

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CHANDLER, ARIZONA, June 15, 2011 held in the City Council Chambers, 88 E. Chicago Street.

1. Chairman Cason called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.
2. Pledge of Allegiance led by Commissioner Veitch.
3. The following Commissioners answered Roll Call:

Chairman Michael Cason  
Vice Chairman Leigh Rivers  
Commissioner Stephen Veitch  
Commissioner Matthew Pridemore  
Commissioner Andrew Baron  
Commissioner Katy Cunningham  
Commissioner Bill Donaldson

Also present:

Ms. Jodie Novak, Senior City Planner  
Mr. Bill Dermody, Senior City Planner  
Mr. Erik Swanson, City Planner  
Mr. Glenn Brockman, Assistant City Attorney  
Ms. Joyce Radatz, Clerk

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES  
**MOVED BY VICE CHAIRMAN RIVERS**, seconded by **COMMISSIONER PRIDEMORE** to approve the minutes of the June 1, 2011 Planning Commission Hearing. The motion passed 5-0 with two abstentions. (Commissioners Veitch and Donaldson were not present at the meeting.)
5. ACTION AGENDA ITEMS  
**CHAIRMAN CASON** informed the audience that prior to the meeting Commission and Staff met in a Study Session to discuss each of the items on the agenda and the consent agenda will be approved by a single vote. After Staff reads the consent agenda into the record, the audience will have the opportunity to pull any of the items for discussion. There were no items pulled for action.

A. DVR11-0010/PPT11-0002 AUTUMN PARK

**Approved to continue to the July 20, 2011 Planning Commission Hearing.**

Request Rezoning from Planned Area Development (PAD) to PAD amended, along with Preliminary Development Plan approval for a 99 lot, single-family residential subdivision located at the southwest corner of 116<sup>th</sup> Street and Riggs Road. **(REQUEST CONTINUANCE TO THE JULY 20, 2011 PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING.)**

B. DVR11-0014 CHANDLER CENTER COMMONS

**Approved.**

Request rezoning from Planned Area Development (PAD) to PAD Amended zoning with Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) approval to allow a day care use and to modify site layout within the Chandler Commerce Center at 5500-5590 W. Chandler Boulevard.

1. Substantial conformance with application materials kept on file in the City of Chandler Planning Division, in File No. DVR11-0014, except as modified by condition herein.
2. Compliance with original conditions adopted by the City Council as Ordinance No. 3770 in case DVR05-0030 SILAGI CHANDLER COMMERCE CENTER, except as modified by condition herein.
3. The playground perimeter wall shall utilize materials drawn from the adjacent building architecture and shall include several staggers per the submitted site plan so as to break up its linear appearance.
4. Landscaping in and adjacent to the playground area shall be maintained at a level consistent with or better than at the time of planting.
5. The playground surface shall be mostly covered with rubber mats, wood chips, artificial turf, or other materials that serve to soften the noise effect as compared to concrete or asphalt.
6. Trees shall be added along the western property line as practical to allow additional screening.

C. DVR11-0018 ARIZONA BLUE STAKE, INC.

**Approved.**

Request rezoning from Planned Area Development (PAD) for light industrial to PAD for light industrial and general office to allow a general office use on the property. The property is located at 2200 South Stearman Drive, north of Ryan Road and west of Gilbert Road within Chandler Airport Business Park.

1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with approved exhibits (Site Plan, Floor Plan, and Narrative) as represented in zoning case DVR11-0018 Arizona Blue Stake, Inc. kept on file in the City of Chandler Planning Division, except as modified by condition herein.
2. Compliance with original conditions adopted by the City Council as Ordinance No. 2996 in case PL99-019, except as modified by condition herein.

D. DVR11-0021 SOUTH OF SEC COOPER & OCOTILLO ROADS

**Approved.**

Request the establishment of initial City zoning of Agricultural District (AG-1) on an approximately 1.6-acre site located south of the southeast corner of Cooper and Ocotillo roads.

E. ZUP10-0047 MONAMI ASSISTED LIVING

**Approved.**

Request Use Permit approval to operate an assisted living home for the elderly, within a single-family residential home located at 2120 W. Shannon Street.

