2019 Planning & Zoning Commission Minutes

Regular Meetings

January 16, 2019
February 20, 2019
March 6, 2019
April 3, 2019
April 17 2019
May 1, 2019 Canceled
May 15 2019
June 5, 2019
June 5, 2019
July 3, 2019 (not available yet)
July 17, 2019 (not available yet)
August 7, 2019 (not available yet)
August 21, 2019 (not available yet)
September 4, 2019 (not available yet)
October 2, 2019 (not available yet)
October 16, 2019 (not available yet)
November 6, 2019 (not available yet)
November 20, 2019 (not available yet)
December 4 2019 (not available yet)
December 18, 2019 (not available yet)

These minutes are fully searchable within this year by using the “Find Feature”.
MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CHANDLER, ARIZONA, January 16, 2019, held in the City Council Chambers, 88 E. Chicago Street.

1. Chairman Wastchak called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance led by Commissioner Klob.

3. The following Commissioners answered Roll Call:

   Chairman Devan Wastchak  
   Commissioner Robert Klob  
   Commissioner George Kimble  
   Commissioner David Rose  
   Commissioner Gregg Pekau  
   Commissioner Matt Eberle

Vice Chairman Rick Heumann was absent.

Also present:

   Mr. Kevin Mayo, Planning Administrator  
   Mr. David de la Torre, Planning Manager  
   Ms. Susan Fiala, City Planner  
   Ms. Lauren Schumann, Sr. Planner  
   Ms. Kristine Gay, Sr. Planner  
   Ms. Jenny Winkler, City Attorney  
   Ms. Cathy Flores, Clerk

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

   MOVED BY COMMISSIONER PEKAU, seconded by COMMISSIONER EBERLE to approve the minutes of the December 5, 2018 Planning Commission Hearing. The motion passed 4-0. Both COMMISSIONER KIMBLE and COMMISSIONER PEKAU were absent at the December 5, 2018 Planning and Commission Hearing and abstained from the vote.

5. ACTION ITEMS:

   CHAIRMAN WASTCHAK informed the audience prior to the meeting, Commission and Staff met in an open Study Session to discuss each of the items on the consent agenda. He stated all Items would be read into the record and voted on in a single motion.

A. PDP18-0011 ORCHARD HEIGHTS

CONTINUED TO FEBRUARY 20, 2019 COMMISSION HEARING AND FEBRUARY 28, 2019 COUNCIL MEETING

Request Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) approval for the housing product for a single-family residential subdivision on approximately 19-acres located at the SEC of McQueen and Chandler Heights roads.
BACKGROUND FROM MEMO:
- Zoned PAD Single-Family Residential; approved on February 22, 2018
- Preliminary Development Plan for subdivision layout approved on February 22, 2018
- 19-net acres
- 60-lot single-family subdivision
- Lot sizes: 60 x 120 (7,200 sq. ft.) and 75 x 125 (9,375 sq. ft.)
- 3.15 dwelling units per acre

SURROUNDING LAND USE DATA
- North Chandler Heights Road, Single Family Residential
- South Rural Residential (County)
- East Rural Residential (County)
- West McQueen Road, Single-Family Residential

PROPOSED HOUSING PRODUCT DATA
- # Of Floor Plans 4 - # Of Elevations per plan 3
- Home size 1,768 sq./ft. – 2,500 sq./ft. # of Stories 1
- Architectural
- Theme
- Contemporary

PUBLIC / NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATION
This request was noticed in accordance with the requirements of the Chandler Zoning Code. A neighborhood meeting was held on July 17, 2018. One neighboring property owner attended. Asking general questions. As of writing this memo, Planning staff is unaware of any concerns or opposition to the request.

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Preliminary Development Plan
Planning staff recommends Planning Commission motion to recommend approval of the housing product for the Orchard Heights subdivision, subject to the following conditions:

1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with the Development Booklet, entitled “Orchard Heights” and kept on file in the City of Chandler Planning Division, in File No. PDP18-0011, modified by such conditions included at the time the Booklet was approved by the Chandler City Council and/or as thereafter amended, modified or supplemented by the Chandler City Council.
2. Preliminary Development Plan approval does not constitute Final Development Plan approval.
3. Compliance with the details required by all applicable codes and conditions of the City of Chandler and this Preliminary Development Plan shall apply.
4. The same floor plan/elevation shall not be built side-by-side or directly across the street from one another.
5. No more than two identical side-by-side roof slopes should be constructed along arterial or collector streets or public open space.
B. PDP18-0012 CHANDLER REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER – TOWER D

Approved

Request Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) approval for a new patient tower to be connected directly to the existing hospital. The subject site is located at the southeast corner of Dobson and Frye roads.

