



**MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
QUEEN CREEK PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
May 12, 2021
6:00 PM**

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:06 p.m.

2. Roll Call: One or more members of the Commission may participate by telephone.

Troy Young	Chair	Present
David Gillette	Vice Chair	Present via WebEx
Matt McWilliams	Commissioner	Present via WebEx
Alex Matheson	Commissioner	Present via WebEx*
Bill Smith	Commissioner	Present
Steve Sossaman	Commissioner	Present via WebEx
Lea Spall	Commissioner	Present

**Initially it was thought that Commissioner Matheson was absent, however, staff later learned that due to technical difficulties he was in attendance via WebEx, though his voice votes of approval for items were not initially heard.*

3. Public Comment: Members of the public may address the Planning Commission on items not on the printed agenda and during Public Hearings. Please observe the time limit of (3) minutes. Comments may also be sent to via email to PublicComment@queencreek.org by 5:30 p.m. on December 9, 2020 (limited to 500 words – identify your name, address and whether you wish your comment to be read at the meeting or just submitted as part of the written record). Members of the Commission may not discuss, consider, or act on any matter raised during public comment.

None.

4. Consent Agenda: *Matters listed under the Consent Agenda are considered to be routine and will be enacted by one motion and one vote.*

A. Discussion and Possible Action on the April 14, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

B. Discussion and Possible Action on P21-0077 Lennar at Harvest Queen Creek Residential Design Review. Lennar is requesting approval of six (6) new standard plans with three (3) elevations each to be constructed on 159 lots at Parcels 3-2 and 3-3 in the Harvest Queen Creek subdivision, located south of the southwest corner of Gary and Riggs roads. (Steven Ester,

Planner II)

- C. Discussion and Possible Action on P21-0018 Mickey 40 Preliminary Plat**, a request from CVL for Preliminary Plat approval of an approximately 40-acre, 162 single-family residential subdivision located internal to the northeast corner of Ellsworth and Queen Creek roads, adjacent to the existing Terravella development. (Sarah Clark, Senior Planner/Projects)

Motion: To approve the Consent Agenda

1st: Sossaman

2nd: Gillette

RESULT: Approved unanimously (7-0)

5. Public Hearing:

A. Public Hearing and Possible Action on P19-0088 Jorde Farms South PAD Rezone, a request from Sean Lake (Pew and Lake, PLC) to rezone 747-acres from R1-43 (Queen Creek Zoning) and RU-43 (Maricopa County zoning R1-43 Equivalent) to R1-18, R1-9, R1-7, R1-5, MDR, and C-2 with a PAD Overlay, located generally east and west of the future Crismon Road alignment, north of Empire Road, west of Signal Butte Road, and south of Cloud Road. (Sarah Clark, Senior Planner/Projects)

Senior Planner Sarah Clark presented P19-0088 Jorde Farms South PAD Rezone and pointed out the surrounding areas, location of the site and the existing zoning designations. The applicant is requesting a rezone to R1-18, R1-9, R1-7, R1-5, MDR, and C-2 with a PAD Overlay. The project will consist of 2,641 residential units and 448 MDR units. Ms. Clark said a portion of the property is located in a Maricopa County island and is subject to a concurrent annexation request. The General Plan designation is primarily Neighborhood and Special District and Open Space.

Ms. Clark discussed the two requested PAD deviations: 1) reduce the R1-7 lot minimum lot width however, the applicant will increase the lot depth and 2) increase the monument entry height to allow for a water tower feature.

Ms. Clark provided an in-depth explanation of the proposed zoning changes, density and the site layout. She discussed buffer areas throughout the development, which are proposed to provide transitions for existing neighborhoods. Ms. Clark outlined specifics to the internal site including two small commercial areas which will feature specialty commercial and neighborhood services. The applicant has proposed that drive-thrus be prohibited to maintain the agrarian vision in this area. Ms. Clark said the applicant has set aside land for a possible public park site and potential future school sites. If these sites are not used for these purposes, they will revert to their respective underlying zoning district.

Ms. Clark concluded with details on design guidelines, landscaping, walls and signage, and said they are all oriented around an agrarian theme. She said conformance with these guidelines

would be reviewed during the future development process for each parcel to maintain consistency throughout.

Ms. Clark said (4) neighborhood meetings were held and outlined the questions and concerns raised by residents in regards to pedestrian and equestrian connectivity; density; traffic; buffering and other issues. She said staff received 12 letters of opposition regarding the case.

Applicant Sean Lake, Pew and Lake, PLC presented on behalf of the Jorde family. He said the Jorde family has owned the property for many years and this is one of the last large parcels in Queen Creek to be planned for the future. He outlined the Jorde land and the State land that make up the 748 acres. Mr. Lake gave a brief history of the property and zoning in relation the Queen Creek General Plan. He said the land has been planned for uses other than 1-acre lots for some time and what is being proposed is consistent with the General Plan. He discussed the buffering around surrounding communities and said the intensity is being pulled inward to the project. He said that all apartments have been removed and stated that there are no apartments in this proposal.

