



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

**Wednesday, April 14, 2010 7:00 P.M.**

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

1. **CALL TO ORDER** The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. **ROLL CALL**

**Present**

Chairman Trapp-Jackson  
Commissioner Atkinson  
Commissioner Perry  
Commissioner Reyes  
Commissioner Sossaman

**Absent**

Vice-Chairman Moore  
Commissioner Ingram

**Staff**

**Present**

Community Development Director Condit  
Planning Manager Balmer  
Principal Planner McCauley  
Senior Planner Williams  
Community Development Assistant Laura Moats

**Absent**

3. **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.**

4. **Consent Agenda:** Matters listed under the Consent Agenda are considered to be routine and will be enacted by one motion and one vote. Public Hearing items are designated with an asterisk (\*). Prior to consideration of the Consent Agenda, the Chairman will ask whether any member of the public wishes to remove a Public Hearing item for separate consideration. Members of the Commission and/or staff may remove any item for separate consideration.

- a. Consideration and Possible Approval of March 10, 2010 Work Study and Regular Session Minutes;**
- b. Consideration and Possible Approval of Olive Garden, SP10-010,** A request by Kourtnie Airheart, on behalf of Darden Restaurants, Inc. for Site Plan, Landscape Plan and Building Elevation Plan approval for an Olive Garden restaurant. The proposal consists of 7,582 square feet of commercial use on a site with existing C-2 PAD zoning. The project is located in the vicinity of the southwest corner of Ellsworth Loop and Rittenhouse roads on Pad A of the Queen Creek Marketplace.
- c. Consideration and Possible Approval of Standard Pacific Homes at Sossaman Estates, Parcels H, I, and K, DR10-015,** A request from Susann Mozer of Standard Pacific Homes for Design Review approval of five standard floor plans with three elevations each on a total of 35 infill lots in Sossaman Estates, Parcels H, I and K, zoned R1-12 PAD, located at the northeast corner of Ocotillo Road and 186<sup>th</sup> Place.

**Motion:** Commissioner Sossaman

**To Remove Item C. on Consent Agenda, as presented.**

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

**Vote:** All ayes. Motion carried 5-0 (Moore, Ingram absent).

**Item C was removed for discussion.**

**Motion:** Commissioner Sossaman

**To approve the remainder of the Consent Agenda.**

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

**Vote:** All ayes. Motion carried 5-0 (Moore, Ingram absent).

Sr. Planner Dave Williams addressed the Commission to answer questions. Commissioner Sossaman did not request a formal presentation. He stated he pulled Item C. from the Consent Agenda in order to resolve his questions on lot layout for two-story homes, noting under the Town's current policy, two-story homes are not permitted to be built on lots adjacent to major arterials. Commissioner Sossaman noted that Mr. Williams had indicated during Work Study that this stipulation was not added under the original conditions, which were previously approved under the Capital Pacific design review case. Commissioner Sossaman requested a stipulation be added that two-story homes are not permitted to be built on Lots 6 and 7 of Parcel K.

**Motion:** Commissioner Sossaman  
**To approve Item C. of the Consent Agenda: Standard Pacific at Sossaman Estates, Parcels H, I and K, DR10-015, as presented, subject to the Conditions of Approval set forth in the staff report, and the additional stipulation that no two-story homes may be built on Lots 6 and 7 of Sossaman Estates, Parcel K.**

**2<sup>nd</sup>:** Commissioner Perry  
**Vote:** All ayes. Motion carried 5-0 (Moore, Ingram absent).

- 5. Public Hearing, Discussion and Possible Action on Circle G at The Church Farm Minor General Plan Amendment, GP10-014,** A request by Greg Davis of Iplan Consulting on behalf of William Lyon Homes, to amend the General Plan Land Use Map designation for 20 acres located at the southeast corner of Ocotillo and Signal Butte roads from Community Commercial to Medium Density Residential.

Senior Planner Williams stated this item will be continued to the May 12 Commission meeting at the applicant's request.

**Motion:** Commissioner Atkinson  
**To continue GP10-014, Circle G at The Church Farm, to the May 12 Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting.**  
**2<sup>nd</sup>:** Commissioner Reyes  
**Vote:** All ayes Motion Carried 5-0 (Moore, Ingram absent).