1. Expansion or modification beyond the approved exhibits (Site Plan, Floor Plan and Narrative) shall void the Use Permit and require new Use Permit application and approval.
2. The Use Permit is non-transferable to any other location.
3. The assisted living home shall have no more than seven (7) residents at any time.
4. The Use Permit to operate an assisted living home is specific to the existing property owner, and if the property should be sold in the future the Use Permit shall be null and void.
5. This Use Permit shall remain in effect for one (1) year from the effective date of City Council approval. Continuation of the Use Permit beyond the expiration date shall require reapplication to and approval by the City of Chandler.
6. The site shall be maintained in a clean and orderly manner.

**MOVED BY VICE CHAIRMAN RIVERS**, seconded by **COMMISSIONER BARON** to approve the Consent Agenda as read into the record by Staff. The Consent Agenda passed unanimously 7-0.

6. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Ms. Novak said there was nothing to report.

7. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

CHAIRMAN CASON announced that the next regular meeting July 6, 2011 at 5:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers at the Chandler City Hall, 88 East Chicago Street, Chandler, Arizona.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

---

Michael Cason, Chairman

---

Jeffrey A. Kurtz, Secretary

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CHANDLER, ARIZONA, July 6, 2011 held in the City Council Chambers, 88 E. Chicago Street.

1. Chairman Cason called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.
2. Pledge of Allegiance led by Chairman Cason.
3. The following Commissioners answered Roll Call:

Chairman Michael Cason  
Commissioner Stephen Veitch  
Commissioner Matthew Pridemore  
Commissioner Andrew Baron  
Commissioner Katy Cunningham  
Commissioner Bill Donaldson

Absent and Excused:

Vice Chairman Leigh Rivers

Also present:

Mr. Kevin Mayo, Planning Manager  
Mr. Erik Swanson, City Planner  
Ms. Joyce Radatz, Clerk

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES  
**MOVED BY COMMISSIONER PRIDEMORE**, seconded by **COMMISSIONER VEITCH** to approve the minutes of the June 15, 2011 Planning Commission Hearing. The motion passed 6-0 (Vice Chairman Rivers was absent).
5. ACTION AGENDA ITEMS  
**CHAIRMAN CASON** informed the audience that prior to the meeting Commission and Staff met in a Study Session to discuss each of the items on the agenda and the consent agenda will be approved by a single vote. After Staff reads the consent agenda into the record, the audience will have the opportunity to pull any of the items for discussion. Item B was pulled for action.

A. DVR11-0012 THE SPRINGS RETAIL CENTER PHASE II

**Approved (to extend).**

Request action on the existing Planned Area Development (PAD) zoning to extend the conditional schedule for development, remove, or determine compliance with the three-year schedule for development or to cause the property to revert to the former PAD zoning for office uses. The existing PAD zoning is for commercial uses. The property is located west of the southwest corner of Chandler Boulevard and Cooper Road.

Staff, upon finding consistency with the General Plan, recommends approval of extending the timing condition for case DVR11-0012 THE SPRINGS RETAIL CENTER PHASE II for an additional three (3) years, with all of the conditions in the original approval remaining in effect.

C. DVR11-0022 GALILEO PIAZZA

**Approved (to extend).**

Request action on the existing Planned Area Development (PAD) zoning to extend the conditional schedule for development, remove, or determine compliance with the three-year schedule for development or to cause the property to revert to the former Agricultural (AG-1) zoning district. The existing PAD zoning is for a single-family residential subdivision. The subject site is located at the southwest corner of Riggs Road and 116<sup>th</sup> Street.

Staff, upon finding consistency with the General Plan, recommends approval of extending the timing condition for case DVR11-0022 GALILEO PIAZZA for an additional three (3) years, with all of the conditions in the original approval remaining in effect.

D. PDP11-0005 RUDY'S RESTAURANT AND COUNTRY STORE

**Approved.**

Request Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) approval for a parking lot which would be developed in association with a planned restaurant and store. The property is located west of the northwest corner of 54<sup>th</sup> Street and Chandler Boulevard.

1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with exhibits represented including the Narrative, Site Plan, Landscape Plan, and Grading and Drainage Plan kept on file in the City of Chandler Planning Division, in File No. PDP11-0005, except as modified by condition herein.
2. Right-of-way dedications to achieve full half-widths, including turn lanes and deceleration lanes, per the standards of the Chandler Transportation Plan.
3. Undergrounding of all overhead electric (less than 69kv), communication, and television lines and any open irrigation ditches or canals located on the site or within adjacent right-of-ways and/or easements. Any 69kv or larger electric lines that must stay overhead shall be located in accordance with the City's adopted design and engineering standards. The aboveground utility poles, boxes, cabinets, or similar appurtenances shall be located outside of the ultimate right-of-way and within a specific utility easement.