Mr. Lake discussed some elements of the Land Use Plan:

School- The school district approached the property owner with the need for a high school site near Cloud & Riggs. Queen Creek Unified School District (QCUSD) and Jorde are working through a potential purchase of land to accommodate the need for a new school in that area. Traffic, road realignment, dedicated right of ways and other concerns were explained.

Future Park Site – Applicant is setting aside land for a potential public park site with an option for purchase by the Town. The Town has 10 years to purchase the land and nothing will be done by the Jordes with the land during that time. If the Town does not proceed with the purchase, the land will revert to the underlying zoning.

Specialty Commercial - The commercial area will include specialty shops, boutiques, services, and no fast food.

Trails & Open Space - The applicant will develop the wash to include multi-use paths and equestrian trails and dedicate the wash to the Town. The applicant will also provide the required trails and connectivity consistent with the Town's Master Plan.

Mr. Lake concluded with information on design guidelines for the development. He discussed citizen outreach including the required neighborhood meetings and individual meetings with residents.

Commissioner Smith inquired if there were any concerns with the change from R1-35 to R1-7 west of the State land. Ms. Clark said that the Town Council approved this rezone at the March Council meeting.

Commissioner Smith asked how the applicant would prevent apartments in the MDR parcels. Mr. Lake referred to Condition #3 and said the parcels are capped at 8 du/acre and the zoning would stay with the property even if it changed hands.

Commissioner Gillette asked if there was any assurance that the proposed park would be developed. Mr. Lake said it is ultimately up to Town Council. He said the property owner has agreed to hold it for the Town for 10 years. If the Town does not purchase it, it would revert to the zoning and the buffers would still be in place.

Commissioner Spall asked about the timeline concerning the alignment on Crismon Road. Mr. Lake said they are planning to dedicate the right of way to the Town this year and the Town and QCUUSD would decide on the timing.

Chair Young opened the public hearing. The following spoke in opposition of P19-0088 Jorde Farms South PAD Rezone:

Susan Wheatley, 22248 E Riggs Road had concerns regarding the accommodation of increased traffic, use of our private frontage roads by school traffic, and increased congestion.

Sonny Randall, 21207 E Cloud Road had concerns regarding increased traffic and speed on Cloud Road, as well as the expansion of lanes on Cloud Road and encroachment onto resident's property.

Debbie Schneider, 21209 E Vallejo Street had concerns regarding the expansion of Cloud Road that will cut into resident's yards. Other concerns include noise, traffic and high-density housing. Additional concerns included insufficient buffers, horse trails and horse safety.

Lisa McBride, 21762 E Cloud Road had concerns regarding high-speed traffic, safety for horses and wants controlled growth. Concerned about the rural character being overrun with congestion.

Chelsea Brandan, 220th Street was opposed to the unexpected growth in the area and property values with construction of patio homes. She had concerns regarding, traffic, safety and increased amount of accidents and the addition of school traffic and turning lanes on Cloud Road.

Rob Schneider, 21209 E. Vallejo Street is opposed to the density and patchwork zoning and the impact to existing horse properties and wants to keep the equestrian rural area.

Shanda Riggs, 21535 E. Excelsior wants to maintain the unique characteristics of rural equestrian lots according to the General Plan. She is opposed to large amount of MDR, patio homes and townhomes in this area and the lack of acre lots that are available.

Cindy Dewine, 24423 S 211th Place had concerns regarding commercial growth and density in the area resulting in traffic and dangerous conditions, in particular the Ellsworth Road and Cloud intersection for trailers and animals.

Taffee Eagar (no address provided) was concerned with increased traffic on Cloud Road. She was opposed to the intensity and the loss of the small town feel and expressed the need for one-acre lots.

Dave Rich, Hastings Farms, was concerned with speeding traffic, density and wants to maintain acre lots and the rural area that surrounds HPEC.

Paul Steka, 24520 S. 211th Place opposed the irresponsible growth and congestion in the area and had concerns with safety issues with the proposed high school and new drivers. He said the buffers are not guaranteed.

Robbin McBride, 21730 E Cloud Road opposed high density, increased traffic and safety for the area roads, and property values with the proposed patio homes.

The following public comments in opposition to the project were received by email and were read into the record (see attached):

Christina Allen, Queen Creek
Rondalyn Chestnut-See and Michael See, 21220 E Vallejo Street
Marcina Layton, 24106 S Cloud Creek Trail
Max and Heidi Petersen, 22041 East Cloud Road
Lawana Mortensen, Queen Creek
Kevin Aikins, 24514 S. 210th Place
Susan Wheatley, 22248 E Riggs Road
Shanda Riggs, 21535 E. Excelsior Avenue
Sonny Randall, 21207 E Cloud Road

Planner Steve Ester read WebEx comments in opposition to the project from Crystal Ehart, 24711 S 222nd Street, Queen Creek and Donna Mortensen, 22224 E Merlot Street, Queen Creek.

