



City of Maricopa

Meeting Minutes - Final 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 13, 2025

6:00 PM

Council Chambers

1. **Call To Order**

Chair James Singleton called to order at 6:00 PM. The invocation was led by Commissioner Yocum, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance led by Chair Singleton.

2. **Roll Call**

Present 5 - Commissioner Robert Brems, Commissioner Maurice Thomas Jr., Commissioner Ted Yocum, Commissioner William Robertson, and Chair James Singleton

Absent 1 - Commissioner Robert Klob

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 25-63](#) The Commission shall approve minutes from the September 22, 2025 meeting.

The commissioners reviewed the minutes from the September 22, 2025, meeting. No questions or comments were raised.

Motion to approve the minutes was made by Commissioner Robertson, seconded by Commissioner Thomas. The motion passed unanimously.

5. **Regular Agenda**

5.1 [DRP25-21](#) PLANNING COMMISSION UPDATE: Major Development Review Permit case # DRP25-21, a request by Sergio Rivera of Vespro, for review of Narrative, Site Plan, Elevations, and Photometrics, for a proposed Pavilion and Storage Building on approximately 6.71-acres of land within Pinal County Parcel No. 512-42-7220, within in the City of Maricopa, generally located west of the southwest corner of W. Santi Road and N. White and Parker Road. DISCUSSION ONLY

LaRee Mason, Associate Planner, presented information on the Major Development Review Permit for Our Lady of Grace Catholic Church. She explained that the proposal included a 6,400 square foot open pavilion and a 1,560 square foot storage building,

both planned with solar panels on top.

Mrs. Mason noted that the pavilion would have a maximum height of 13.5 feet at the peak, and the plan included extending the 5-foot sidewalk for accessibility. She added that the storage building would have a maximum height of 14.5 feet and would also add another 5-foot sidewalk to increase the site's walkability.

Mrs. Mason explained that this proposal was part of phase 1 of the PAD (Planned Area Development) that was approved in 2011, continuing ancillary uses within phase 1 for church uses. The proposal was consistent with both the general plan and the PAD 11-01. She added that staff determined that the proposal complied with the city's development regulations, the PAD requirements, the proposed ancillary land uses, vehicular and pedestrian connectivity, as well as the parking and open space requirements.

Regarding public outreach, Mrs. Mason stated that the notification letter went out on September 25, with signposting completed the next day. The notice was placed on the website on September 29. She noted that no public comments or queries had been received.

Chair Singleton opened the floor for questions. No commissioners had significant questions or concerns about the item.

The presentation was heard.

5.2 MISC 25-24

Report to Planning and Zoning Commission - A report from planning Staff regarding City of Maricopa municipal code requirements for Secondary and Emergency Access compared to other city requirements in the region.

Rick Williams, Planning Manager, presented a report on the city's requirements for secondary and emergency access compared to other cities in the region. He explained that this presentation was prompted by a discussion during an August meeting regarding a preliminary plat for The Sanctuary development.

Mr. Williams began by reviewing the International Fire Code (IFC) requirements, which state that developments with 30 or more one or two-family dwellings must provide two separate and approved fire apparatus access roads. An exception exists if the 30 dwelling units on a single access road are equipped with automatic sprinklers.

Mr. Williams explained the "half the diagonal distance" requirement, using The Sanctuary development as an example. He explained that for this development, the diagonal distance across the property was 3,400 feet, with half being 1,750 feet. This measurement determined where a secondary access point needed to be placed relative to the primary access.

Mr. Williams detailed the requirements for temporary fire access roads, explaining that they must support the imposed loads of fire apparatus, with a 75,000-pound capacity; provide all-weather driving capabilities; have a minimum width of 20 feet; and be maintained by the developer.

Mr. Williams then compared Maricopa's requirements with those of Avondale, Peoria, Tempe, and Gilbert. He presented a chart showing that all five cities had identical requirements for the total number of units not sprinkled, which is 30, meeting the diagonal distance requirements, the 75,000-pound capacity requirement, the mountable curb requirement, the consideration of life safety versus convenience, and

the responsibility for maintenance by the developer or HOA. He identified the only difference was with the City of Peoria, which had an additional requirement in their traffic control management plan. For developments with 100 or more lots, Peoria required half-street improvements with 26-foot collector improvements. This meant that once a development reached 100 lots, developers would be required to build half of the collector road.

