

Planning and Zoning Commission Actions
Regular Meeting
December 13,
2021

Call to Order	Meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm by Chair Huggins
Invocation	Commissioner Irving
Pledge of Allegiance	Commissioner Sharpe
Roll Call	Present: Yocum (Phone in) / Sharpe/ Huggins /Irving / Frank Excused: Leffall / Robertson
Call to thePublic	No one spoke at the call to public
Minutes	No minutes to approve.
Agenda Item 5.1:	<p align="center">5.1</p> <p>DISCUSSION & ACTION Planning & Zoning Manager, Rick Williams presented. Yocum: Looks like a great building and appreciate the security features. No comments from the other Commissioners. Irving motioned to approve. Sharpe seconded. Passed unanimously.</p>
Agenda Item 5.2:	<p align="center">5.2</p> <p>PUBLIC HEARING / DISCUSSION & ACTION Director of Development Services, Rudy Lopez presented. 3 letters from the public were dropped off for the record. Applicant, Ben Taylor of 1746 N. Williams St. Denver CO. presented explanations to issues from previous Planning & Zoning meeting. Public Hearing opened at 6:25 pm. Speaker (1) Mike K. 197491 N. MacNeil Ct. Maricopa. Spoke against the re-zoning. Received a letter stating 30 acres and the presentation stated 15. There is a disconnect. Not in favor of the upcoming project. This project was denied last month and hoping the board members will again vote the same way. Speaker (2) Cindi Olvey 19263 N. Cinder Maricopa. Read a letter she wrote and submitted for the record. Also, not in favor of the project. Closed the Public Hearing at 6:31 pm. Yocum: Two comments housing diversity according to the general plan is being met. Last time there was no mixed use. Now with the 2 acres that issue was addressed. Sharpe: Cognoscente of the residents of the feelings. Last time we were trying to shoehorn high density into a multi-use criteria. Now they have designated it correctly and our hands are somewhat tied as property rights are property right. Irving: I voted against this last time. You have met my concerns. One concern was quality of life. You mention outdoor lawn games, eating areas, dog parks, ball park, dog run, parks, this will truly meet a mixed use. You really stressed the issue of green spaces. These are not low income these are affordable and there is a difference. This had my support. Frank: Can we see the site plan, point of clarification the additional acreage there is no commitment to build that? Rodolfo Lopez explained that being presented tonight is just the multi-family aspect. Frank: This meets the letter of the law. So, it's mixed-use. Is this area dedicated to commercial? Commissioners clarified that this has to be commercial and the multi-family is taken. Frank asked about the multi-family and commercial general plan update presentation that Rudy showed, can we review it again? Rodolfo showed the housing study about three years ago shows the plan is 25%, to date we have only met 9% of that. Irving: The first apartments were sold out immediately. Sharpe: We needed these apartments years ago, we have to be judicious and set the criteria and standards as they come in. Huggins: Can we see the slide with the site plan? This is the overall plan and we can see the designation and mixed use coming up. We can not control 347 there are plans and we were working on the East / West Corridor. Things are being done. Vice Chair Sharpe motioned to approve. Irving seconded. Passed unanimously.</p>