4. Future median openings shall be located and designed in compliance with City adopted design standards (Technical Design Manual # 4).
5. Completion of the construction of all required off-site street improvements including but not limited to paving, landscaping, curb, gutter and sidewalks, median improvements and street lighting to achieve conformance with City codes, standard details, and design manuals.
6. The developer shall be required to install landscaping in the arterial street median(s) adjoining this project. In the event that the landscaping already exists within such median(s), the developer shall be required to upgrade such landscaping to meet current City standards.
7. Landscaping shall be in compliance with current Commercial Design Standards.
8. The landscaping shall be maintained at a level consistent with or better than at the time of planting.
9. The site shall be maintained in a clean and orderly manner.
10. The landscaping in all open-spaces and rights-of-way shall be maintained by the adjacent property owner or property owners' association.

E. ZUP10-0030 SHARNET'S CHILD CARE

**Approved.**

Request Use Permit extension approval to allow residential child care for up to ten children in a single-family home. The subject site is located at 4904 W. Buffalo Street, south of the southeast corner of Chandler Boulevard and Rural Road.

1. The residential childcare home shall have no more than ten (10) children at any time.
2. Should the applicant sell the property, this Use Permit to operate a childcare home shall be null and void.
3. This Use Permit shall remain in effect for three (3) years from the effective date of City Council approval. Continuation of the Use Permit beyond the expiration date shall require reapplication to an approval by the City of Chandler.

F. ZUP10-0054 CORNERSTONE CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP

**Approved to continue to the July 20, 2011 Planning Commission Hearing.**

Request Use Permit approval for the continued use of a temporary unpaved parking lot. The parking lot area is approximately 8.5 acres. The subject site is located east of the southeast corner of Alma School and Willis Roads. **(REQUEST CONTINUANCE TO THE JULY 20, 2011 PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING.)**

**MOVED BY COMMISSIONER VEITCH,** seconded by **COMMISSIONER CUNNINGHAM** to approve the Consent Agenda as read into the record by Staff. The Consent Agenda passed unanimously 6-0 (Vice Chairman Rivers was absent).

**ACTION:**

B. DVR11-0019 NORTON'S CROSSING

Request action on the existing Planned Area Development (PAD) zoning to extend the conditional schedule for development, remove, or determine compliance with the three-year schedule for development or to cause the property to revert to the former PAD zoning for commercial development. The existing PAD zoning is for office, retail, and multi-family development. The subject site is located at the northwest corner of Chandler Boulevard and Gilbert Road.

Staff, upon finding consistency with the General Plan, recommends approval of extending the timing condition for case DVR11-0019 NORTON'S CROSSING for an additional three (3) years, with all of the conditions in the original approval remaining in effect.

**ERIK SWANSON, CITY PLANNER**, stated this request is to take action on the existing PAD zoning to extend the conditional schedule for development, remove or determine compliance with the three-year schedule for development or to cause the property to revert to the former PAD zoning designation. The current PAD zoning designation is for a multi kind of mixed-use development that included multi-family residential, commercial and office development. The site is located at the northwest corner of Chandler Boulevard and Gilbert Road. It is roughly a 23.5 acre site. The current plan includes 8.3 acres of commercial development and 15.25 acres of multi-family development. Again, the current application is to extend the zoning for an additional three years from the original approval. The site was initially zoned in 1993 as part of the larger Dobson Place Master Planned Community. In 1995, the site was rezoned to PAD strictly for commercial uses eliminating the prior multi-family designation. With that development of Dobson Place subdivision the zoning was vested and then in 2008 the site was rezoned to allow for that office retail, multi-family development. During that process the original request actually triggered a legal protest as there were a number of residents opposed to that initial request for rezoning. A predominant number of those concerns were related to that multi-family. Some of the issues expressed were traffic, crime, etc. in the area. Ultimately, through a lot of neighborhood work through the applicant and their parties, a lot of the issues were resolved. As part of that Council approval, there were a number of letters in recommendation for support of the request. Ultimately, the request was approved by Council and as part of that request there is the typical 3-year timing condition which is where they are at today. As Kevin alluded to in the Study Session, Staff has currently reviewed a revised plan and that will be forthcoming in the month to come. Again, they are looking at whether or not the zoning is still consistent with the General Plan. Staff thinks that it is and with that they recommend approval.

