this area.

11. Michelle Foster, 22031 E Stoney Vista Queen Creek Ms. Foster is in opposition. Quality of life will be compromised. The old plan was represented to me when I bought my home and relocated my family.

12. Eric Lamb, 24509 S 221 Place Queen Creek Mr. Lamb is in opposition. Pinal County to my knowledge has approved a hospital to be built on the SW corner of Combs and Ironwood.

There was no further public comment. Chairman Schweitzer closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Perry inquired on when was the original approval of this case. Planning Manager Brittingham advised the approval was December, 2004.

Commissioner Trapp-Jackson asked for staff's opinion on the reduction of the transitional buffer. Staff feels that the 660 is sufficient, noting that a transitional buffer along any Residential property must be 660 feet.

Commissioner Sossaman motioned for denial. His concern is the uses that are being requested are not being presented in the best area.

Commissioner Perry moves for approval; but requests to leave the buffer in. Planner Dave Williams will need to include the language change that was provided to Commission in the work study into the Regular Study.

Motion: Commissioner Perry

To approve GP06-001. Recommending a reduction in the proposed densities from 25du/ac maximum to 18 du/ac and from an overall average of 10 du/ac to 8du/ac. The applicant's request would result in approximately 3,100 dwelling units on the site and staff's recommendation would achieve approximately 2,400 dwelling units.

2nd Vice-Chairman Shifman

Vote: 6 ayes 1 nay (Sossaman) Motion Carried.

7. **PUBLIC HEARING, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON GP06-002**

MAJOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT. A request to amend the General Plan Land Use designation from Very Low Density Residential to Neighborhood Commercial for approximately nine (9) acres located at the southwest corner of Power and Riggs Roads.

Location: Southwest corner of Power Road and Riggs Road

Total Acreage: 9 acres

Requested Change: to amend the General Plan Land Use Map from Very Low Density Residential (0-1 du/ac) to Neighborhood Commercial

Reese Sanders presented on behalf of Vanderbilt Farms. This site is currently in a County island. Changing this area will conform it to the Town uses. This is a great site to serve the nearby neighbors. This will not increase the Traffic in this area it will allow the residents to have their needs met closer to their homes for quick shopping.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL. Staff supports this request because it complies with GP goal of providing only 2 corners of commercial at any intersection (the NEC is already zoned commercial). This corner creates a better traffic pattern as it is diagonal from the NEC and is a size that would provide local services without attracting substantial additional traffic. The Town is extending the sewer line south from Chandler Heights Road to the intersection. It will also induce annexation of the site. The Town has received both opposition and support comments.

Chairman Schweitzer opened the Public Hearing.

1. George Surbeck 25217 S 182nd Place Queen Creek Mr. Surbeck is in opposition. As this community goes forward would this impact the community around this area. If this development was to be busy during the day and quite at night we would be ok with that.

2. Robin Oare, 18427 Watford Drive, P.O. Box 9274 Chandler Ms. Oare is in Opposition strongly. I do not want additional traffic issues. Unless it would contribute to the community we do not need this area to be rezoned

3. S Centos, 26226 S Hawes Rd. Queen Creek Ms. Centos is in opposition to this.

4. Kyle Robinson, 18557 E Ranch Road Queen Creek. Mr. Robinson is in favor. This amendment request will have no significant impact on the infrastructure of the Town. This amendment would provide for the building of a small shopping center that can service the Southwest part of our Town. This proposal would help minimize cross town traffic by providing a location close to area residents. I feel this would benefit to our town.

There was no further public comment. Chairman Schweitzer closed the Public Hearing.