<p>Agenda Item 5-3:</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">5-3</p> <p>DISCUSSION & ACTION</p> <p>Director of Development Services, Rudy Lopez presented. Applicant, Ben Taylor of 1746 N. Williams St. Denver, CO. presented.</p> <p>Yocum: This is in line with the general plan. Parking is adequate. The efforts the developer made regarding bike paths and dog runs etc. are great. Open spaces are appreciated and they have met are requirements.</p> <p>Frank: No comments.</p> <p>Irving: Why do require 120 sf when no one else does? Then we don't have to have the developers keep asking for waivers.</p> <p>Rodolfo clarified it is to code, we need to start investigating other standard practices.</p> <p>Irving: It implies that we are giving the developer what ever they want. Glad they reduced the parking within a reasonable amount, applaud them for coming close. Maybe need to justify the 20% waiver in the future.</p> <p>Sharpe: Parking was previously discussed can you elaborate what they did to reach that incentive. Lopez clarified that in 2016 we allowed if the developer to reach a sustainable incentive program. If a certain amount of incentives is met then the developer would qualify for 20% parking reduction. Sharpe asked what did this developer do to qualify? Lopez stated solar, garbage enclosure and a few other items. They met 10 of our criteria.</p> <p>Sharpe asked if this is a gated community? Applicant Ben, answered yes; for security for the residents. The frontage along Honeyctt & Continental will have a 3' viewing fence.</p> <p>Huggins: What type of accessibly do the residents have to the commercial area?</p> <p>Applicant stated they have to comply fully with ADA requirements there are sidewalks and access from a wheelchair to amenity onsite. All 5% of the required ADA units are on the first floor.</p> <p>Huggins asked is there connectivity to the commercial property, they do not want to go around. Is there a planned gate?</p> <p>Applicant clarified without knowing what the future development is we do not have plans for a gate. Huggins asked the attorney if we can make a requirement or stipulation for future, no we cannot. Is there solar lighting for the common areas? Or in between building? Applicant said it is all master metered other than the solar for parking. Huggins asked in a case of power failure? Applicant stated there will be emergency lighting and it will be along the sidewalks and wall packs. How do residents get out in an emergency? Applicant stated there is emergency lighting. Attorney stated there is nothing written in the code, they have met the current code requirements. Rodolfo Lopez clarified we can look into adding it to our code and look into it.</p> <p>Huggins: This needs to be added to our multi-family design guidelines.</p> <p>Commissioner Irving motioned to approve. Commissioner Frank seconded. Passed unanimously.</p>
<p>Agenda Item 5-4:</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">5-4</p> <p>PUBLIC HEARING / DISCUSSION & ACTION</p> <p>Senior Planner, Byron Easton with the City of Maricopa presented. Applicant, Kurt Jones of 2525 E Camelback Rd. Phoenix, AZ. presented. Public Hearing opened at 7:18 pm. Closed public hearing at 7:18pm.</p> <p>Yocum: Impressed with this presentation package. Open space plan is outstanding. Mixed-use aspect is complied with potential to high density a commercial. Flood zone has been addressed. Access and street design are discussed.</p> <p>Sharpe: In regards to the Central park plan, is there an east west connectivity in the Northern half? Kurt addressed and replied that there is a sidewalk and access to the paseo. Sharpe added wasn't sure on the scale it looked like 20 acres for a pedestrian to walk without coming all the way down to the collector. On the project plan everything is running North South just asking about walking thru to get to East West. Todd S. with Lennar of 1665 W Alameda Dr. answered questions regarding walking paths and pedestrian connectivity. There will be landscape tracks and people are able to travers. We want them to cross as few main streets as possible. They will connect east and west thru the neighborhood. Landscaped walking paths. Sharpe asked once it's developed they will connect and have access to tot lots ect.</p> <p>Byron added when it comes back for preliminary plat stage we will see this and we can see that those East West connections will be on there. Sharpe: Will these be platted individually or all together.</p> <p>Byron clarified that the applicant said it will be separate.</p> <p>Irving: Anderson is keeping the original farm there? Applicant stated yes, the original farm is staying there.</p> <p>Frank: Surprised there is not a commercial component on Murphy seems like a Circle K would miss out on a huge opportunity with the High School being there. Todd says they have taken advice from the City Manager on which corner would be best for commercial. Frank: Also wondering about the flood zone. Todd says they are working on elevating the property up and getting a CLOMR to get it out of the flood zone. Frank: Where will it go? Todd stated it will circulate the southern boundary along Ferrall. Currently working with the City Engineer, if not it would traverse around the project where the historical outfall is.</p>

	<p>Huggins: I know you doing straight roads, high schoolers like to drive fast. Todd only of the street is long, we are making them short. Huggins: Pushing for one side of the street to have no parking, parking is always a issue for emergency vehicles. Commended the developer on a great design concept and keeping the original agrarian theme. Commissioner Irving motioned to approve. Commissioner Sharpe seconded. Passed unanimously.</p>
Agenda Item 5.5:	<p>5.5 DISCUSSION ONLY Director of Development Services, Rudy Lopez discussed proposal for a future text amendment. Sharpe: Deleted notations regarding signage, is this just to move it to staff approval? Rodolfo correct this was left over verbiage that did not get deleted after we updated last time. Huggins: If a packet is submitted and we approve the whole package, the City cannot go back and change it? Rodolfo signage would not be included in the packet. That is something that staff handles internally. Sharpe: Appreciates staff trying to clean up the multi-family design guidelines. Would like to see refinement on medium density requirements, can we streamline these? RM is being utilized for single family for rent products. We have multiple zoning districts example RS2-RS5 very repetitive. Can we combine them? Rodolfo agreed. Yocum: Agrees with the changes and discussion. Frank: No comments Irving: No Comments Huggins: Outdoor storage and screening wall should be consistent, should be 8’.</p>
Agenda Item 5.6:	<p>5.6 DISCUSSION & ACTION Senior Planner, Byron Easton with the City of Maricopa presented. Yocum: No comments Commissioners concerned by lack of public comments. Would like to give the public and stake holders more time to comment. Commissioners would like to publish it in Maricopa, utilize social media other outlets etc. Commissioner Irving opposed to allowing more time. Vice Chair Sharpe motioned to table item. Commissioner Frank seconded. Commissioner Irving opposed. Motion to table passed 4 to 1.</p>
Agenda Item 6.0 Update from Staff	<p>6.0 Rudy Lopez announced no meeting for the rest of 2021. The next meeting will be January 10th 2022.</p>
Agenda Item 7.0: <u>Executive Session</u>	<p>There was no executive session.</p>
Agenda Item 8.0: <u>Adjournment</u>	<p>Irving motioned to adjourn. Sharpe seconded. All approved Meeting adjourned at 8:09 pm.</p>

I hereby certify to the best of my knowledge, that the foregoing Actions are a true and correct copy of the Actions of the regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission held on the 13th day of December 2021. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

Dated this 14th day of December, 2021