BACKGROUND FROM MEMO

The approximately 35-acre Chandler Regional Medical Center’s campus is located at the southeast corner of Dobson and Frye roads. Medical offices, retail, assisted living, and a school district facility surround the hospital campus. The nearest residential properties are located to the northwest and southeast across the intersections of Dobson and Frye roads and Fairview Street and Pennington Drive respectively.

Last July, the City Council approved a rezoning request to extend the 90-foot maximum building height Mid-Rise Overlay over the entire hospital campus. The City Council also approved a PDP for a 5-level parking garage that is currently under construction at the southeast corner of the campus. The approved PDP identifies Phase 3 - Proposed Tower D as a future phase that requires a separate PDP application submittal, which is the subject of this request.

The following are provided as key details regarding the new tower proposal:

- There will be one basement and five levels above grade matching the existing five-story tower.
- The highest point will be 89 feet and 9 inches to the top of the mechanical screening. The highest point of the existing tower is 85 feet.
- It will be 79 feet and 8 inches to the top of the building parapet, approximately the same as the existing tower.
- The tower will contain approximately 215,000 square feet.
- Initially there will be 96 new patient beds.
- The first and fifth levels will have space for 60 additional patient beds totaling 156 beds at build out.
- A new pharmacy will be in the basement.
- The main level will include the new main hospital entrance and lobby, patient admitting, cardiac rehabilitation, gift shop and a chapel.
- The proposed exterior design consists of Exterior Insulation and Finish System (EIFS), metal panels, curtain wall glazing and colors that match the finishes and styles of the existing campus.
- The parking garage will be completed before construction on the new tower begins and will provide more parking than code requires.

PUBLIC/NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATION

This request was noticed in accordance with the requirements of the Chandler Zoning Code. A neighborhood meeting was held on December 10, 2018. Representatives from Dignity Health, McCarthy, Devenney, and staff attended. No neighbors or nearby business/property owners attended. As of the writing of this memo, Planning staff has not been contacted by any neighbors or nearby business/property owners and is not aware of any opposition to the request.
RECOMMENDED ACTIONS
Planning staff recommends Planning Commission motion to recommend approval of PDP18-0012
CHANDLER REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER – TOWER D, subject to the following conditions:

1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with the Development Booklet, entitled
   “Chandler Regional Medical Center New Tower D” and kept on file in the City of Chandler
   Planning Division, in File No. PDP18-0012, modified by such conditions included at the time the
   Booklet was approved by the Chandler City Council and/or as thereafter amended, modified or
   supplemented by the Chandler City Council.
2. Landscaping shall be in compliance with current Commercial Design Standards.
3. The site shall be maintained in a clean and orderly manner.
4. The landscaping shall be maintained at a level consistent with or better than at the time of planting.
5. The landscaping in all open-spaces and rights-of-way shall be maintained by the adjacent property
   owner or property owners’ association.
6. The Planning Administrator shall approve landscaping plans (including for open spaces, rights-of-way,
   and street medians) and perimeter walls.
7. Preliminary Development Plan approval does not constitute Final Development Plan approval;
   compliance with the details required by all applicable codes and conditions of the City of Chandler
   and this Preliminary Development Plan shall apply.
8. Conceptual approval is granted for future additions that match the building architecture, materials,
   and colors of the existing campus and this Preliminary Development Plan. Such future additions
   may be reviewed and approved administratively by staff upon finding compliance with all City
   Code requirements.

C. PDP18-0015 LASER COMPONENTS

Approved
Request Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) approval for site layout and building design of a
new office, laboratory, and light industrial building. The site is Lot 6 of the Westech Corporate
Center, located north and east of the northeast corner of Arizona Avenue and Warner Road.

BACKGROUND FROM MEMO:
The subject site is Lot 6 of the Westech Corporate Center, located north and east of the northeast
corner of Arizona Avenue and Warner Road. Westech Corporate Center received conceptual
zoning in 1985. The conceptual zoning included industrial (105.1 acres), commercial (46.4 acres),
and multi-family (33.3 acres). Industrially zoned properties exist to the north, east, and south of
the site. A multi-family residential development is located to the west, across Nevada Street.