Chair Young closed the public hearing.

Mr. Lake addressed some of the questions and concerns as follows:

50 foot buffer along south part of Riggs Road - This is a 50-foot green strip committed to landscaping and is not future roadway. Chair Young asked if it could be used for horses. Mr. Lake responded that we could work with the Town on what they would like to see.

Cloud Road – Mr. Lake clarified that Cloud road is an 80 foot right of way road designed for three lanes at build out (one lane each direction and a center lane). The 80-foot right of way is not all black top and will also include landscaping and sidewalk.

Trails Plan – The multi-use path on the north side of Riggs allows equestrian and pedestrians. The applicant will also install improvements to the Sonoqui Wash with an 11-mile loop once connected which will include equestrian uses.

Internal (pink) Paths – These internal paths in the subdivision are pedestrian only.

Diversity of Housing – The project is an 800-acre master plan (very large) and will have different lot sizes with multiple choices over a large area.

Land Use Plan – The proposed project is not in an area designated as rural and has always been planned for future development. The southwest portion of the Town is designated as Rural in the General Plan and this will not change because of this development.

The Commission discussed internal trail systems for pedestrians and horses and asked the developer to consider equestrian needs and trail connections based on the amount of surrounding horse properties. They discussed the importance of safe connections and crossing for animals. Mr. Lake explained the multi-use path design and the setbacks from the roadway (which includes curb gutter, landscaping, pathways and then additional landscaping) and confirmed that horses will not be beside the roadway.

The Commission asked about traffic studies and long term plans for Cloud Road. Planning Administrator Erik Swanson confirmed that Cloud Road has been established for three lanes. Deputy Public Works Director Mohamed Youssef provided further clarification on traffic on Cloud Road. He referenced the Transportation Master Plan Update of 2020, which used the Maricopa Association of Government (MAG) model with two lanes (twelve feet each) and a turn lane and said we are not widening Cloud Road. The remainder will be for ROW landscape and drainage.

Chair Young asked if it was possible to have horse trail access along the side of Cloud Road west of 213th Street to access Horseshoe Park. Mr. Youseff said we have the width to do this. Mr. Youseff also provided an overview of traffic improvements in the Queen Creek area including State Rte. 24, Ironwood, Signal Butte and Meridian roads, which will alleviate traffic from San Tan Valley on Ellsworth Road when completed. He said the Master Plan took this into consideration in regards to the design for three lanes only for Cloud Road. Mr. Mouseff said that the \$200M in road improvements in Queen Creek will improve traffic circulation and traffic in Queen Creek will change. He said the dynamic of traffic will be very different upon completion.

Motion to recommend approval of P19-088 Jorde Farms South PAD Rezone, subject to the outlined Conditions of Approval and with the added condition of approval that the developer continue to work with the Town on the equestrian trails portion of the development.

1st: Sossaman

2nd: Smith

AYES: Young, Gillette, Sossaman, Smith, McWilliams, Matheson

NAYES: Spall

RESULT: Approved 6-1

B. Public Hearing and Possible Action on P21-0037 Barney Farms North Orphan Rezone, a request by Greg Davis (Iplan Consulting) to rezone a 2-acre triangular site from EMP-A to HDR, located approximately 1,500 feet southwest of the southwest corner of Germann and Signal Butte roads. (Sarah Clark, Senior Planner/Projects)

Senior Planner Sarah Clark provided information on the Barney Farms North Orphan Rezone to rezone a 2-acre triangular piece of land from Employment A to High Density Residential. The General Plan designation is Industrial but allows for rezoning requests with minor changes without a General Plan update. Ms. Clark said there are no deviations requested. Ms. Clark said a neighborhood meeting was held and no members of the public attended. Ms. Clark said the parcel was initially located within the Phoenix Mesa Gateway Airport (PMGA) noise contour line but PMGA updated their contour lines and the parcel is now outside of the noise contour area.

Greg Davis, Iplan Consulting, gave a brief summary of the project on behalf of the Barney Family via WebEx.

There were no comments from the Commission or the public.

Motion to recommends approval of P21-0037 Barney Farms North Orphan Rezone, subject to the Conditions of Approval.

1st: Spall

2nd: McWilliams

RESULT: Approved unanimously (7-0)

- C. Public Hearing and Possible Action on P12-0021 Costco Fuel Station Conditional Use Permit,** a request from Andrea Urbas of MG2 for Conditional Use Permit approval for a fuel station located at the northwest corner of Ellsworth and Queen Creek roads. (Erik Swanson, Planning Administrator)

Planning Administrator Erik Swanson summarized the request for a Conditional Use Permit for a fuel station in association with the future Costco Warehouse. He gave a brief description of the site plan, 32 fueling stations, access points, landscaping and elevations and it will be consistent with the site as it develops. He gave details on the improvements, which will take place on Queen Creek Road. A neighborhood meeting was held and five members of the public attended with general questions.

