



**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE WORK STUDY MEETING OF THE QUEEN CREEK
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

Wednesday, July 13, 2011 6:00 P.M.

Council Chambers, 22350 S. Ellsworth Road, Queen Creek, AZ 85142

1. **CALL TO ORDER** The meeting was called to order at 6:15 p.m. in the Council Chambers by Acting Chairman Reyes.

2. **ROLL CALL**

Present

Commissioner Alex Matheson
Commissioner Ryan Nichols
Commissioner Debbie Reyes
Commissioner Robinson

Absent

Chairman Steve Sossaman
Vice-Chairman Steve Ingram
Commissioner Gad

Staff Present

Community Dev. Manager Wayne Balmer
Senior Planner Dave Williams
Community Development Assistant Laura Moats

Absent

Director of Development Svcs. Tom Condit

3. **Discussion on DR11-031, “Highland Homes at Crismon Heights”**, A request by Kendall Baxley of KB Drafting and Design for Design Review approval of two additional floor plans with three elevations each in the Crismon Heights Subdivision, located at the northeast corner of Crismon and Ocotillo roads.

Senior Planner Dave Williams presented the staff report for two additional floor plans, which are 2,422 and 2,960 square feet in size, which meets the criteria for the 40 per cent garage face in comparison to the front elevation of the house, and the setback requirements of five-feet recessed from the livable area. Staff supports the proposed architecture. Mr. Williams stated these floor plans will be built on R1-9 and R1-12 lots designed to fit into 12 remaining lots in Phase I, as well as being built on lots in Phase II. The architecture is complementary to what has already been approved, and the range of square footage falls into the same range of the previously approved floor plans.

Commissioner Matheson asked what an ‘orphan’ lot is. Mr. Williams responded it is a residual lot that is remaining because it was not purchased due either to its irregular shape or size.

Commissioner Nichols asked about windows on the garage doors. Mr. Williams responded this is not a code requirement, but the Town has embraced it. Specifically, Plan 2242, Elevation C includes a carriage door, which would not normally require windows; however, Mr. Williams stated staff could add a stipulation to put windows on the carriage style garage door if the Commission would like. Commissioner Nichols asked if staff requires something other than a plain garage door. Mr. Williams responded the code requires three distinctive garage doors, which this applicant has provided.

4. **Discussion DR11-042, “Standard Pacific Homes at Charleston Estates”**, A request by Sue Mozer of Standard Pacific Homes for approval of one additional floor plan with three elevations to be constructed in the Charleston Estates subdivision, located at the northwest corner of Signal Butte and Ocotillo roads.

Mr. Williams presented the staff report, stating there were several floor plans approved within the last two months. This is an additional plan to add to that mix. This proposal meets architectural requirements. Mr. Williams noted the Commission may want to add the garage window stipulation to this floor plan as well. The square footage is approximately 3,200 square feet, which falls into the range of the already approved homes. It meets the garage width requirements as well as the five-foot garage setback requirement. Staff is supporting this request.

Commissioner Robinson asked if the previously approved floor plans have windows in the garage doors. The applicant responded they do not; however, they are offered as an option.

Commissioner Matheson asked for clarification on the code requirements regarding garage doors. Mr. Williams responded the code states the elevations must have three distinct garage doors to provide variation; however it does not require windows on the garage doors.

5. **Discussion on RZ10-102, “Charleston Estates”**, A request by Carol Grumley of Standard Pacific Homes to amend the existing PAD to change the existing R1-12 zoning to R1-7 zoning with an overall increase of approximately 44 residential lots. The property is located at the northwest corner of Ocotillo and Signal Butte roads.

Mr. Williams presented the staff report, stating this application is on the northern half of the Charleston Estates subdivision. Of this portion, it is for the interior lots, not including exterior lots north of Quintero Road. The applicant is requesting the R1-12 zoning district be deleted and replaced with R1-7 zoning. The 90-foot wide lots would be reduced to 65-feet in width. The infrastructure (roadway, sewer, etc) will not be impacted. The proposal increases the number of lots by 44 lots. Staff supports this request since they are retaining the larger lots on the exterior portion to act as a buffer zone to the neighboring County subdivision on the north. Since there is an increase in the number of residential units, an increase to the number of play stations was required. The applicant has eliminated some lots and in their place, has created a park located south of Camacho Road, which is a pocket park with creative elements not typically seen in residential subdivisions in that these parks provide amenities for both children

and adults. Staff is supporting the rezoning request and the modified preliminary plat for the increase in lots.

Community Development Manager Balmer noted a letter received by Ralph Pew, the applicant's representative, stating "the applicant has reviewed the Planning and Zoning Commission Staff Report and is in agreement with all the proposed conditions of approval".