- 6. Public Hearing, Discussion and Possible Action on Barney Farms Major General Plan Amendment, GP09-058,** A request by Ralph Pew on behalf of Barney Farms to amend the General Plan Land Use Map designation for 257 acres located at the northwest corner of Queen Creek and Meridian roads from Employment Type B to 20 acres of Employment Type A, 20 acres of Community Commercial and 217 acres of Medium High Density Residential-A (0-5 du/ac).

Planning Manager Balmer presented the Power Point and staff report, showing the current Industrial land use designation for the project site and the proposed single family Residential land use.

The following items were highlighted in the presentation:

Minor General Plan Amendment to the Transportation Element: Mr. Balmer reviewed this minor General Plan Amendment, which was processed last year, and its pertinence to the Barney Farms re-submittal. This amendment links Signal Butte and Meridian roads, which increases early development opportunities by taking advantage of Mesa's plans to accelerate the completion of the 802 Freeway.

Site Plan for the Queen Creek Sports Complex (QCSC): The QCSC is proposed as a regional-type facility for large-scale events. The complex, as planned, will have several amenities including lighted ball fields, which are not typically amenable to residential areas.

Modified Site Plan: The applicant's modified plan shows Meridian Road curving to the northwest and linking into the second phase of the project, bringing it up to Germann Road. With this revised plan, the applicant had suggested reconfiguring the park to a more square than linear shape.

Planning Commission November, 2009 Recommendation: At the November Public Hearing, the Commission recommended the case be continued for further study to:

- Develop a transportation plan for the entire square mile (Germann to Queen Creek roads; Signal Butte to Meridian roads), including the potential realignment of Signal Butte Road.
- Evaluate options and issues associated with the redesign of East Park to accommodate the revised transportation plan.
- Reconsider the proposed land use plan to reduce the requested residential density.

#### Project Changes

Since the November, 2009 meeting, the applicant has made the following changes to the proposed amendment:

- Rezoning application RZ09-060 has been withdrawn.
- General Plan Amendment application has been modified from requested MHDR-A and B to just MHDR-A.
- The overall project density has been reduced to 4.5 dwelling units/acre.

Mr. Balmer outlined the public meeting schedule from December, 2009 to present, including Town Council, Transportation Advisory Committee, Parks, Trails and Open Space Committee, Economic Development and Planning Commission.

The following core issues associated with the request were summarized:

- Barney Farms request
- Transportation
- Possible reconfiguration of Queen Creek Sports Complex
- Land Use (including airport over flight and noise issues)
- Economic development
- Infrastructure costs, land dedications and land transfer

Mr. Balmer summarized the recommendations from the Transportation Advisory Committee, PTOS and Economic Development Commission.

Mr. Balmer outlined staff's alternative proposal, which incorporates the following changes:

- The proposed realigned Signal Butte/Meridian road would cross the Town property from east to west at the location previously planned for the transition from the Sports Complex to the proposed Corporate Yard.
- The park would remain in its current location and could be completed as planned. No land exchange would be needed.
- The new road would provide greater visibility and a new northern entrance to the Sports Complex.
- "Old" Signal Butte Road north of Queen Creek Road would be realigned to a location west of the park.
- A reduction of the proposed MHDR-A acreage from 217 to 178.
- Retain 39 acres for future consideration as a future Mixed Use development, which could possibly include retail, office or higher density residential as options in lieu of the proposed MHDR-A residential development.
- Allow for development of additional employment and revenue generating uses to help retain the employment character and benefit to the community.

Ralph Pew of Pew and Lake, 1744 S. Val Vista Drive, Suite 217, Mesa, addressed the Commission on behalf of the Newell Barney family. Mr. Pew stated the applicant's position on the staff recommendation as follows:

- Applicant concurs with Employment Type A and Community Commercial parcels.
- Applicant does not agree with the concept of coming back in the future to reapply for a General Plan Amendment for the remaining Mixed Use parcels (currently proposed for MHDR-A).
- Applicant no longer wishes to propose reconfiguration of park site. If the Town desires to do this in the future, the Barney family is agreeable to working with staff on this.
- Applicant is requesting the Commission approve:
  - 20 acres of Employment Type A
  - 20 acres of Community Commercial
  - 217 of Medium-High Density Residential A (up to 5 du/ac)

Mr. Pew responded to the five core issues outlined by Mr. Balmer:

- 1) Transportation: The applicant feels the transition from Signal Butte and Meridian roads through Queen Creek is pre-imminent, as it is very important in allowing north-south traffic to traverse through Queen Creek. Since the applicant is the property owner for this square mile (with the exception of the park land), this can be achieved. If this proposal is ultimately approved, the applicant will process a rezoning case for Phase I. This will require dedication of the roadway configuration from Signal Butte to Meridian Road. The specific configuration can be worked out with staff's suggestion in relation to the existing park.