Motion **Commissioner Trapp-Jackson**

To approve GP06-002

2nd **Commissioner Sossaman**

Vote **All Ayes. Motion Carried (7-0)**

8. **PUBLIC HEARING, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON GP06-003 MAJOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT**, A request by Ralph Pew of Pew and Lake, PLC, for a Major General Plan Amendment to amend the General Plan text for the creation of two new land use categories; Medium-High Density Residential (6-10 du/ac) and High-Density Residential (12-18 du/ac) and to amend the General Plan Land Use Map from:

- Low Density Residential (1-2 du/ac) to Neighborhood Commercial on approx. 15 acres located at the northeast corner of Signal Butte and Ocotillo Roads;
- Employment Type B to Neighborhood Commercial on approx. 15 acres located at the southeast corner of Queen Creek and Signal Butte Roads;
- Low Density Residential (1-2 du/ac) and Employment Type B to Medium-High Density Residential (6-10 du/ac) on approx. 30 acres located on the east side of Signal Butte Road south of Queen Creek Road; and
- Employment Type B to High-Density Residential (12-18 du/ac) on approx. 20 acres Located on the south side of Queen Creek Road, half way between Signal Butte and Meridian Roads Plan.

Ralph Pew addressed the Commission in behalf of Vanderbilt Farms.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DENIAL. Staff does not support this request as it introduces medium-high and high density outside of the Town Center area. Staff believes this a significant policy shift that is best addressed as part of the General Plan rewrite which commences early in 2007. Regardless of the density proposed, it would be located in the WGA Overflight Area 2, which could limit the ability of the airport to function and/or expand in the future. This request is strongly opposed by WGA and the City of Mesa. Public comment received to date universally opposes the residential density increase but there is some support for the commercial.

Chairman Schweitzer opened the Public Hearing

1. Keith Phelps 22246 E Alyssa Rd, Queen Creek, Az “ I am opposed to this plan for many reasons. Let me bring up something that may not have been talked about. Parks are planned for that area. We all know what parks turn into when you have high density right next to them. A breeding ground for crime”.

2. Kimberly Malgar, 21007 S 222nd Street, Queen Creek Ms. Malgar is in opposition. "Too great deviation from existing General Plan. I do not believe medium-high or high density is appropriate outside of Town Center."
3. Damon Lines 22228 E Alyssa Rd, Queen Creek Mr. Lines is in opposition. "This is no good!"
4. Brandon Pierce 22214 E Alyssa Rd, Queen Creek. Mr. Pierce is in opposition. "I do not want high density living".
5. Wanda Miliias 21521 E Alyssa Rd, Queen Creek Ms. Miliias is in opposition. "I moved out here to get away from all of the hussel and bussel. I do not want this out here for myself or my neighbors".
6. Rob Johns 2666 E Fox St. Mesa, Az Mr. Johns is in opposition. "I feel this is too great of a change from the General Plan. We don't need apartments in this area. I don't feel this change would improve the city and would tax the city service when do we stop bending over for land developers".
7. Craig Carroll 22015 E Stoney Vista Dr, Queen Creek Mr. Carroll is in opposition. "I live in a 2-acre home site neighborhood and do not feel it appropriate to put medium density up next to low density. Would like to see it stay zoned as low density."
8. Nick Wood 400 E Van Buren Phoenix, Az Mr. Wood is in opposition. "I am here to speak on behalf of Williams Gateway Airport. The Town is part owner of the Airport. Allowing a higher density will discourage Commercial Airlines from coming to Williams Gateway Airport."

There was no further public comment. Chairman Schweitzer closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Trapp-Jackson inquired on expecting the just accepting the commercial sites (NC) for this Amendment. Planning Manger Fred Brittingham stated that Staff does not object to separating the Commercial sites from the Residential Use.

Commissioner Sossaman expressed thoughts of the NC could be supported but not the high density.

Commissioner Perry advised that this needs to be explored more.

Chairman Schweitzer feels that there could be some needs in another area later

Motion: **Commissioner Sossaman**

To Deny GP06-003.

2nd : **Vice-Chairman Shifman**

Vote: **All Ayes (7-0) Motion Carried.**

9. **PUBLIC HEARING, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON GP06-004**
MAJOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT A request by Ralph Pew of Pew and Lake, PLC, for a Major General Plan Amendment to amend the General Plan Land Use Map from Very Low Density Residential and Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential totaling 320 acres; and, Very Low Density Residential to Low Density Residential totaling 320 acres. The property is located between Cloud Road and Empire Boulevard and between Crismon and Signal Butte Roads.