Mr. Balmer brought Commission's attention to *Condition of Approval #5, "The developer shall be responsible to pay the current review fees associated with taking Phase 2 out of lot sale prohibition. The review fees for Phase 2 shall be paid at the time the new subdivision plans are submitted. Phase 2 shall be taken out of lot sale prohibition prior to recordation of the Replat"*.

Engineer Marc Palichuk explained this condition, stating the Town records a document that prohibits the developer from the sale of any lot within the subdivision, which is done when the developer wishes to release their construction assurance on the property due to it being inactive. When the developer re-activates the subdivision, the Town takes it out of lot sale prohibition, which includes a \$400 processing fee. The developer then posts a construction assurance replacing the lot sale prohibition. The construction assurance would be noted on the final re-plat of the property.

Commissioner Reyes asked if there is a limit to the amount of time a subdivision can be dormant, to which Mr. Palichuk responded there is no limit. Mr. Balmer added if Town standards have changed during the time the subdivision has been dormant, then the developer would need to meet the new standards.

Commissioner Nichols asked if there are any physical improvements in the ground. Mr. Williams responded, "No". There is only rough grading on the property. Commissioner Nichols noted with the re-plat for the additional 44 lots, there will be additional water and sewer services, different fire hydrant requirements, utility, electric and J-Box requirements. He asked if these were addressed. Mr. Palichuk responded updated wastewater and drainage reports have been received and reviewed by Town staff. Commissioner Nichols asked if the updated drainage report indicates increased run-off. Mr. Palichuk noted the report notes the increased run-off from increased rooftops and driveways. Commissioner Nichols asked if this additional runoff would be retained in the new pocket park, or in existing basins. Mr. Palichuk responded it is very minor, with most of the runoff going to existing basins and mostly in the center retention basin. Commissioner Nichols asked if this was already oversized to accommodate the additional runoff, to which Mr. Palichuk responded, "Yes".

Commissioner Nichols stated the originally-approved PAD included a requirement that the site contain a minimum of 30 per cent of R1-12 lots. He asked if staff was aware why this requirement was placed in the original PAD. Mr. Williams responded at that time Staff looked at balance-of-densities, requiring several different zoning districts. Since that time, the Town has gotten away from that philosophy and is now looking at the overall density of the entire project. This is why it was specifically called out in the original PAD, and is why this is a PAD amendment. Staff has no objection to this request because varying zoning districts still exist in

this request, and this subdivision meets that intent. Commissioner Nichols stated the existing General Plan category lists this area as 2-3 dwelling units/acre, and the overall, entire Charleston Estates subdivision falls into that requirement; however, if he calculates the density of this specific area, it results in 3.42 dwelling units/acre, which is quite a bit higher than the 2-3 du/acre category. He is very concerned about this because if Charleston Estates was to go through platting separately for the multiple parcels, 3.42 dwelling units would have to go through a major General Plan Amendment; however, because it is part of a larger development, he feels it is sneaking through and averaging the density across the entire subdivision. He compared this to the existing R1-7 density and noted it was about 3.12 du/acre. He feels this is still about ten percent higher density than the existing R1-7. Mr. Williams responded when staff looks at density, it looks at the entire project. In different zoning districts, there will be peak densities and lower densities. He used Nauvoo Station as an example, noting the peak density in some of the individual parcels may be close to 5 du/acre, whereas when looking at the entire subdivision, the density is still under 2-3 du/acre and meets the intent. He noted another reason for looking at the entire project when calculating densities is to incorporate the Open Space, which balances out the densities. Commissioner Nichols stated his understanding of this, however he still feels this is a concern, even though he is not completely opposed. Mr. Williams noted the additional 44 lots increased the overall density on the 160 acres from 2.1 du/acre to 2.46 du/acre, so this still meets the requirements. He also commented that as staff started the review on this project, the original pre-app design contained significantly more lots. The final application is approximately 16-20 lots less than the original proposal. Commissioner Nichols asked if there are any current lot owners or homeowners adjacent to these lots. Mr. Williams responded, "No", stating the models have not yet been built. He stated the walls are up, and some grading has been done. There will be more activity once the weather is cooler. Mr. Balmer noted the adjacent residents are located to the north, therefore, that is one of the reasons the applicant was asked not to change the lot sizes in that area.

Commissioner Nichols asked if the proposed lot setbacks for the current R1-7 zoning are consistent with the already approved R1-7 zoning. Mr. Williams responded, "Yes".

Commissioner Matheson asked how many dwelling units per acre are in the buffer zone. Mr. Williams responded the buffer zone is zoned R1-15. This depends on the open space; however, these lots are at the lower end of 2 du/acre.

Commissioner Reyes asked if this request is for Phase I. Mr. Williams responded Phase I goes from the park south. Phase II is the north section. Commissioner Reyes asked what the zoning is for the lots in Phase I. Mr. Williams responded they are oversized R1-7 and R1-9 lots.