**CHAIRMAN CASON** said when they have items like this that come before them where they are asking to continue what has already been approved there are no changes to the plan or anything else like that because they would actually have to submit for that if they were. In this

particular case it is just the exact thing that was negotiated and approved and worked through with the neighborhood three years ago. Correct? Mr. Swanson replied correct. **CHAIRMAN CASON** said this is pretty typical where the construction isn't done, where people do come back with their original plans and just try to extend them until the market is in a little better position to make an investment like this work. Right? Mr. Swanson said that is correct. Historically, they haven't had as many zoning extensions come through as even in the case of tonight where they have 3 or 4. So it is really one of those things that due to the market it is just natural that they are seeing those now so it is a matter of that. **CHAIRMAN CASON** asked if it would be fair to say in his opinion that if the market had not have collapsed, it is possible that this would have been built within the three year period? Mr. Swanson said that is a fair assessment. It probably wouldn't be complete with construction. Generally, from submittal or approval by Council to moving dirt, it takes somewhere between 12 and 18 months. It's quite possible that it could have been done or on the finishing legs of being wrapped up. **CHAIRMAN CASON** asked if he recalled some of the items that were part of the compromise between developers and the homeowners at that time? Mr. Swanson replied that if he can recall correctly, he believes there was some discussion about landscaping along the north and western portions of the site and increasing that. He also believes there was some discussion about the height of the multi-family structures and there were portions of it that were 3-story. All of those adjacent to the subdivision, which in this case were all of those homes and the apartment buildings, were somewhere along the lines of 75 to 100 foot separation. All of those were reduced to 2-story so he thought there were some things taken care of. There is also some discussion about covered parking canopies and making sure they were nice. A number of those things were worked out through Commission and Council. **CHAIRMAN CASON** said he knows the attorney/applicant would probably have better recollection. Wasn't there something where there was some retail pushed to the back and there was some agreement to change the property so that the noisiest factors would be moved closer to the street and away from the homes? Mr. Swanson replied that he couldn't directly recall that but he does recall regarding some of the layout of some of the homes or some of the apartment structures that were pulled away from the single-family properties a bit more to internalize them, which then again opened up more space between the single-family home property boundary and then also the multi-family. He said Kevin Mayo, Planning Manager, is thinking there were some changes in the commercial layout but again he doesn't recall those and he isn't seeing notes in the original Council memos.

**CHAIRMAN CASON** called up the applicant to speak.

**MIKE CURLEY, EARL, CURLEY & LAGARDE**, stated he was going to just add a couple of comments and maybe respond to the individuals who submitted the cards who he met with a couple weeks ago at the neighborhood meeting. Everything that Erik and Kevin said is basely accurate. He said Chairman Cason had a very good memory. They went through a number of changes on this plan as they worked through the neighborhood and some of the changes were exactly as he said. If you look at the site plan originally, they had carriage units along the north property line and the west property line. The carriage units are 2-story structures where you have a garage and there are maybe seven or eight garages and two living units above it. They had the carriage units along the north property line in several locations. Along the west property line some neighbors didn't want them, other neighbors wanted them. He has done a lot of multi-

family where some people think they provide a good buffer so in these two instances they put them over here (he showed on the screen). As Erik said these are all 2-stories as a result of discussions. The nearest 3-story was almost 200 feet away from the property line. They got into detailed discussions regarding the landscaping. There were certainly some discussions about adorning some of the parking structure. The case did come before Council with Staff Report, Planning and Zoning Commission support and the Economic Development department also supported it. He thinks there were about 50 petitions from the immediate neighbors who support the case. That is a general overview. If they want him to talk about some specifics, he will be glad to but he said maybe he will just respond to whatever the individual has to say.