Senior Planner Mike McCauley presented GP06-004.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DENIAL. The request is located in between several already developed minimum one-acre lot size subdivisions (Pegasus, Orchard Ranch and two in the County). The 320-acre medium density request would create compatibility issues and the low density request would add 320 acres to the sewer district. The sewer district is a significant issue in this case. Riggs Road has always been the line of demarcation for very low density development and this site is located in the Rural Preservation Tier of the Growth Element and is intended to preserve the rural lifestyle. Increasing the density south of Riggs Road appears to be a significant policy shift. Staff has received significant public opposition.

Mr. Ralph Pew presented on behalf of the property owner. This request is inconsistent with the General Plan. Applicant agrees with Staff that if it is to be approved this will be a deviation from the current General Plan Amendment. The reason why this would benefit the community is this property has been a hot station of discussion of different uses. This would be a significance benefit to the community. Staff recommends denial of this area. Applicant wants a different density, they believe it needs to have a 2-3 dwelling units per acre density; this does not seem unreasonable or out of place. Applicant does not want to build 0-1. In regards to possibly overloading the public facility, the applicant knows that they will have to either pay for or find an appropriate way to handle any of these concerns.

Chairman Schweitzer opened the Public Hearing.

1. Edward G Cardinal 21268 E Pegasus Parkway, Queen Creek Mr. Cardinal is in opposition. "We are adamantly opposed to rezoning from the low density requirement in effect now because of the proximity to the high quality developments already adjacent to the proposed area. Homeowners purchased those existing homes in part because the Township of Queen Creek appeared to promise two important benefits. 1) The entire area was already zoned for low density housing. 2) The entire area would be horse property and contain horse trails throughout. This is a clear and obvious reversal of the "Different by Design" concept of Queen Creek. To eliminate the bridle trails and horse property and increase the housing density in this area would make Queen Creek no different from any other ordinary, congested, overdeveloped, run of the mill community. Additionally, regardless of the zoning issue the new development should be required by the Township of Queen Creek to disclose to potential buyers they are purchasing homes within close proximity to Pegasus Airpark before a sale is consummated".
2. Joann Cardinal 21268 E Pegasus Parkway Queen Creek Ms. Cardinal is in opposition
3. Harold Whittle 21615 E Orion Way Queen Creek Mr. Whittle is in opposition. "There needs more comment on traffic and school overloads. Also we need to keep our neighborhood as they were designed."
4. Dewy Webb 22126 E Cedar Waxwing Drive Queen Creek. Mr. Webb is in opposition.
5. Dan and Joyce Coury 21211 E Pegasus Parkway Mr. and Mrs. Coury are in opposition. "Safety is an issue when you propose changes as listed. We understand when we purchased our property that there were to be a set number of airplane lots and equestrian lots increasing the number of houses per lots."
6. Betty Pearce 2693 W Half Moon Circle Queen Creek Ms. Pearce is in opposition. "An increase in density will critically diminish the value of Pegasus Airpark as a thriving general avigtim community. This is a desert area for decades we have been water critical. What has changed".
7. Charlie Silvers 21257 E Excelsior Ave Queen Creek Mr. Silvers is in opposition.
8. Ben Conner 22004 E Country Shadow Road Queen Creek Mr. Conner is in opposition
9. Richard Yerian 4293 W Kitty Hawk Chandler Mr. Yerian is in opposition
10. Randy VerHager 22010 E Country Shadow Rd Queen Creek Mr. VerHager is in opposition. "I oppose further erosion of the General Plan".
11. Ralph and Lois Clark 21570 E Pegasus Parkway Mr. and Mrs. Clark are in opposition
12. Susan Zito 20911 E Excelsior Ave Queen Creek Ms. Zito is in opposition