There were no further questions from the Commission.

- 6. Discussion on CU11-032/SP11-033, "Sprint Collocation"**, A request by Danielle Wachter of Wireless Resources, on behalf of Hadrian Synergy and Sprint for modification of Conditional Use Permit SU01-96 to remove Condition of Approval #3 limiting the maximum number of cellular and microwave antennas for the cell tower located at 18433 E. Rittenhouse Road, zoned I-1.

Mr. Williams presented the staff report, stating the original Special Use Permit for this cell tower was approved in 1996. At that time, the Town had placed a maximum on the number of antennas allowed on one pole. With technology changing, it is preferable to collocate multiple providers on the same pole. In order for the applicant to do this, Condition of Approval #3 (SU01-96) must be removed. This will enable the applicant to expand service. Staff has no objection to this application.

In response to a question by Commissioner Reyes, Mr. Williams stated other towers being approved do not have a limit as to the number of antennas that are allowed. Once the tower has been erected, there is no additional impact by locating additional antennas.

- 7. Discussion on RZ11-030/SP11-015, "Rock Point Church"**, A request by Craig Goldstone of Todd and Associates on behalf of Rock Point Church to amend the existing Planned Area Development (PAD) terminating their existing PAD approval in accordance with the Town's Zoning Ordinance requirements and approving new PAD requirements and a modified Site Plan for a 24,000 square foot church on approximately 5.4 acres, located near the southeast corner of Power and Cloud roads.

Mr. Williams presented the staff report, stating this applicant received approval two years ago for a large church, encompassing the entire 33-acre site, with 6-7 buildings in addition to a 60-foot tall tower. The new application is a modification from the approved PAD. Mr. Williams stated staff's point of view is to let the existing PAD expire because the current proposal does not include any of the items previously approved under the PAD. The applicant's new proposal is for a 24,000 square foot church on 5.4 acres at the southwest corner of Power and Ivy Lane, with 253 parking spaces to serve current needs, and the possibility for expansion in the future. Staff is suggesting approval of the Site Plan, and as far as the rezoning portion, let the PAD expire on December 2, 2011.

Mr. Williams stated the proposed church is L-shaped and meets Town's architectural requirements. There will be parking in front of the church, a fire lane and overflow parking on decomposed granite, which staff supports. Mr. Williams stated there will be offsets negotiated with the Town Council in the form of a Development Agreement which will reduce the timing of the off-site improvements concerning drainage, roadway improvements and landscaping, since there is an ongoing drainage study taking place. The Development Agreement is on the Town Council's July 20 agenda.

Mr. Balmer pointed out Condition of Approval #12 regarding the Development Agreement. Engineer Marc Palichuk stated the Development Agreement will not limit any of the off-site improvements. All of the off-site improvements and the drainage channel will be completed. It is just a matter of working out the details with the applicant as to the timing of payment. Most likely the Town will ask for cash-in-lieu for all of the improvements.

Commissioner Robinson asked if Power Road in this location will be a four-lane road. Mr.

Palichuk responded this is a principal arterial; however, there are houses to the north which will preclude expansion to a six-lane road; therefore, it will most likely be a four-lane road.

Commissioner Nichols asked why there is a big difference between the 75 required parking spaces and the proposal for 253 spaces. Mr. Williams responded it is based on need; 75 spaces will not be enough. Mr. Williams pointed out that 88 of the 253 spaces being provided are overflow parking spaces for the future. The overflow parking spaces will be on unpaved decomposed granite. Commissioner Nichols asked if the Town's engineering guidelines specify any special treatment on the decomposed granite, or dust preventative. Mr. Williams responded that the staff engineer signed off on compacted decomposed granite only. Mr. Balmer added the fire lane will have an extra treatment on it to handle the heavy trucks.

Commissioner Robinson asked if there were two ingress/egress points. Mr. Williams responded, yes, there are access points on Power Road and on Ivy Lane, which is the extension of Victoria (County name). Commissioner Matheson asked if the church will be responsible for roadway improvements. Mr. Palichuk responded they will be responsible for installing the roadway to their entrance, and dedicating 40-feet of right-of-way for the entire length of the property.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS - all *Administrative Items* were deferred to the Regular Session.

8. **Review** of next month's agenda items.
9. **Report** on Town Council Action
10. **Summary of Current Events** from members of the Commission.
11. **Adjournment**

Motion by Commissioner Matheson, seconded by Commissioner Robinson, to adjourn. All ayes. Motion carried 4-0. The Work Study meeting adjourned at 7:03 p.m.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

Debbie Reyes, Acting 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 July 13, 2011 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 14th day of July, 2011

These are draft minutes, which have not yet been approved.

Passed and Approved this day of , 2011.

DRAFT