Mr. Swanson said the applicant is available for questions if needed. There were no comments from the Commission or the public.

Motion to recommends approval of P21-0021 Costco Fuel Station CUP, subject to the Conditions of Approval.

1st: Gillette

2nd: Spall

RESULT: Approved unanimously (7-0)

- D. Public Hearing and Possible Action on P21-0087 Mobile Food Vendor Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment.** An amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to conform with the recent approval to the Town Code addressing mobile food vending in the Town of Queen Creek. (Sarah Clark, Senior Planner/Projects)

Senior Planner Sarah Clark said that Town Council approved a text amendment to the Town Code at the April 7, 2021 meeting addressing fees, licensing and other requirements for mobile food vendors operating in Town limits. Mobile vendor can now operate under the general business license and the permitting process has been streamlined. Ms. Clark said a subsequent text amendment to the Zoning Ordinance is needed to reflect the Town Code changes. Ms. Clark outlined the changes need in the zoning ordinance, which are the same as those approved by Council.

There were no comments from the Commission or the public.

Motion to approve P21-0087 Mobile Food Vendor Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment.

1st: Spall

2nd: Smith

RESULT: Approved unanimously (7-0)

E. Public Hearing and Possible Action on P21-0089 Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment – Residential Design Review, an amendment to DS.4 Single-Family Residential by creating a new subsection F. Approved Product Transferability, to the Town’s adopted Design Standards (Erik Swanson, Planning Administrator)

Planning Administrator Swanson gave an overview of the proposed text amendment for Residential Design Review (RDR). The amendment would modify the current process so homebuilders who have received RDR approval within the past 12 months are able to use the approved housing product in other parcels/subdivisions without an additional RDR approval. He said that administrative approval would still be required. This would streamline the process by an estimated 3-6 months and reduce staff review time and would also keep our design standards. Mr. Swanson said this was an item discussed in the Town Council strategic planning session.

Mr. Swanson reviewed the following considerations recommended by the Planning Staff:

1. Any housing product that was first to a new community would require RDR review and approval by the Planning Commission.
2. If housing product has previously been approved and is being requested for transfer to another community, the housing product would have to meet all applicable conditions of approval for that community
3. Product would have to be commensurate with the lot sizes
4. The number of housing products/elevations would need to be evaluated prior to approval to ensure sufficient diversity within the community
5. Product cannot be transferred that has received approval for deviations
6. Product may only be transferred up to 2 times

Commissioner Smith had concerns regarding diversity, rubber-stamping and neighborhoods looking the same. He asked how many times they could re-use the product. Mr. Swanson said they can only use it two times and then they have to come back for approval. Mr. Swanson discussed market trends and housing styles and said there are natural changes that occur over the years.

Motion to recommend approval of P21-0089 Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments – Residential Design Review, an amendment to DS.4 Single-Family Residential by creating a new subsection F. Approved Product Transferability, to the Town’s adopted Design Standards

1st: Spall

2nd: Sossaman

AYES: Young, Gillette, Sossaman, Spall, McWilliams, Matheson

NAYES: Smith

RESULT: Approved (6-1)

A. Final Action:

A. Discussion and Possible Action on P21-0017 Village at Schnepf Farms Site Plan, a request from Sherri Koshiol of the Empire Group for Site Plan approval of a 144-unit multi-family development on a 13 acre site, located west of the northwest corner of Rittenhouse and Cloud roads. (Steven Ester, Planner II).

Planner Steven Ester provided an overview on the Village at Schnepf Farms site plan for a single story multi-family development. He gave a brief description of the 13-acre site and area surroundings. The General Plan is designated Special District 1: Agritainment and the current zoning is Agritainment with a PAD overlay. Mr. Ester gave a brief history of the site which included an annexation and rezone approved by Town Council in 2020. He said this is the first site plan to come forward for this property.

Mr. Ester outlined the site plan including parking, open space, access, landscaping, buffers and trails. He said the plan is part of the overall Schnepf Farms Agritainment PAD and South Specific Area Plan. The project will have an emphasis on farm-related elements which will be displayed in the various models, walls and monuments.

Sherry Koshiol of the Empire Group gave additional details on the Village product and the many amenities offered for this project. She discussed the agritainment theme and said the concept was designed in coordination with the Schnepfs to develop a modern farmhouse style.

