



**DRAFT Minutes**  
**REGULAR MEETING**  
**QUEEN CREEK PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**  
**December 8, 2021**  
**6:00 PM**

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 6:01 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
Matt McWilliams	Commissioner	Absent
Alex Matheson	Commissioner	Present
Bill Smith	Commissioner	Present
Jeff Nielsen	Commissioner	Present
Lea Spall	Commissioner	Present

**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@queen creek.org](mailto:PublicComment@queen creek.org) by 5:30 p.m. on December 8, 2021 (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 November 10, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.**

**B. Discussion and Possible Approval of P20-0169 Bridle Creek Preliminary Plat.** A request by Michael Brungard (SKG Enterprises) for approval of a new 10-lot subdivision zoned R1-43 on approximately 13 acres, located west of the southwest corner of 196th Street and Chandler Heights Road (Steven Ester, Planner II).

**MOTION: To approve the Consent Agenda**

**1<sup>st</sup>: Matheson**

**2<sup>nd</sup>: Spall**

**AYES: Young, Gillette, Smith, Spall, Matheson, Nielsen**

**ABSENT: McWilliams**

**RESULT: Approved (6-0)**

**5. Public Hearing:**

- A. Discussion and Possible Action on P21-0082 and P21-0081 Sparrow Ironwood Rezone and Site Plan.** Request for Rezoning from General Commercial (C-2) to High-Density Residential/PAD (HDR) and Site Plan approval of a 199-unit, age-restricted, multi-family development located on approximately 9-acres west of the northwest corner of Ironwood and Ocotillo roads (Erik Swanson, Planning Administrator).

Planning Administrator Erik Swanson presented a request to rezone a 9-acre site from C-2 to HDR for a 199-unit age restricted (55+) multifamily development (Sparrow Ironwood). He outlined the location and surrounding properties.

Mr. Swanson reviewed the Site Plan. He said there is an increased buffer of thirty feet (code requires fifteen feet) with oversized trees and step-up transitioning for increased separation. He briefly discussed building design, elevations and amenities.

Mr. Swanson said the applicant is requesting a deviation from the parking standards and is proposing 279 parking stalls (338 are required) reflecting an 18% reduction. Mr. Swanson said our Code does not distinguish between age-restricted and non age-restricted and this is the first 55+ community in our Town. To justify the reduction the Town looked at studies using industry standards for age-restricted developments. Based on those studies staff is recommending approval. Mr. Swanson said Condition #12 was added stating that the property must be operated as a senior age-restricted community.

Mr. Swanson said four separate neighborhood meeting were held (both virtually and live) and there were no issues reported from attendees.

Sean Lake, Pew & Lake, presented on behalf of the applicant, Sparrow Ironwood. He said this is the first development of its kind (55+) for Queen Creek. It will be a high-end active gated community with one, two, and three story structures. He said it was designed with more amenities than a typical multifamily project and exceeds open space requirements. Mr. Lake discussed the buffers and said they worked with area neighbors and staff and made several changes to protect the line of sight, enhance landscaping and keep the project internal to the site.

Mr. Lake discussed the request for a reduction in parking and said the Town has no standards for age-restricted communities. They are held to the same standards as multifamily developments even though they typically have less people per household and could have as many as 60% single/widowed households with an approximate age of 70 years old. He reviewed results of various parking studies and parking deviations. Mr. Lake said that Sparrow communities typically

park at 1.3 spaces per unit. Kimley Horne was hired to see what would be appropriate level of parking for this project and based on the study the ratios ranged from .61 to 1.37 spaces per unit. The applicant is proposing 1.40 parking ratio for Queen Creek, which would be the highest in the Valley. Mr. Lake said that based on Sparrow's five other communities in the area they feel this would more than meet the needs. He said the applicant would rather have more open space in the development than unutilized parking spaces.

The Commission had a lengthy discussion on parking assumptions and occupancy rates. The following questions were raised:

**1. How many units are one-bedroom vs. two-bedrooms or 3-bedroom?**

Mr. Lake said there are 121 one-bedroom/studio units and 78 two-bedroom units. There are no three-bedroom units.

