

Planning and Zoning Commission Actions

Regular Meeting

May 9th, 2022

1.0 Call to Order	Meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm by Chair Huggins
Invocation	Commissioner Irving
Pledge of Allegiance	Commissioner Frank
2.0 Roll Call	Present: Yocum/Sharpe/ Huggins /Irving / Frank/Robertson Phone in: Sharpe / Leffall
3.0 Call to the Public	No one spoke at the call to public
4.0 Minutes	4.1
Agenda Item 4.1	MIN 22-21 Approval of Minutes from the March 28, 2022 Commission meeting. A motion was made by Commissioner Irving, seconded by Commissioner Frank, that these Minutes be Approved. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.
Agenda Item 5.1:	<p>5.1</p> <p>CUP 22-03 PUBLIC HEARING: A request by Tower Engineering Professionals (TEP) on behalf of DISH Wireless to co-locate a wireless telecommunication facility on an existing cell tower. The site is generally located approximately one mile north of the northeast corner of N. Murphy Rd. and W. Honeycutt Rd. and just northwest of the Volkswagen facility. This project is considered an Eligible Facility Request, and falls under Section 6409 of the Spectrum Act. Discussion and Action</p> <p>Assistant Planner, Alexander Bosworth presented. The Public Hearing opened at 6:09 pm. There were no public comments. The Public Hearing closed at 6:09 pm. Leffall asked why the Casa Grande Dispatch was chosen for notification. Huggins explained we have no local newspaper system. A motion was made by Commissioner Yocum, seconded by Commissioner Irving, to Approve. The motion carried by unanimous vote.</p>
Agenda Item 5.2:	<p>5.2</p> <p>DRP 22-07 A request by Don Leake of Shelter Asset Management, on behalf of property owner El Dorado 27, LLC, for review and approval of Site Plan, Landscape Plan, Photometric Plan, and Elevation Plan for a proposed 536-unit multi-family residential development. Generally located just north of the northeast corner of N. Porter Road and Maricopa-Casa Grande Hwy. Discussion and Action.</p> <p>Planner II, Derek Scheerer presented. There were 7 Speakers: All speakers spoke in opposition to the project. All expressed concerns regarding traffic, school zones, safety, and infrastructure issues along with quality of life.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Brittany Pisola 41160 W Summerset Dr. 2) Sue 41452 W. Lucera Lane 3) Henry 41736 W. Learmy Rd. 4) Roy Bowen 41848 W. Monteverde Ct. 5) April 42498 W. Monteverde Dr. 6) Jonie 41949 W. Arvada Lane 7) Sam 41867 W. Sussex Dr. <p>Applicant was present and presented to address some of the concerns. Discussion ensued. Sharpe expressed gratitude for the applicant addressing the EV parking. This is about progress the submissions don't always have the broader context. If a project meets all the requirements from zoning and design standards as a property owner they have rights that cannot just be denied. In this instance there is phasing options we can get a balance of commercial and residential that can be monitored. Leffall expressed that the design looks nice and likes the elevator. The location is a little congested but in the vicinity of the potential growth of future commercial. It is also close to the collage. This is catering to a population of youth that are going to school or traveling nurses. This checks all the boxes and has growth potential. Yocum mentioned the ingress and egress for the development has a round-a bout and emergency service. Applicant explained the residents</p>

	<p>can only exit on 2, emergency vehicle can use them as entrance and exit. The access to the commercial is in phase II. The fire department may require an access throughout the entire project duration. Irving stated there are 4 reasons on which the board can deny. The applicant has met all 4. Voting on the site plan meets the criteria. You as the applicant have met it. His issue is with the city and the current traffic. Strongly recommends the city to do a traffic study and from a safety concern the city should really look at this. Adding the buildings and more people will add more traffic. The report states it adequately meets the need, but based on what number? Frank agrees with Irving the idea of traffic being adequate is not true now or in the future. Frank asked about “alternative retention design” as mentioned is being used? The applicant explained it is going to percolate into the turf. Most multi-family goes under ground. It is pretty standard not really alternative. Frank also asked about the water harvesting beds, they were shown as small and close to the building, questioned logic of putting water ponding that close to the building as far a maintenance stand point. The applicant said they will consult with their landscaping architect and if it is an issue they will bring into compliance. The owners do not sell they keep and manage the facilities so this would be important to them. Frank also asked about the narrative stating they follow the Maricopa tree pallet and then in the site plan they do show different trees. Last parking the standard parking is 9x16 which is a little short for larger vehicles. The 2’ overhang onto the sidewalk is prohibited by the house bill that was passed last year. Suggestion is to detach the sidewalk a little bit. Robertson thanked the public for expressing their concerns. He also explained that the zoning has already passed the P&Z board and is in the hands of the city council and suggested the public to take their concerns to the city council meeting next week. Huggins stated that a stipulation is the building permits are within 2 years and is hoping to stick to that time frame. Really liked connecting to the outdoors and getting people outside. Likes the dog park, does not see the pet stations throughout the property. Would like to make a stipulation that each building has 2 pet stations.</p> <p>A motion was made by Commissioner Yocum, seconded by Commissioner Irving, to Approve. The motion carried by unanimous vote.</p>
Agenda Item 5.3:	<p>5.3</p> <p>SUB 21-38 A request by the EPS Group Inc, on behalf of Lennar Homes, for approval of the Anderson Farms Phase 2A subdivision preliminary plat. The property is generally located south of the southeast corner of Bowlin Road and Hartman Road. DISCUSSION AND ACTION</p> <p>Planning & Zoning Manager, Rick Williams presented. Discussion ensued. Robertson asked if the streets are going to be narrower in this subdivision and if that is regulating the stipulation of the no parking on one side. Rick answered that the streets still meet the standard 50’ width requirement. Huggins explained that it is in the code and is required moving forward and that was prior to Rick’s arrival.</p> <p>Huggins asked if the wording will be changed, and wants to clarify that HOA is required to pay the bill and not for the street light fixture maintenance.</p> <p>A motion was made by Commissioner Irving, seconded by Commissioner Frank, to Approve. The motion carried by unanimous vote</p>
Agenda Item 6.0 Update from Staff	<p>6.0</p> <p>Rick stated there are 4 items tracking for the next meeting on 05/23/22.</p> <p>Commissioner Frank asked about the quarterly meeting and if we have a date for that yet.</p>
Agenda Item 7.0: <u>Executive Session</u>	<p>There was no executive session.</p>
Agenda Item 8.0: <u>Adjournment</u>	<p>Commissioner Sharpe motioned to adjourn. Commissioner Frank seconded. 7:33 pm meeting adjourned.</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 9th day of May 2022. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.