13. Kathy Dorer 21180 E Orchard Lane Ms. Dorer is in opposition. "No! All homes around here are on large lots with horse privileges. You already have the Villages, Queenland Manor, etc. We do not need or want small lots in this area".
14. Nick Wood 400 E Van Buren Phoenix, Az Mr. Wood is in opposition.
15. John Byrne 21055 E Orchard Lane Queen Creek Mr. Byrne is in opposition.
16. Kevin Dorer 21180 E Orchard Lane Queen Creek Mr. Dorer is in opposition. "This goes against the General Plan approved by voters".
17. Randa Larson 24516 S 220th Place Queen Creek Mr. Larson is in opposition. "These amendments destroy the community atmosphere that all residents in the area came here to Queen Creek. Higher Density equals Higher Crime. Not in my backyard!!"
18. Jim and Julie Larson 24508 S 220th Place Mr. and Mrs. Larson are in opposition. "We want to stay more rural. It will bring in too much traffic."
19. Natalie Lamb 22207 E Nacoma Dr. Queen Creek Ms. Lamb is in opposition. "I agree completely with the staff's denial and the reasons given therein."
20. Mitzi Brown 21336 E Orchard Lane Queen Creek Ms. Brown is in opposition.
21. Eric Lamb 24509 S 221st Place Queen Creek Mr. Lamb is in opposition. "Agree with the staff and all of their reasoning."
22. Allen Kauffman 24613 S 220th St Queen Creek Mr. Kaufman is in opposition.
23. Jo Ann Cardinal 21268 E Pegasus Parkway Queen Creek Ms. Cardinal is in opposition.
24. Velia Gomez 22337 E Cloud Road Queen Creek Ms. Gomez is in opposition. "I live at the corner of Cloud and Signal Butte and traffic is of great concern to me. I agree with the staff in recommending denial of this request."
25. Rob Milburn II 222nd St and Cloud Queen Creek Mr. Milburn is in opposition. "I agree with the staffs denial, however if there has to be a change I would like to see only low density (1-2 houses per acre) throughout the entire area."
26. Sharon Aut 21279 E Pegasus Parkway Ms. Aut is in opposition.
27. Steve Marr 22105 E Cedar Wakwing Drive Queen Creek Mr. Marr is in opposition.

There was no further public comment. Chairman Schweitzer closed the Public Hearing.

Motion: **Commissioner Atkinson**

To recommend denial of GP06-004.

2nd: **Vice-Chairman Shifman**

Vote: **All ayes (7-0) Motion Carried.**

10. **PUBLIC HEARING, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON GP06-005
MAJOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT**

A request by Ralph Pew of Pew and Lake, PLC, for a Major General Plan Amendment to amend the General Plan text to allow for vertical and horizontal mixed uses within the Town Center land use definition and to change the General Plan Land Use Map from Employment Type B and Low Density Residential (1-2 du/ac) land uses to Town Center, which would expand the Town Center north of Rittenhouse Road and west of Ellsworth Road.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DENIAL. Town Center is a semi-compact urban form with identifiable boundaries. Staff believes that expanding the Town Center north of Rittenhouse and the railroad creates a separate commercial center with high density residential not an expansion of the Town Center. The spatial and functional separation created by Rittenhouse and the railroad tracks precludes easy access and would divert users from the Town Center Area. The loss of employment is also a strong concern. Allowing high density outside of the current Town Center Area is also a significant policy shift. Staff could support an indefinite continuance (or withdrawal) to allow this to be considered as part of the General Plan update. To date staff has received numerous indications of opposition to the request.

Ralph Pew presented in behalf of the applicant.