Commissioner Sossaman had questions regarding access, traffic and the other uses in the surrounding area. Ms. Koshiol said that the traffic generated from the project will access the primary entrance onto Rittenhouse and provided traffic projections for both entrances. (70% north /south on Rittenhouse and 30% for the secondary access east/west on Cloud). There was additional discussion by the Commission on the left out restriction on Rittenhouse and how it may affect the area.

Chair Young read a comment card from Shanda Riggs who commented that many residents did not know about this project beforehand.

Motion to approve P21-0017 Village at Schnepf Farms Site Plan, subject to the Conditions of Approval.

1st: Gillette

2nd: Spall

RESULT: Approved unanimously (7-0)

7. Items for Discussion: *These items are for Commission discussion only and no action will be taken. In general no public comment will be taken.*

None.

8. Administrative Items:

A. Recent activity update

Planning Administrator Erik Swanson recognized Sarah Clark's birthday.

Planning Intern Laney Corey introduced herself to the Commission and reported on single-family building permits. She said 274 permits were issued in April, which is a 24% increase from 2020.

9. Summary of Events from members of the Commission and staff. *The Commission may not deliberate or take action on any matter in the "summary" unless the specific matter is properly noticed on the Regular Session agenda.*

None.

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:52 p.m.

TOWN OF QUEEN CREEK

Troy Young, Chair

ATTEST:

Joy Maglione, Deputy Town Clerk

I, Joy Maglione, do hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the foregoing Minutes are a true and correct copy of the Regular Session Minutes of May 12, 2021 Regular Session of the Queen Creek Planning Commission. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and that a quorum was present.

Passed and approved on June 9, 2021

5/12/2021

Town of Queen Creek Mail - Jorde farms



Sarah Clark <sarah.clark@queencreek.org>

Jorde farms

2 messages

'Christina Allen' via publiccomment <publiccomment@queencreek.org>

Tue, May 11, 2021 at 5:39 PM

Reply-To: Christina Allen <rodeomom03@icloud.com>

To: PublicComment@queencreek.org

I am against rezoning of the rural farm land. Against any apartments, condos, etc. We are already getting a school in our backyard. Leave the rest alone and rural. Do not widen Cloud Rd. If access is to be off of Riggs then what's the need. You keep saying that the traffic will not increase then why the need to widen Cloud? So sad that our Queen Creek leaders are taking the country out of Queen Creek!!!! Leave some land!

Sent from my iPhone

Sarah Clark <sarah.clark@queencreek.org>

To: Christina Allen <rodeomom03@icloud.com>

Cc: PublicComment@queencreek.org

Hi Christina,

Thank you for your email. It will be saved in the official case record and will be read into the public record. Please reach out to me if you have any additional questions.

Sarah Clark
Senior Planner
480-358-3020

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Sarah Clark, AICP | Senior Planner/Project Manager, Development Services Department | Town of Queen Creek |
phone: 480-358-3020 | fax: 480-358-3105 | e-mail: sarah.clark@queencreek.org |
22358 S. Ellsworth Road, Queen Creek, AZ 85142 | www.queencreek.org Office hours: Monday – Thursday, 7 a.m. – 6 p.m.. closed on Fridays

Sarah Clark <sarah.clark@queencreek.org>
To: Joy Maglione <joy.maglione@queencreek.org>

Wed, May 12, 2021 at 10:04 AM

Can you read this item into the record during the public comment portion of the meeting per Erik's direction?

Thank you!

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Erik Swanson** <erik.swanson@queencreek.org>

Date: Wed, May 12, 2021 at 9:51 AM

Subject: Re: <https://www.queencreekaz.gov/Home/Components/Calendar/Event/31684/17> ' JORDE FARMS'

To: Sarah Clark <sarah.clark@queencreek.org>

Unfortunately it appears that she is trying to cover both cases. I think we can read in the first paragraph and forego the second as it is not being discussed.

On Wed, May 12, 2021 at 9:22 AM Sarah Clark <sarah.clark@queencreek.org> wrote:

FYI - Do you want this to be read into the public comment portion since its in relation to the Durham rezone?

On Wed, May 12, 2021 at 9:15 AM RONDALYN CHESNUT <rondalync@msn.com> wrote:

I AM ASKING THIS BE READ AT THE MEETING. THANK YOU

Dear Planning, Name: Rondalyn Chesnut-See and Michael See. [21220 E. Vallejo St. Queen Creek, AZ. 85142](https://www.queencreekaz.gov/Home/Components/Calendar/Event/31684/17)

Phone 480-721-3865

When I moved out here 2005 downtown Queen Creek was just a stop sign, with a few cafes and of coarse the famous Norton's.

If you rezone it is going to cause a lot more traffic , accidents, and animal accidents. My story of an accident, my husband and I were leaving and noticed the traffic was back up on Cloud and 213th. There was a girl on a horse trying to grab another horse with out a rider. This was all caused by the horse getting startled and car traffic. Just as she was reaching for the other horses reins, the horse with out a rider took off and started running down cloud, just as she started running her horse fell and she flew off hit the pavement rolled like a rag doll and cracked open her head bleeding profusely. I was the first one there, the horses were running down Cloud heading west towards Ellsworth and ran all the way to Target before they were able to be corralled.