Chair Singleton asked if that was the only difference found between cities, and Mr. Williams confirmed it was. Commissioner Robertson sought clarification about temporary access roads being specifically for fire apparatus access and not for resident convenience, which Mr. Williams confirmed. Commissioner Robertson and Mr. Williams also discussed that a half-street collector road could serve as secondary fire access, but if it was designated as fire access only, it would not be for public use.

Chair Singleton inquired about potentially implementing a similar 100+ lot requirement in Maricopa. Mr. Williams explained this would require council approval and would likely be an update to the engineering design standards manual. He cautioned that there would be cost implications, potentially affecting housing prices in Maricopa, but acknowledged it would be a worthwhile discussion to have with city leadership.

The presentation was heard.

5.3 **MISC 25-25**

Report to Planning and Zoning Commission - A report from planning Staff regarding City of Maricopa municipal code requirements for Public Hearing/Neighborhood Meeting Sign Postings.

Mr. Williams presented a report on the city's requirements for public hearing and neighborhood meeting sign postings. He explained this was in response to a question from Commissioner Klob during an August meeting.

Mr. Williams reviewed the Municipal Code requirements, noting that neighborhood meetings are required for conditional use permits, variances, planned area developments, major PAD amendments, annexations, zoning map amendments, and general plan amendments. The same requirements apply for public hearing notifications.

For notification procedures, Mr. Williams explained that mailed notices must be sent to property owners within 600 feet at least 15 days prior to a neighborhood meeting. For public hearings, notices cannot be sent more than 90 days before the meeting, a change made from 45 days to 90 days about a year ago. Newspaper notices follow the same 15-90 day timeframe.

Regarding posted notices, Mr. Williams showed examples of different sign types. Large 4'x8' orange signs with QR codes are used for rezonings, annexations, general plan amendments, and development review permits. Smaller 24"x36" signs are used for conditional use permits, variances, temporary use permits, and maps of dedication.

Mr. Williams explained that the number and location of signs are determined by the zoning administrator or authorized designee on a case-by-case basis. He showed examples of sign placements for different developments, including Bowlin and Hartman Rezone with a corner placement, Apex Auto Club with multiple signs due to property size, Industrial Triangle with five strategically placed signs, and Terrible's Rezone with two signs due to visibility issues and obstructions.

Mr. Williams noted that for the Terrible's Rezone, two signs were placed instead of one

diagonal sign at the corner because utility boxes, traffic signals, and drainage scuppers would have required placing a single sign so far back that it would not have been visible.

Mr. Williams concluded by emphasizing that while there are specific requirements, each site is unique and may require different approaches, with the goal being to reach and inform as many people as possible.

Commissioner Yocum asked if a diagonally placed sign at a corner would typically satisfy the need for multiple signs, and Mr. Williams confirmed this was standard practice when site conditions allowed.

The presentation was heard.

6. Reports from Commission and/or Staff

Mr. Williams reported that the next meeting agenda was being prepared for distribution either the following day or Wednesday. The upcoming meeting would include a Development Review Permit (DRP), a rezone, and the 2025 text amendments.

Mr. Williams mentioned several ongoing projects including the non-residential design guidelines nearing completion, which would likely require two study sessions due to the document's size, and the general plan update with a first draft expected in November and study sessions likely in early 2026.

Mr. Williams also noted that Rudy Lopez, Development Services Director, would be providing a legislative update to the Commission in the near future.

Commissioner Robertson requested quarterly educational presentations on sections of the code that might be relevant to current or upcoming topics, similar to the presentations provided that evening. Mr. Williams responded positively, stating that staff was already planning to implement such educational sessions in 2026.

Chair Singleton expressed interest in exploring the possibility of implementing requirements similar to Peoria's 100+ lot requirement for half-street improvements, and Mr. Williams agreed to discuss this with the Development Services Director and City Engineer.

7. Executive Session

No executive session was conducted.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:40 PM.

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