Chairman Schweitzer opened the Public Hearing

1. Nichole Gardner 20537 Superstition Queen Creek Ms. Gardner is in favor
2. Mike Leonard 20101 E Superstition Dr Queen Creek Mr. Leonard is in opposition
3. Nancy Leonard 20101 E Superstition Dr Queen Creek . Ms. Leonard is in opposition
4. Dennis Egel 20402 E Superstition Dr Queen Creek Mr. Egel is in favor
5. Eric Kerr 20202 E Superstition Dr. Queen Creek Mr. Kerr is in opposition

6. Bill Stevenson 20550 E Ryan Rd. Queen Creek Mr. Stevenson is in favor
7. Cody Zhog 20521 E Germann Road Queen Creek Mr. Zhog is in favor
8. Claudia and Karl Alder 2933 North Kashmir, Mesa Mr. and Mrs. Alder are in opposition. "The current city plan with a planned city centers is well thought out. If changes are made please limit heights, no vertical residential condos or apartment."
9. Jay Stevenson 20537 E Superstition Queen Creek Mr. Stevenson is in favor "This is a perfect area for commercial housing. Near a railroad and major airport would not be desirable."
10. Rich Pattisum 20002 E Superstition Dr. Queen Creek Mr. Pattisum is in opposition.
11. Dante Proto 20646 E Superstition Dr Queen Creek is in opposition "Plan change proposed is not compatialbe with existing neighborhood to the north is much too broad in scope and is in fact open-ended. There is not sufficient buffering and its not appropriate to place Town Center adjacent to R-143. Developer has asked for much too radical of a changed without solciting neighborhood input.
12. Jim and Arlene Trout 20727 E Superstition Queen Creek is in favor.
13. Bill Stevenson Jr. 20646 E Ryan Road Queen Creek is in favor
14. Tony Lek 20134 E Superstition Dr Queen Creek is in opposition
15. William Fish 20001 E Germann Road, Queen Creek is in opposition "I am in favor of the idea just not the location.
16. Kerry Stevenson 20646 E Ryan Road Queen Creek is in favor
17. Rosanna Sweek 20230 E Superstition Dr Queen Creek is in opposition.
18. Al Weiss 20738 E Superstition Dr. is in opposition.

No further public comment. Public Hearing closed.

Chairman Schweitzer would like to see some rewrites done in 2007.

Commissioner Atkinson would like to look at this again after Vestar, Westcor have been built and the Ellsworth Loop road is completed.

Commissioner Sossaman expressed concerns with the rail road 20 years ago. The concept of joining the two sides needs to be looked at in more detail. The underpass is a concern for economic opportunity.

Commissioner Shifman recommended to have this be a continuance to Council. So that this can be looked into further for a possible 2007 re-write.

Planning Manager Fred Brittingham stated that this would become a discussion in the next discussion of the General Plan.

Motion Vice-Chairman Shifman

Recommend to forward this to Council for an indefinite continuance of this so that it can be considered in General Plan Update in 2007

2nd Commissioner Sossaman

Vote All Ayes (7-0) Motion carried forward

11. **PUBLIC HEARING, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON GP06-006**

MAJOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT

A request by Ralph Pew of Pew and Lake, PLC, for a Major General Plan Amendment to amend approximately 15 acres of the General Plan Land Use Map from Low Density Residential to Neighborhood Commercial. The property is located along the northwest corner of Ellsworth and Riggs roads.

Chris Ramos presented for the Staff.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL. Staff supported a similar request in 2004 but the applicant withdrew the request due to neighborhood opposition. Riggs will be extended to the east as far as Meridian Road and Ellsworth will be a six lane road. The NEC of the intersection is a county island and has a small site already zoned for commercial. This would be the second commercial corner and would thus comply with the GP. The GP currently indicates the NWC of the future extension of Riggs and Crismon Roads to be commercial. Queen School District is purchasing that site from the State Land Department and it will not be commercial.

There is an 18 acre commercial site at the NEC of Chandler Heights Road and Ellsworth Roads that was approved as part of the Hastings Farms Master Plan. Given the expansion of Ellsworth and extension and expansion of Riggs, loss of the commercial corner at Crismon and Riggs and conformance with the GP provision to have no more than two commercial corners staff is supporting the request. The public comments are mostly in opposition to the request.

Mr. Reese Anderson spoke on behalf of the property owners.