**2. Are other Sparrow communities 100% full?**

Pat Helgeson from Sparrow Partners said that we strive to stay at 95% occupancy. He said it is very rare to see 100%.

**3. Is the project deed restricted for age? Does the Town enforce the age restriction?**

Mr. Lake said, yes it is deed restricted. Mr. Lake said Condition #12 addresses age restrictions and it will be operated, marketed and leased as age-restricted.

Mr. Helgeson said this is all Sparrow does (age-restricted communities/no conventional multi-family) and it is our business plan. They are all deed restricted and will stay as age restricted.

Mr. Swanson said the Town does not have authority to check id's and it would be complaint driven. We do not have an Ordinance on age-restricted communities.

**4. What is the people per household ratio in multifamily?**

Mr. Swanson said we have been using three for multifamily.

Mr. Lake said 60% of residents are singles or couples with one car.

**5. How do urban developments compare with rural developments in regards to parking and what are the ratios during peak hours?**

Mr. Lake said the study used urban developments.

Mr. Helgeson said at 1.34 spaces per unit, communities still have a dozen open spaces and we feel we will have excess parking even during peak hours. Queen Creek is proposed at 1.40.

**6. Is there assigned parking?**

Mr. Helgeson said residents have a choice of assigned covered spots at \$40 month or garages. The rest is open parking behind the gates for residents only.

**7. Is there enough visitor parking?**

Mr. Helgeson said visitors are not allowed behind the gate (that is secured resident parking only). Guest parking (16+ spaces) is available near the lobby and we found this has always been adequate.

**8. What does Queen Creek require for parking in their current standards?**

Mr. Swanson said 1.7 per unit and this figure is for multifamily. We do not have a standard for age-restricted communities.

**9. Have you had trouble in other cities with parking standards and have projects ever been turned down based on statistics? Are you open to alternatives to add other parking?**

Mr. Helgeson said no, we have never been turned down due to parking in the six states we are in. He explained that we are not lowering the parking standards; there simply are no standards created yet in many cities because active adult rental is fairly new. All five communities in the Valley approved our projects based on our studies/statistics. Mr. Helgeson said we do not want to under park our community; that does us no benefit.

Mr. Helgeson said Queen Creek would be the highest parked community in the west. They will agree to work with staff to discuss a 1.44 ratio to include compact spaces per Code.

**10. Are amenities lighted for evening use?**

Mr. Helgeson said the clubhouse is open 24/7 and mostly used inside at night. There are outdoor lights for pickle ball only and the lights are focused inward. The pool is open dawn to dusk. There are other lights for safety/security in the community.

Commissioners commented that this is a good project that fills a need in the community but had concerns with parking for the elderly, visitor parking and using lower parking ratios than allowed in the Code. The Commission would like to see the Town develop standards for 55+ communities for the future.

Chair Young opened the public hearing. There were no public comments and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Matheson made a motion to approve **P21-0082 and P21-0081 Sparrow Ironwood Rezone and Site Plan subject to the Conditions of Approval and the additional Condition #12.** Commissioner Nielsen seconded the motion.

Commissioner Smith commented that he would like the applicant to provide additional studies on the amount of available open parking in actual properties that are at 95% occupancy to back up numbers in their reports.

Commissioner Spall commented that she was concerned about the visitor parking.

Commissioner Gillette suggested an amended motion to approve **P21-0082 and P21-0081 Sparrow Ironwood Rezone and Site Plan subject to the Conditions of Approval and the additional Condition #12 AND to add a condition that the applicant agree to work with staff to add additional compact parking spaces internal to the site.**

**MOTION: To approve P21-0082 and P21-0081 Sparrow Ironwood Rezone and Site Plan subject to the Conditions of Approval and the additional Condition #12.**

**1<sup>st</sup>: Matheson**

**2<sup>nd</sup>: Nielsen**

**AYES: Young, Gillette, Smith, Spall, Matheson, Nielsen**

**ABSENT: McWilliams**

**RESULT: Approved (6-0)**

The original motion passed as stated and the amended motion was not voted on.

**6. 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.

**7. Administrative Items:**

**A. Recent activity update.**

Update provided at the Work Study Session.

**8. 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.

**9. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned 7:09 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 December 8, 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: January 2022.