The girl was bleeding profusely from her head and knocked out completely, and gurgling. It was almost like a death rattle. If you have ever heard a death rattle then you know what I am talking about. I covered her with a blanket and another lady came over with one of those fabric shopping bags and got it under her head where she was bleeding from. But, after a 5 minutes she finally came too, and we were trying to keep her calm and for her to stay laying so she did not bleed more or aggravate any other injury's she might have. e She was disorientated and trying to get up and then remembered that she had been on a horse and was trying to get up to go after them. Then finally the Fire department and Ambulance got there. This was very scary, and I really thought she was going to die on us until she started to come around. These type of accidents are caused by an animal getting startled because of traffic.

As far as dealerships they are not a necessary business and if they are the dealership's of our neighbor on Ellsworth, why doesn't he get rid of some of his cattle and rezone his property and put the dealerships on his property. This also means people driving new cars and test driving new cars that will also add to traffic. We want to keep our county island quiet and country as Queen Creek was meant to be. We bought here because there were no houses on top of each other. We have had more and more suspicious looking people driving up down our streets. A neighbor just posted about one theft and some one messing with her tractor in the back yard. Vote no , on increased traffic, car and animal accidents and more theft. Vote no Rezoning.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Fwd: URGENT for May 12 meeting

1 message

Sarah Clark <sarah.clark@queencreek.org>
To: Joy Maglione <joy.maglione@queencreek.org>

Wed, May 12, 2021 at 12:56 PM

Can you read this item under the Jorde public hearing tonight as well?

Thank you,

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Marcina L** <mlskyline1@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, May 12, 2021 at 12:49 PM
Subject: URGENT for May 12 meeting
To: <publiccomment@queencreek.org>

We DO NOT want Cloud Road to be widened beyond two lanes and the turning lane!!

I have friends who live right on Cloud Rd, who will probably lose most of their front yards, and others who will lose most of their side yard. Please have compassion, check out the situation with your own eyes and DON'T do anything that will necessitate Cloud Road to be widened!!!

If that means Jorde Farms needs to be zoned for less density, or no apartments on Cloud and Rittenhouse, or whatever else necessary, then make it so. If that means the entrances into Jorde Farms or the high school, off of Cloud Road are limited, then make sure that happens.

Please do everything in your power to ensure that Cloud Road doesn't need to be widened to accommodate the proposed housing for Jorde Farms, the apartments at the corner of Rittenhouse and Cloud, or the high school! There are plenty of other high traffic roads; Ellsworth, Riggs, and Rittenhouse. PLEASE keep Cloud Rd a smaller road!

Thank you!

Marcina Layton
24106 S Cloud Creek Trail
Queen Creek, AZ 85142

Sent from my iPad

Fwd: CALL TO THE PUBLIC: Comment regarding changes to Cloud Road, Jorde Farms Proposal

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **'Heidi Petersen' via publiccomment** <publiccomment@queencreek.org>

Date: Wed, May 12, 2021 at 4:27 PM

Subject: CALL TO THE PUBLIC: Comment regarding changes to Cloud Road, Jorde Farms Proposal

To: PublicComment@QueenCreek.org <PublicComment@queencreek.org>

Max and Heidi Petersen family

22041 East Cloud Road
Queen Creek, Arizona
85142

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

To whom it may concern:

Two and a half years ago, we purchased our home directly off Cloud Road due to the quiet, small town feel. We understood that there was potential to grow and believe some growth is beneficial. With the existing growth approved, we are already experiencing an increase in large haul truck, dump truck, and other massive vehicles traveling the span of Cloud Road, between Rittenhouse and Ellsworth. These vehicles are not specific to the ongoing construction, and flout the posted signs stating "No Large Vehicles, Local deliveries only", thus Cloud Road has become a convenient pass-through for these unauthorized OVERSIZED vehicles. These vehicles often travel well over the posted speed limit, as denoted by the introduction of a speed limit sign registering the speeds of passing vehicles. If this body were to allow the widening of Cloud Road, the drivers, at these speeds, would literally be moving directly through my front yard. Additionally, this would force my teenage children who are new drivers to pull out directly into 3-4 lanes of traffic increasing the potential for accidents. I understand there is an existing easement, that allows for a widening, but easements don't take into consideration the safety factors associated with the addition of a "freeway" (I term it this due to trucks already passing at over 65 miles per hour regularly) into citizens front yards.

