



City of Maricopa

Meeting Minutes - Draft Planning & Zoning Commission

Maricopa City Hall
39700 W. Civic Center
Plaza
Maricopa, AZ 85138
Ph: (520) 568-9098
Fx: (520) 568-9120
www.maricopa-az.gov

*Chair James Singleton
Commissioner Robert Brems
Commissioner Robert Klob
Commissioner William Robertson
Commissioner Maurice Thomas Jr.
Commissioner Ted Yocum*

Monday, October 27, 2025

6:00 PM

Council Chambers

1. **Call To Order**

Chair Singleton called the meeting to order at 6:03 PM. The invocation was given by Commissioner Yocum, and the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Klob.

2. **Roll Call**

Present 4 - Commissioner Robert Klob, Commissioner Ted Yocum, Commissioner William Robertson, and Chair James Singleton

Absent 2 - Commissioner Robert Brems, and Commissioner Maurice Thomas Jr.

3. **Call to the Public**

No members of the public approached the podium during the call to the public. No speaker cards were provided by the public.

4. **Minutes**

4.1 **[MIN 25-64](#)** The Commission shall approve minutes from the October 13, 2025 meeting.

The commissioners reviewed the minutes from the October 13, 2025, meeting. No questions or comments were raised. Commissioner Klob excused himself from the vote since he did not attend the meeting.

Motion to approve the minutes was made by Commissioner Yocum, seconded by Commissioner Robertson. The motion passed with Commissioner Klob abstaining.

5. **Public Hearings**

No members of the public approached the podium for public hearings.

6. **Consent Agenda**

No items were included on the consent agenda.

7. **Regular Agenda**

7.1 [DRP 24-12](#)

PLANNING COMMISSION UPDATE: Major Development Review Permit case # DRP24-12 Buffalo Wild Wings, a request Peter Vesecky on behalf of Vespro, for review of Site, Floor, Elevation, Landscape and Photometric Plans for a proposed restaurant building on approximately 1.47-acres of land within the City of Maricopa, generally located north of the northeast corner of W. Maricopa-Casa Grande Hwy., and N. Stonegate Rd. Discussion Only.

Derek Scheerer, Senior Planner, presented the Buffalo Wild Wings project, noting this was the second technical review. He explained that the applicant is proposing a 7,644 square foot restaurant with approximately 120 off-street parking spaces and two full access points along the southern private driveway. The development will not be phased.

Mr. Scheerer displayed the elevation plans showing all four sides of the building, explaining that the east elevation would be the front of the building, the north elevation faces the parking lot, the west elevation faces Stonegate Road, and the south elevation faces the private drive.

Mr. Scheerer noted that staff had worked with the applicant for almost a year on refining the site plan, particularly to accommodate the required parking. While the parking exceeds city requirements, a traffic impact letter from the applicant's traffic engineer determined this level of parking was necessary for the demand of this use. He explained the challenges in aligning driveways with the Circle K development to the south to avoid conflicts and ensure sufficient space for fuel truck deliveries.

Mr. Scheerer mentioned that staff still had outstanding comments on the elevations, particularly concerns about the west elevation that faces Stonegate Road, which is the only side facing a public right-of-way. The applicant is working to address these concerns to create a more front-facing appearance on that side.

Commissioner Klob expressed concern about the west elevation and noted that three-dimensional renderings would better convey the building's design than static two-dimensional drawings. He also pointed out a potential conflict area in the parking lot where 90-degree parking connects to angled parking in the northwest corner, suggesting this could lead to accidents. Commissioner Klob did compliment the applicant for placing the patio on the west side to shield patrons from the summer heat.

Mr. Scheerer agreed with Commissioner Klob's comments and confirmed that staff had noted the west elevation concerns in their comments to the applicant. Regarding the parking lot configuration, he explained the significant effort required to fit all parking spaces within the limited area, noting that neighboring properties could not provide shared parking, so this site needed to be self-sufficient.

Commissioner Yocum asked about the private road that would provide access to the site. Mr. Scheerer confirmed that the private road would be adapted to 36 feet in width.

Commissioner Robertson asked if there was an opportunity to improve the existing private road, which he referred to as "roller coaster road." Mr. Scheerer confirmed that as developments occur on the north side of this road, it would be widened and improved to handle increased traffic volumes, working with property owners and developers in the area.

Chair Singleton commented that he noticed an existing driveway cutout in the

northwest corner and asked if that could have been used for large delivery vehicles instead of having two access points on the south side. Mr. Scheerer explained that staff and the applicant had reviewed that option, but the property owners to the north were not interested in cross-traffic access. Additionally, there were drainage concerns and issues with a turn lane already installed in that area.