Chairman Schweitzer opened the Public Hearing

1. John Byrne 21055 E Orchard Lane Queen Creek is in opposition
2. Kevin Dorer 21180 E Orchard Lane Queen Creek is in opposition. "We do not need commercial property at this intersection. There is already more than enough traffic congestion. Let's continue with the Town Center approved by voters.
3. Kathy Dorer 21180 E Orchard Lane Queen Creek is in opposition. "I have problems pulling onto Ellsworth now, we do not want commercial on the NW corner of Ellsworth and Riggs Road. We all know that the SW corner (County) will end up being commercial anyway. Let's keep it at just one corner".
4. Paul MacDonald 20930 E Orchard Lane Queen Creek is in opposition. "This GPA is not in my vision of Queen Creek. We are in a rural gateway area of Queen Creek. It does not complement the future equestrian center or the future school on the SE corner. Please vote no and preserve the San Tan area".
5. Maureen MacDonald 20939 E Orchard Lane Queen Creek is in opposition. "This change is not consistent with the General Plan. This is on equestrian, residential land. The Town Center and Power/Riggs/Chandler Heights I am fine with I do not support commercial in this area.

No further public comment. Public Hearing closed.

Commissioner Trapp Jackson inquired in regards to the circulation and Traffic concerns what are the proposed improvements for the area?

Planner Chris Ramos advised Commission that Riggs Road and Ellsworth Road will be built out to 4-6 lane roads. These size roads would support a commercial building. After speaking with Mike Pacelli the expansion of the roads should correspond with the building of a commercial development. Planning Manger Fred Brittingham advised that the best estimate of completion will be in about 5 years.

Commissioner Sossaman stated that even people who live on small lots need to have services close to home. This will help pay for the improvements for the Town.

Commissioner Ingram stated that due to the limited retail space that more retail is needed to keep prices down.

Motion **Commissioner Sossaman**

Recommended for Approval of GP06-006

2nd **Commissioner Ingram**

Vote **All Ayes (7-0)**

12. **PUBLIC HEARING, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON GP06-007 MAJOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT.** A request to amend the General Plan Land Use designation from Medium Density Residential to Neighborhood Commercial for approximately six (6) acres located east of the northeast corner of Sossaman and Realigned Rittenhouse Roads.

Planner Valerie Chambers presented in behalf of Staff. **STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL.** This request is an expansion of an amendment that was approved in 2004. That request was for 10 acres of commercial designation at the NEC of Sossaman Road and the future re-alignment of Rittenhouse Road. This site is immediately adjacent to the east. Re-aligned Rittenhouse will be extended in front of the parcels and will separate it from its neighbors to the south. It backs to the existing Rittenhouse Road.

Staff believes that this expansion will provide commercial services in an area that is currently under served and meets the GP policy of only allowing two corners to be developed as commercial. There will not be any residential neighbors to the project thus it should not impact any residential uses. To date staff has received public comments that are in support and no indications of opposition.

Mr. Sean Lake presented in behalf of the applicant.

Chairman Schweitzer opened the Public Hearing

1. Kyle Robinson 18557 E Ranch Road Queen Creek is in favor. "I live close to this area in Cortina. This proposal fits in well with the SRP Substation, Church and rock retailer in the area. I feel this amendment request will have not significant impact on the infrastructure of the Town. This proposal would help minimize cross Town traffic by providing a commercial location close to the area residents. I feel this would be a benefit to our Town.

2. Vince Gonzono 19409 S Sossaman Road. Queen Creek is in favor of this. Hopefully next year my corner will be up for this approval as well.

No further public comment. Public hearing closed.

Motion **Commissioner Sossaman**

For approval of GP06-007

2nd **Commissioner Perry**

Vote **All Ayes (7-0)**

13. **PUBLIC HEARING, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON GP06-008 MAJOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT,** A request by Ralph Pew of Pew and Lake, PLC, for a Major General Plan Amendment to create a new Land Use Designation “High Density Residential (12-18 dwelling units per acre)” in the General Plan Land Use Element and to amend the General Plan Land Use Map from Employment Type B to High Density Residential for 27+/- acres. The property is located approximately 400 ft. west of the northwest corner of Germann and realigned Rittenhouse Roads.