**CHAIRMAN CASON** called up the first speaker.

**GREGORY SCOTT WOODS, 241 N. NASH WAY, CHANDLER**, stated this is in the Dobson Place development. He showed where he lived on the map. He said he is opposed to the extension of this mixed-use zoning. He feels the mixed-use zoning is a failed concept for this area. This particular design and zoning appears to introduce urban elements to an area that is primarily suburban. Some of the surrounding areas especially over on the Gilbert side of Gilbert Road are transitioning from rural to suburban. This zoning is not consistent with the surrounding area. Rather than extend the zoning he would suggest to the Commission that they consider not extending the zoning and letting it revert to the underlying C-2 zoning and let the applicant come back with a concept that would be more marketable and is more consistent and conducive to the area.

**CHAIRMAN CASON** asked Diane Woods if she would like to speak. She said she does not but is opposed to the item. He asked the applicant to come up and asked if there was anything specifically that he would like to address regarding the conditions that the property would be under and what he would end up developing if it reverted, and what type of market are they looking at that drives the success of what they have there now versus a reversion.

**MIKE CURLEY** stated the previous zoning on the property was C-2 and was 23 acres of C-2 which would accommodate 2 big boxes. The City has always pretty jealously guarded the corners particularly when they are crossing Gilbert. The Economic Development department in terms of this application came down and said they had produced an Economic Development Study that basically looked at the surrounding commercial and Ms. Mackey said to keep this commercial would be a mistake because of there is such an oversaturation of commercial in the area particularly down a couple miles away. They said commercial wasn't a viable use and so what they did is they had some small boutique type of retailing – one of the reasons this didn't develop is because Fresh and Easy was the anchor tenant and they bailed out. As they may have read over the past year and a half, they have stopped building many of the stores. His applicant/client is Starpointe. They are probably the leading condo and apartment developer in the entire state going back about 15 years. They have done a whole slew of projects including Biaggio, which is down at Chandler Boulevard and Alma School – the northeast corner. It was an award winning project so they were very well received. When he zoned this it was shortly thereafter the economy went into the tank and there was just no financing. They have built somewhere in the neighborhood of 600 units over the last 7 or 8 years so if it wasn't for the

economy they would clearly have developed it. What is proposed here is significantly less intense than what the previous underlying C-2 zoning is. When you say this is a mixed-use, this basically is retail with multi-family surrounding it – very similar to what they see at various intersections around Chandler including Ray and Alma School, the southeast corner, there is a whole bunch of projects that are very similar type of development patterns. They have smaller boutique retail surrounded by multi-family so he doesn't think it is out of character with this area at all. It is constant with the General Plan as Staff has indicated and they respectively ask that the extension be granted.

**CHAIRMAN CASON** asked him to talk a little bit about the type of apartments that are being built, the level of the quality and the price points of the rentals to try to give an indication as to the market that they are trying to grab to live there.

**MIKE CURLEY** said this is part of the same presentation. He looked at his presentation notes from three years ago to address exactly the questions he is asking for. Starpointe had a very well-deserved reputation probably being the highest end condo multi-family developer in town. They have developed several along Scottsdale Road on Indian Bend Road by the park and the golf course. They did Biaggio and they built one over in Awhatukee. They basically had from an architectural standpoint vaulted ceilings; the interior had granite counter tops, security system, and upgraded appliances. They spent a lot of time with Staff in terms of the site plan. When you look at the site plan and the retail, they spent a lot of time on this – on the corner/landscaping treatment. As you come up this entry treatment off of Chandler Boulevard, there are tower elements at the shops. You come into a turn-around area that would be an entrance way into the multi-family. They have spent a lot of time with Staff in terms of both the retail design as well as the multi-family. He said that in this case Chairman Cason was exactly right; the original retail had some higher intense uses up closer to the residential and they re-arranged that so that there was a bank pad which is generally considered to be a fairly benign use. There are 2 swimming pools, interior courtyard areas and full athletic gym. At the time they were getting in the \$1200 - \$1400 rental rates. That policy has changed somewhat although from a rental standpoint he is seeing a lot of rental multi-family activity from a development standpoint after having seen none for the past three years. The reason is there hasn't been any building for the past three years and occupancies are continuing to go down primarily because of the single-family market with people getting out of their homes. They can't qualify for single-family homes so the rental rates are going up. Clearly, the multi-family activity is occurring. He is actually doing one on Arizona Avenue and for the first time in three years they are seeing that activity.

**CHAIRMAN CASON** had a question for Staff. When the project was first submitted, it comes with full documentation that describes exactly the type of structures and the materials that are going to be used on the side of the building and those types of things. If he understands it correctly, those can't change. Those still have to remain the same as they were originally. Correct?