The presentation was heard.

7.2 [DRP25-18](#)

PLANNING COMMISSION UPDATE: Major Development Review Permit case # DRP25-18 Southbridge Marketplace North, a request by John Barclay of Upward Architects, for review of Site, Landscape, Elevation, and Utility Plans for a proposed multi-building commercial development on an approximately 5.78-acres of land, within the City of Maricopa, generally located at the northeast corner of W. Honeycutt Ave. and N. John Wayne Pkwy. DISCUSSION ONLY

Derek Scheerer, Senior Planner, presented the Southbridge Marketplace North project, explaining this was Phase 2 of the Southbridge Marketplace that includes Shops B, Pad A, and Pad B. He noted that the overall site is 8.48 acres, but this application covers approximately 5.78 acres for the western portion of the development.

Mr. Scheerer explained that the project includes a 10,000 square foot multi-tenant commercial building (Shops B), a 6,500 square foot multi-tenant commercial building with a restaurant component (Pad A), and a 3,200 square foot building with a restaurant (Pad B). He displayed the site plan highlighting these buildings and explained that the previous phase (Phase 1) with Aldi, Shops A, Pad C, and Pad D had already received DRP approvals and were under construction drawing review.

Mr. Scheerer showed the elevations for the buildings, noting they follow the same architectural theme approved for the previous phase to create a unified development. He explained that Shops B would be attached to the Aldi building, though they are being built separately with a fire-rated wall between them.

Commissioner Klob commented on the proportions of the north elevation design, noting that the columns and pediment seemed slightly off but overall thought the design worked. His main concern was about potential traffic congestion with the two drive-throughs converging in the same area. He compared it to developments in Chandler where multiple high-traffic drive-throughs (like Dutch Bros, Chick-fil-A, and In-N-Out) created significant traffic issues, particularly during lunch hours. He predicted this could become a "problem child" going forward.

Mr. Scheerer acknowledged these concerns, explaining that staff had worked with developers to push the drive-throughs to the west side to create as much stacking space as possible. He noted they had converted what was originally proposed as a full access intersection to right-in/right-out only with a large "pork chop" design to prevent left turns that would create conflicts. He explained their strategy to keep traffic internal to the site rather than backing up onto Honeycutt Avenue.

Commissioner Yocum expressed concern about the plain appearance of the elevations in the presentation materials, asking if they would be dressed up with signage and displays. Mr. Scheerer explained that the applicant was proposing a comprehensive sign plan to unify signage for the site, and that the colors in the renderings appeared washed out compared to the actual color and material boards, which showed deeper and richer colors.

Chair Singleton echoed Commissioner Klob's concerns about the drive-through at Pad

B, comparing it to the Taco Bell exit near Bashas' where trucks cannot make the tight turn, causing people to hop the curb and damage landscaping. He expressed concern that the exit might force most drivers to turn left instead of right due to the difficulty of the turn, potentially creating more traffic issues during busy periods.

The presentation was heard.

7.3 [TXT 25-01](#)

PUBLIC HEARING: TXT25-01 Text Amendment: A request by the City of Maricopa for review and approval of proposed miscellaneous text amendments to the Maricopa City Code, Section 17.20.050 Preliminary Plats, Section 17.20.060 Final Plats, Section 17.30.040 Recreation and Tot-Lot Design Requirements, Section 18.40 Commercial Districts, 18.75 Food Courts, 18.75.030 Mixed Use Heritage Development Standards, Section 18.80.110 Screening, Section 18.90 Landscape, Section 18.120.240 Group Homes, Section 18.120.260 Temporary Uses, Section 18.120.300 Food Court Mixed Use Heritage, Section 18.135.020 City Council, Section 18.135.030 Planning Commission, Section 18.35.050, Development Services Director, Section 35.060 Hearing Officer, Section 18.18.135.070 Zoning Administrator, Section 18.135.110 Review Authorities, Section 18.140.050 Neighborhood Meeting Notification, Section 18.140.060 Public Hearing Notification, and Section 18.205.020 List of Definitions. Discussion and Action

Rick Williams, Planning Manager, presented an extensive overview of the proposed text amendments required to update the code in accordance with the current Arizona Revised Statutes. The aim was to rectify non-functional elements and address scrivener's errors within the existing code. One major legislative requirement discussed was House Bill 2547, which mandates cities to prepare a housing impact study for specific applications. Mr. Williams included this study in the presentation materials for the Commission's reference, ensuring transparency and understanding of its impact.

Mr. Williams explained House Bill 2447 was another key provision, which effectively removes certain powers traditionally held by the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council concerning preliminary and final plats. He stated this legislative directive necessitates administrative approval rather than a public review process, thereby shifting responsibility and authority to the administrative personnel.