In addition to the safety factors, the property values along Cloud Road and adjoining streets will be significantly, and negatively, affected by the widening of this road and the addition of high density housing. Simply put, if this board approves the widening of the road and the addition of a high density housing complex, money and value will come directly out of the pockets of the existing citizens along Cloud Rd, and into the pockets of the developers who will do their project and leave the citizens dealing with the mess each and every day. It is our fervent request that this board Vote AGAINST the Jorde Farms Proposal.

Thank you,

Max and Heidi Petersen

Fwd: Latest QC residence plans

Sarah Clark <sarah.clark@queencreek.org>
To: Joy Maglione <joy.maglione@queencreek.org>
Cc: Erik Swanson <erik.swanson@queencreek.org>

Wed, May 12, 2021 at 5:14 PM

Hi Joy. Here is another.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: 'Lawana Mortensen' via publiccomment <publiccomment@queencreek.org>
Date: May 12, 2021 at 5:09:18 PM MST
To: PublicComment@queencreek.org
Subject: Latest QC residence plans
Reply-To: Lawana Mortensen <lmortensen@yahoo.com>

Everyone—

I am writing in regards to both the Village at Schnepf Farms as well as the Jorde Farms proposal. I have been a resident of Queen Creek since 2003 and have loved being a member of the community. I have loved that QC has always had a "down home/country/small town" feel to it. However, lately it has felt more like the town of QC is more interested in cramming as many houses into as little space as possible. My concern regarding these proposed communities is that I currently live in the Orchard Ranch subdivision. We moved here because of the access to the equestrian arena and that this area of QC had been planned as farming/animal access. I believe that these plans are in direct conflict with prior planning and zoning and will change the feel as well as the significant traffic increase that makes it non conducive to the purpose that this area of QC was designed for. Please consider all the current and long term residents that such a decision to approve such high density housing in this area will drastically impact. Thank you, Lawana Mortensen

Sent from my iPhone

Fwd: Call to public-Opposition to Jorde Farms Rezone

Sarah Clark <sarah.clark@queencreek.org>
To: Joy Maglione <joy.maglione@queencreek.org>

Wed, May 12, 2021 at 5:40 PM

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Kevin Aikins <kev2709@hotmail.com>
Date: May 12, 2021 at 5:32:12 PM MST
To: PublicComment@queencreek.org
Subject: Call to public-Opposition to Jorde Farms Rezone

Kevin Aikins
24514 S. 210th Place
Queen Creek, AZ 85142

Mayor Barney, members of the town council. I am writing to you in opposition of the Jorde Farms rezone. This area should be left as R1-43 and RU-43. Many people in this area purchased and built homes here because of the surrounding zoning. We did our research to ensure where we were buying would fit our lifestyle. We also bought here because of the atmosphere of the south end of Queen Creek. This is supposed to be the rural end of town. Large lots with horses, ranch animals, or just space to support our dreams. With each passing Planning and Zoning meeting, and subsequent town council meeting, this is being changed. This town spent millions of dollars on creating an equestrian park that no one can now easily access because of the commercial rezoning as well as the high density housing being proposed. While we all understand the need for progress, it should not come at a price to those already living here or the character of this part of town. I also oppose this because traffic in this part of town will continually increase with high density homes. Ellsworth Road is already a high traffic volume road with people from neighboring towns using it in conjunction with Queen Creek residence. This increase in high density homes will exacerbate the situation leading to more accidents, more congestion, and more unhappy citizens. I support building homes here, but not high density neighborhoods. Homes with large lots and space. Thank you.

Kevin Aikins



Sarah Clark <sarah.clark@queencreek.org>

Jorde farms development

skwheatley877@gmail.com <skwheatley877@gmail.com>

Mon, May 10, 2021 at 5:02 PM

To: PublicComment@queencreek.org

Hello my name is Susan Wheatley and my address is 22248 E Riggs Rd Queen Creek AZ 85142.

I am writing to voice my disapproval and my concerns regarding the development called Jorde Farms and other development being considered specifically the parcel south of Riggs and west of Signal Butte. I understand there is a church, a school, an assisted living facility, and an apartment complex being considered at the south east corner of this parcel. I have several concerns mostly related to the school and the apartment complex. I feel a school with entrances, either for buses or parent pick up will create more traffic issues along Riggs Rd and also that my frontage road on the north side of Riggs will be used even though it is marked private road. A school ideally should be within a neighborhood as to limit speed and to make it more accessible for students who walk or ride bikes. The apartment complex just opens the door for more crime, more over crowding and much more traffic congestion. I feel that Queen Creek does not have the infrastructure to accommodate more cars on Riggs Rd or anywhere else in the town. The homes that surround this parcel are in the price range which makes them targets for break ins and theft. And throw a school and apartment complex in there and you are asking for more crime. I wish you as the town council would protect the rural nature of Queen Creek and especially the corridor from Cloud Rd to Empire and from Gary to Ellsworth. We need this to be equestrian friendly horse property. I know the customary response is that one acre lots don't sell but I don't believe that for one minute. I think it is just the greediness of the town for impact fees. I realize my concerns will never truly be addressed and you will develop the land according to your wishes but I at least want my disapproval heard.