Senior Planner Mike McCauley presented in behalf of the staff.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DENIAL. The introduction of high density residential outside the Town Center is a significant policy issue in staff’s viewpoint. The current low density approach to development outside the Town Center has been a closely held part of the General Plan. Also, the loss of employment in close proximity to Williams Gateway

Airport and replacing it with residential is a concern. WGA has submitted a letter of opposition to this request. To date all public comments are in opposition this request.

Mr. Sean Lake presented in behalf of the property owner.

Chairman Schweitzer opened the Public Hearing

1. Kyle Robinson 18557 E Ranch Road Queen Creek is in opposition. This proposal would increase the burden on waste water, traffic control and other Town resources. The Town can not afford to upgrade water systems, sewer systems and roads to accommodate housing and developments that exceed the current planned capacities.

2. Stephanie McCagno 18775 E Seagull Dr Queen Creek is in opposition. “The area is already getting to congested with traffic in what should be a residential area. Not including high residential areas the area should not be filled with apartments which will only contribute to a decrease of property value.

3. Jimi McCagno 18775 E Seagull Dr Queen Creek is in opposition. "Please consider a first time home owner who appreciates the value of his surroundings and the very negative effect this project will have on the community. My wife and I are planning a family and the speed of traffic and people impairs the beauty and comfort of our property".

4. Nancy Cattani 18771 E Swan Dr Queen Creek is in opposition. I live 2 streets over from where this is proposed and I feel sick every time I think that this will be approved. Crime has gone up due to the apartments located by Power Ranch. Find another place to build apartments. Our schools can not handle the taxes.

No further public comment. Public hearing closed.

Chairman Schweitzer made a comment that this should be an option to explore in the 2007 rewrite.

Commissioner Sossaman stated that over the years the Town has stayed clear of diversity in housing. Queen Creek still needs to address having different housing within the Town Limits. This area has the criteria for putting in higher density housing.

Commissioner Perry stated in 1986 this changed the face of apartments. In today's time apartments have to have a higher quality of living to make money.

Chairman Schweitzer suggested speaking to Council

Motion **Vice-Chairman Shifman**

Recommend Council to continue indefinitely GP06-008

2nd **Commissioner Sossaman.**

Vote **All ayes (7-0)**

14. **PUBLIC HEARING, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON GP04-007 MAJOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT**, A request by Ralph Pew of Pew and Lake, PLC, for a Major General Plan Amendment to change the General Plan Land Use Map on approximately 330 acres from Employment Type A to:

- Neighborhood Commercial (on approx. 10 acres)
- Community Commercial (on approx. 20 acres)
- Employment Type B (on approx. 40 acres)
- Low Density Residential (1-2du/ac) (on approx. 120 acres)
- Medium Density Residential (2-3 du/ac) (on approx. 140 acres).

APPLICANT WITHDREW THE REQUEST

Motion **Commissioner Sossaman**
2nd **Commissioner Ingram**
Vote **All Ayes (7-0)**

15. **ADJOURNMENT**

Motion: **Commissioner Atkinson**

To adjourn the Meeting.

2nd: **Commissioner Ingram**
Vote: **All ayes. Motion carried**

The Meeting adjourned at 12:05 P.M.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

By: _____
Paul Schweitzer, Chairman

Sherry Perez, Sr. Administrative Assistant

The Town of Queen Creek encourages the participation of disabled individuals in the services, activities, and programs provided by the Town. Individuals with disabilities, who require reasonable accommodation in order to participate in the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, should contact the Town Clerk at (480) 358-3003.

I, Sherry Perez, 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 October 11, 2006 Work Study of the Planning and Zoning Commission. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and that a quorum was present.

Dated this 12th day of October, 2006.

Passed and Approved this 10th day of January, 2007.