Mr. Williams approached the breakdown of these text amendments by categorizing them into several focal areas:

The first area discussed pertained to Recreation and Tot Lot Design Requirements, where requirements were moved from Section 17, which originally governed Subdivision Regulations, to Section 18. Mr. Williams informed the Commission that this change was aimed at broadening the applicability of these requirements, making them relevant to all forms of development, including multi-family residences and commercial areas featuring playground facilities.

In terms of the Mixed-Use Heritage Overlay, Mr. Williams indicated a notable change was the modification of parking requirements for pre-approved plans within the heritage district. Previously, these plans were designed without parking garages but mandated two covered parking spots, a requirement now under reconsideration.

Mr. Williams also highlighted changes regarding the screening category, which involved codifying existing guidelines mandating that downspouts and SES cabinets be integrated internally within buildings. This change aligns the town's regulations with modern design aesthetics and practices.

Mr. Williams included another significant amendment that involved Group Homes. The proposed text aimed to clarify existing rules regarding the separation requirements for group homes housing 7 to 10 residents. These changes intend to streamline and enhance the effectiveness of these regulations.

Regarding Temporary Uses, Mr. Williams emphasized a clarification in regulations insisting that seasonal sales pitches, such as those involving Christmas trees and fireworks, require a formal temporary use permit rather than just an administrative one. Furthermore, he mentioned the proposed increase in allowable signage to better accommodate these seasonal events.

As the presentation transitioned to the final focal point on Food Courts, Mr. Williams highlighted the addition of food courts as permissible land use within the Mixed-Use Heritage District. Drawing on models from similar establishments in other cities, these modifications were made in response to feedback from local property owners and directives from the city council to encourage economic diversity and opportunity.

During the session, Commissioner Robertson strongly contested the removal of the Planning and Zoning Commission from the plat approval process. He argued that this exclusion would result in diminished transparency and potentially erode public trust in governmental processes. His concerns hinged on whether House Bill 2447 explicitly mandated the complete exclusion of the Commission from this process.

Drawing upon legal expertise, Nick Cook, City Attorney, clarified that the state legislation necessitated cities to adopt ordinances whereby administrative staff would handle plan reviews and approvals without public hearings, effectively imposing an in-house process model.

Acknowledging these concerns, Mr. Williams conveyed the willingness of his department to explore alternative methods to improve notification processes ensuring sustained public engagement and transparency. He committed to investigating how other cities manage these notifications effectively.

Adding to the robust dialogue, Commissioner Klob emphasized the value of preserving a public component in these processes. He noted the importance of participation in refining project details, which can foster significant improvement.

The discussion also extensively touched upon the requirements associated with food courts. Chair Singleton raised the issue of requiring permanent power pedestals for each vendor stall, considering it a potentially prohibitive financial burden for proposed projects. Following this, Commissioner Klob suggested phased implementation strategies to support gradual growth in such projects.

In response to these suggestions, Mr. Williams assured the Commission of his intention to deliberate further with staff and examine potential adjustments to the proposed amendments, keeping the concerns raised during the discussion in mind.

Concluding the thorough discussion, Chair Singleton requested Mr. Williams to look into several aspects, including crafting effective notification processes for various stages of the development application cycle, reassessing parking requirements within the heritage district, identifying methods for maintaining public involvement throughout the plat review process, and reevaluating the power pedestal mandate for food courts.

Motion to approve TXT 25-01 was made by Commissioner Yocum, seconded by Commissioner Klob. The motion passed with the following vote:

Aye, 3 - Commissioner Klob, Commissioner Yocum, and Chair Singleton

Nay, 1 - Commissioner Robertson

8. Reports from Commission and/or Staff

Mr. Williams reported that there would be no meeting on November 10 as the deadline for notification had passed. The November 24 meeting (Thanksgiving week) was still tentative, depending on whether items were submitted within the next three weeks. He confirmed the December 8th meeting would proceed with regular zoning items and a legislative update from Rudy Lopez, Development Services Director. There will be no meeting on December 22nd due to its proximity to Christmas.

Mr. Williams noted a new planning commissioner would be sworn in the following week and would likely attend the December 8th meeting. He also mentioned that beginning in January, staff would start providing quarterly informational updates to the Commission, and the January meeting would include the Chair and Vice Chair elections.

Commissioner Robertson mentioned that earlier in the day, the Legistar agenda system had mistakenly displayed the Parks and Recreation Commission agenda instead of the Planning and Zoning Commission agenda.

9. Executive Session

No executive session was conducted.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:24 PM.

Motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Klob, seconded by Commissioner Yocum. The motion passed unanimously.