Susan Wheatley
480-560-4579

Sent from my iPhone

Fwd: Jorde Farms South PAD rezoning

Sarah Clark <sarah.clark@queencreek.org>
To: Joy Maglione <joy.maglione@queencreek.org>

Wed, May 12, 2021 at 5:40 PM

Another.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Shanda Riggs <shandariggs@hotmail.com>
Date: May 12, 2021 at 5:39:27 PM MST
To: PublicComment@queencreek.org
Subject: Jorde Farms South PAD rezoning

Please vote no on this rezoning proposal. I particularly oppose the commercial and multi family dwelling sections of the proposal. The applicant says multi family use near the commercial parcels will benefit and support the commercial venues. The applicant also admits that these days are a very different commercial environment. The applicant admits with more online sales, it is more challenging for commercial development. So one needs the other. Multi family housing needs commercial options within walking distance, and commercial developments need higher density housing to be successful. Well, the residents in the area highly object to both!

Also, traffic is obviously a great concern. Ellsworth is infamous for its traffic delays, and this nearby section is no different. The applicant tries to calm concerns of residents saying they will expand and build roads to accommodate more population. But we want neither larger roads nor more traffic.

Furthermore, there currently is virtually no significant lighting in the area. The dark and the quiet nature of the residences in this vicinity are nearly unmatched. This project would greatly pollute the nearby residences.

This development would drastically change the character of the area, lower quality of life for surrounding residents, create less open space, and take away the uniqueness of Queen Creek. Each of those are elements that the town self-proclaims as goals. While this project may indeed be meeting the goals of the land owners, this is not meeting the goals of the town. Please preserve this corridor of low density residential options! We are running out of rural residential areas in Queen Creek! Please vote no on the Jorde Farms South PAD rezoning proposal!

-Shanda Riggs
21535 East Excelsior Avenue

Fwd: Jorde Farms South PAD Rezone

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **SONNY RANDALL** <sonny.arizona@gmail.com>

Date: Wed, May 12, 2021 at 2:01 PM

Subject: Jorde Farms South PAD Rezone

To: <PublicComment@queencreek.org>

Call to the public

Sonny Randall
21207 E. Cloud Road

My family recently moved to Queen Creek as we were fortunate enough to purchase a vacant lot just off of Cloud road and build our home that we had been planning for a few years. One of the reasons we moved to Queen Creek was to have a little more space and area for our kids to play and enjoy life. Shortly after we moved here, we started hearing talk about a new development, high school and other amenities coming to the area south of us. Not too long ago, we received a letter from the school district about a meeting regarding the high school, but that was the only notice we received in the mail up to that point in time. I was surprised we did not receive other notices of hearings as we would have welcomed the opportunity to voice our opinions and concerns. As luck would have it, we received a piece of mail from the office of Pew and Lake last week but it was sent to our old address in another city. I read through the provided materials and meeting minutes from previous hearings and I have major concerns about Cloud road being widened.

I have read the comments and minutes regarding this particular proposal which is supposed to help alleviate the traffic congestion from the Jorde Farms development. While that may be the intent, bringing two more lanes onto our property will bring the road noise of a Queen Creek autoban (Cloud road) even closer to our front door. This is very concerning to me! It is not ideal living next to a major street anyway, but then to have that street moved ~30 feet closer to our home will not only impact our quality of life but will have a negative impact on our property value as well. From the comments I have read regarding Cloud road, the concerns seemed to be focused on heavy traffic issues rather than disrupting the lives and property of those living on Cloud road. I realize the majority of individuals that have been involved in this process may not be adversely affected by this part of the proposal, but I have serious concerns with the extra two lanes and shoulder being built on the south side of Cloud and coming onto our property.

Adding more lanes also invites more speeding and 'street racing' within our community. I regularly see cars racing side by side down Ellsworth road and that is on a major street with many traffic lights. I can only imagine what it will be like if Cloud is built out with minimal traffic lights, as it is currently proposed. It will only continue to invite that

behavior down Cloud road. While speeding and racing are serious concerns, because we hear those cars all the time now, I am mainly concerned about Cloud road encroaching onto our property and bringing traffic that much closer to our home. We built here for a reason, to enjoy our space, so you can understand our concern in hearing that two more lanes and a shoulder will be added to the south side of Cloud.

I am not against improving the area if that is what is best for the community, but I have to wonder if the widening of Cloud road has been fully assessed to determine the impact to those living right off of Cloud? I know I have not been part of those conversations. Proposals on paper and real world investigations are two very different things, and I would hope this particular aspect of the proposal is looked over carefully so those living off Cloud road will be able to enjoy their intended purpose of moving here in the first place.

Thank you for your time.