- 2) Reconfigured Park – This is no longer an issue. The applicant is leaving the park ‘as-is’.
- 3) Over flight issue – Mr. Pew reiterated that, according to Town Ordinance, residential uses are allowed in this area with proper mitigation methods and stipulations.
- 4) Economic Development – The application was reviewed by the Economic Development Commission on two occasions, resulting in the EDC’s recommendation of approval of the application as submitted.
- 5) Infrastructure Costs, land dedications and Land Transfer: Mr. Pew pointed out the inventory of developed employment land and offered a comparison of employment square footage per person in surrounding municipalities, stating Queen Creek will have an oversaturation of employment at build-out, equaling about 1,068 acres. He summarized the applicant feels the requested modification of Employment to Residential land use is a minimal concern for a 217-acre parcel. The applicant feels approval of this request will create a catalyst for getting the Town’s northern tier developed to translate into shovel-ready land needed for economic development.

The applicant is requesting approval of their plan as submitted, including keeping the 18-acre and 21-acre parcels as MHDR-A, rather than the staff-recommended Mixed Use. The applicant does not feel MU is good at this location because MU relates to a destination spot with pedestrian-friendly amenities. MU also requires transit uses which do not exist in Queen Creek. The applicant feels MU is the most difficult land use category to develop.

Mr. Pew summarized, the applicant is requesting approval of 217 acres of residential uses. Mr. Pew referred to the letter submitted during Work Study from his office stating the applicant’s future commitments, including a future General Plan Amendment application for the balance of Barney Farms; cooperating to realign the road through the park; understanding of density issues to be worked out during the zoning case; and notification to property owners/residents as part of the zoning case.

Commissioner Sossaman questioned the timing of the road realignment and the zoning plat with stipulations. Mr. Pew stated the applicant will cooperate with staff for the new roadway, which will be done during the General Plan Amendment. When the zoning comes through, this new roadway will already exist.

Chairman Trapp-Jackson opened the Public Hearing at 7:53 P.M.

- 1) Scott McCoy representing CMC Steel – Mr. McCoy expressed gratitude and appreciation to Pew and Lake, and the Barney Family for their generosity of time, stating he feels progress has been made on this proposal since last November. He knows the applicant will continue to work on public notification for employment uses. Mr. McCoy expressed concern over the proximity of residential uses next to the most intense industrial land use, that being the steel plant. He stated the steel plant does mitigate impacts to adjacent property owners and there are other intense land uses in this area. He is concerned over harmful impacts to residents south of Germann Road, and feels the half-mile buffer is appropriate and can help ease impacts on residential uses; however, he is concerned that 10 to 15 years into the future the industrial use will grow into other elements that come out of steel uses, such as a steel crusher. This use relies on semi-tractor trailer delivery, which will create a lot of traffic on Germann Road. CMC Steel feels the proposed transportation element is an improvement but there will still be conflicts that arise.

There were no further public comments. Chairman Trapp-Jackson closed the Public Hearing at 7:57 p.m.

#### COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Sossaman asked staff about the timing of the approved road configuration and the zoning request, and the possibility of making changes or improvements to the road and/or park configuration once action is taken. Mr. Balmer responded that although it is recognized that the Town owns the park property and has done extensive work on the concept, staff also recognizes the ideal park configuration is not linear, and the exact alignments of the park and road can be modified. He stated the General Plan Amendment will be done to show the road configuration; an amendment to the park could also be done at this time. Mr. Balmer pointed out this is still a topic of discussion. Staff's challenge is to identify a way to work with the existing system, make the road connection with the least amount of adverse impact to the park, and also be able to improve on issues which were raised during the review process, such as access to the park.