**MR. SWANSON, CITY PLANNER**, replied that is correct with the caveat that sometimes minor modifications happen where maybe a rail detail changes. Everything has to maintain in substantial conformance to what was approved. As long as they can find that it meets that, yes it

will not change. You won't see a different layout. They want to approve something that is completely different than what was represented in the development booklet.

**CHAIRMAN CASON** said so the quality, the sense of it being in the neighborhood and how it interacts with its neighborhood will be as high a quality as it was when they passed it three years ago not knowing there was going to be the financial meltdown that caused it not to get financing and those types of things. The quality won't go down. They will be held to that same level of quality as they were before. Mr. Swanson said they look at doing the administrative approvals or they look at it as being as good as or better than what was previously approved. They would never try to make the step down approach.

**CHAIRMAN CASON** asked if there were any questions for the applicant.

**COMMISSIONER PRIDEMORE** asked how many units are there? Mr. Curley replied there are 286. They reduced the density significantly as they went through the process.

**DIANE WOODS, 241 N. NASH WAY, CHANDLER,** said from what she understood and the neighborhood meeting they went to a couple of weeks ago, they had changed the plan quite a bit. Many aspects of their new plan are not the plan they are showing them tonight. She really does like it in many ways. Part of it she does not like at all. A lot of it is experience she has had. They use to live in Mesa for many years and worked with the City and neighborhoods, Outreach and all the different departments with the police and so forth. She knew a lot of the people and learned a lot of things that she was clueless on – what makes a good community, a good neighborhood and really what will benefit a city. They told her husband they would e-mail some information about the apartments that they are talking about. She is not just interested in the looks of apartments; she wants to know the crime stats. She wants to know the crime stats of apartments that have been there a long time. Not just the first year or two but those that have been there quite a while. Her experience and the things she has gained over the years is that you can start out with a high quality apartment and you get one or two people in there that will chase out the good people and pretty soon the whole place falls apart. When the apartment falls apart, then so does the neighborhoods nearby. It ends up being a domino effect. She would rather see single-family homes. They did have a concept of having single-family homes with 1400 square feet for maybe half of the area. It might have been more. She has seen areas like that where they have done single-family homes anywhere from 1200 to over 2000 square feet, so it is a mixed-use. That plan she would probably like and approve but she wants to not just see the quality of the look. That is important too but you can have a beautiful apartment on the outside and the crime is horrendous on the inside. It is a domino effect. She wants to see the crime stats. She would hope that there would be large apartment complexes where you don't have that over time but she would really love to see that. She is afraid that it will have a domino effect and ruin all the areas around it. Then when those areas get ruined, more areas will get ruined until things happen like they have in Mesa.

**MR. SWANSON, CITY PLANNER,** said he wanted to add something that the neighbor discussed about the new plan. Again, to reiterate what the item on the agenda is, this is strictly for this plan and that future plan will actually have its own neighborhood meeting and its own

public hearing process. The fact that these neighbors were notified with this project certainly means that they will be notified of the next project. They will be able to have those full discussions about that layout etc. and the design that. It is something that will come before them again so they can have that conversation.

**CHAIRMAN CASON** asked when would this go before City Council? Mr. Swanson said the application has yet to be submitted. What they have gone through is their preliminary technical site plan review process. That was just completed so generally speaking with all the parties involved and once they generate those comments it usually takes about a month to two months to get that back in a formal submittal. He would say by the end of the year they should have something in play. **CHAIRMAN CASON** asked with this particular application, when would it go before City Council? Mr. Swanson said it goes to the next Council which would be July 28, 2011.

**CHAIRMAN CASON** entertained a motion.

**MOVED BY COMMISSIONER PRIDEMORE**, seconded by **COMMISSIONER BARON** to approve DVR11-0019 NORTON'S CROSSING as recommended by Staff. The item passed unanimously 6-0 (Vice Chairman Rivers was absent).

6. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Mayo said there was nothing to report.

7. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

**CHAIRMAN CASON** announced that the next regular meeting is July 20, 2011 at 5:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers at the Chandler City Hall, 88 East Chicago Street, Chandler, Arizona.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:06 p.m.

---

Michael Cason, Chairman

---

Jeffrey A. Kurtz, Secretary