Director Condit added one of the things Commissioner Sossaman addressed is if the road realignment follows that shown by the dots on the exhibit, would the Town be able to make a future park site work should this remain an alignment. The answer is "yes". Even if some development occurred in a residential area and the road alignment was fixed in this location, there would still be room in this corner to do a reconfigured park site.

Commissioner Sossaman asked Mr. Balmer for clarification that the 21-acre and 18-acre parcels would revert to Employment Type B if no changes are made. Mr. Balmer responded the underlying zoning is Industrial. The two parcels would retain Employment Type B until a new plan is submitted. He stated it is likely that these areas would be revisited at a future date.

Commissioner Sossaman stated he likes the road alternative because it accommodates the Town with no change to the park. He does not favor leaving Employment Type B gaps in the plan, and favors the applicant's designation of what these areas will be. Commissioner Sossaman stated he understands the Town is concerned with more housing in this area, but the alternative limits density no matter what is put here. In addition, the Mixed Use designation could allow the potential for higher density housing, since 4.5 du/ac could be exceeded in the MU areas.

Mr. Balmer explained staff's motive behind recommending MU in this particular location: there are industrial uses north of this MU area and in Mesa. The subject property backs up to future Employment and the Town's service yard; therefore, staff is concerned that this is not a good location for single family homes and feels it may be a better location for condos/apartments, given it is near employment, the park and other services in the area. However, staff does not know what the exact use will be until the applicant brings it forward. Mr. Balmer acknowledged the property west and north of the planned area is unplanned. More commercial/office in this area would help balance the revenue issue to Town. The MU area may change because it's nearer park and residential areas, but there's not enough information

for this yet.

Commissioner Perry stated he agrees MU projects are very slow moving. This is a very unique situation given the applicant owns the entire square mile surrounding a huge transportation issue, with the potential for a reconfigured park even though it's currently not on the table. He feels if the park were reconfigured, there would be potential for a synergy of four corners of MU. A smaller amount than what is currently proposed makes sense to him. Commissioner Perry stated he feels the Commission should send this request forward as the applicant has requested with stipulations to address the AOA areas. The transitions between uses can always be handled, but with the open space unknowns, a General Plan Amendment could change those areas. He stated the road realignment and park became big issues and this allows it to move forward either way. He suggested the GPA be processed with the next phase and the Mixed Use issue could be revisited with the potential for four corners or on either section of the two major arterials. He suggested this be sent forward with 4.5 max density, and MU on the corner.

Commissioner Atkinson stated he does not like putting stipulations on the remainder of the square mile. Commissioner Perry stated the recommendation should include the four stipulations outlined in the April 14 letter from Pew and Lake.

**Motion:**                    **Commissioner Perry**

**To approve GP09-058, "Barney Farms Major General Plan Amendment", according to the applicant's requested submittal for Employment Type-A, Commercial on the corner and MHDR-A on the balance of the property, with a maximum density of 4.5 dwelling units/acre, to include the four stipulations proposed by applicant in its April 14 letter to Town staff.**

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

**Vote:                         All ayes. Motion carried 5-0. (Moore, Ingram absent).**

Commissioner Sossaman stated the staff and applicant presentations were great, and he hopes Town Council gets a feel for where the Planning & Zoning Commission is on all the issues. He further stated he sympathizes with staff's position related to Town property, the economic future, and all the components related to this project. He feels this is too important to just let go without moving forward.

Mr. Balmer thanked the Commission, and reminded them this Public Hearing will be conducted during the Town council meeting on April 21, 2010 at 7 pm.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

All administrative items were discussed during Work Study.

7. **Review** of next month's agenda items



8. **Report** on Town Council Action
9. **Communication** from members of the Commission and Staff
10. **Adjournment**

**Motion:**        Commissioner Atkinson  
**To adjourn.**  
**2<sup>nd</sup>:**            Commissioner Perry  
**Vote:**         **All ayes. Motion carried**

The meeting adjourned at 8:13 p.m.

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Kathy-Trapp Jackson, Chairman

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Laura Moats, Community Development Assistant

\*\*\*\*\*

I, Laura Moats, do hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the foregoing Minutes are a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the April 14, 2010 Regular Session Meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and that a quorum was present.

Dated this 15th day of April, 2010.  
Passed and Approved this 12<sup>th</sup> day of May , 2010.