The proposed development is a single story office, laboratory, and light industrial building of
approximately 20,170 square feet on 1.87 acres. Building modulation is created with alternating
vertical planes of materials and glazing. The building design consists of a blend of masonry walls,
metal louvers, and architectural exposed steel. A covered steel canopy accents the main building
entry. Architectural louvers vary in spacing to create a dynamic rhythm to the façade. The louvers
are dark grey accented with red louvers at select locations such as the main entry and employee
patio. Additionally, similar louvers are placed at glazed areas along both street facing elevations
to provide continuity.
The site layout and building design is commensurate to the surrounding properties within the Westech Corporate Center. The building design meets the design standards, including a mix of materials, colors, and architectural elements.

PUBLIC/NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATION
This request was noticed in accordance with the requirements of the Chandler Zoning Code. A notification letter was sent in lieu of a neighborhood meeting due to the minimal amount of residential in the area. As of the writing of this memo, Planning staff is not aware of any concerns or opposition to the request.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS
Planning staff recommends Planning Commission motion to recommend approval of PDP18-0015 LASER COMPONENTS, subject to the following conditions:

1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with the Attachments as represented by the applicant in case PDP18-0015 LASER COMPONENTS, except as modified by conditions herein.
2. Landscaping shall be in compliance with current Commercial Design Standards.
3. The site shall be maintained in a clean and orderly manner.
4. The landscaping shall be maintained at a level consistent with or better than at the time of planting.
5. The landscaping in all open-spaces and rights-of-way shall be maintained by the adjacent property owner or property owners' association.
6. Approval by the Planning Administrator of plans for landscaping (open spaces and rights-of-way) and perimeter walls and the Public Works & Utilities Director for arterial street median landscaping.
7. Preliminary Development Plan approval does not constitute Final Development Plan approval; compliance with the details required by all applicable codes and conditions of the City of Chandler and this Preliminary Development Plan shall apply.

D. PDP18-0016 CHANDLER AIRPORT LOGISTICS CENTER

Approved.
Request Preliminary Development Plan approval for a light industrial development located east of the southeast corner of Cooper and Germann roads.

The vote included a revised site plan given to the Commission at the Study Session. During the study session, a new condition was set. Condition 8: The width of the yellow accent steel canopy located above the entry shall be enlarged from 12 inches to 18 inches and the steel accent located above the entry wall pop out from 8 inches to 12 inches.
BACKGROUND FROM MEMO:
The subject site is part of the 134-acre Chandler Airport Center Master Plan that originally received conceptual zoning approval in 2005 and was subsequently amended in 2009. The proposed development of light industrial and warehouse is consistent with the PAD zoning for the approximately 15-acre subject site (shown as parcel 18 in the attached master plan), which allows office, light industrial, hangars and showroom uses.

The proposed development consists of two single-story industrial shell buildings of approximately 91,000 square feet and 133,000 square feet. Both buildings will be constructed of tilt-up concrete with varying scoring lines and alternating colors to break up the mass and length of the buildings. The north elevation of the smaller building fronting Germann Road contains a higher level of architectural detail including, aviation themed canopies over the building entrances, bigger variation in parapet heights and subtly angled walls and parapets.

The applicant met with the Airport Administrator several times to ensure that the proposed development does not conflict with airplane departure and approach surfaces. Because of these meetings, a notch was cut out of the southeast corner of the southern building to avoid conflict with the existing 40:1 departure surface boundary, noted on the site plan.

PUBLIC / NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATION
This request was noticed in accordance with the requirements of the Chandler Zoning Code. A notification letter was sent in lieu of a neighborhood meeting due to the lack of residential in the area. As of the writing of this memo, Planning staff is not aware of any concerns or opposition to the request.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS
Planning staff recommends Planning Commission motion to recommend approval of PDP18-0016 CHANDLER AIRPORT LOGISTICS CENTER, subject to the following conditions:

1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with the Development Booklet, entitled “Chandler Airport Logistics Center” and kept on file in the City of Chandler Planning Division, in File No. PDP18-0016, modified by such conditions included at the time the Booklet was approved by the Chandler City Council and/or as thereafter amended, modified or supplemented by the Chandler City Council.
2. Landscaping shall be in compliance with current Commercial Design Standards.
3. The site shall be maintained in a clean and orderly manner.
4. The landscaping shall be maintained at a level consistent with or better than at the time of planting.
5. The landscaping in all open-spaces and rights-of-way shall be maintained by the adjacent property owner or property owners' association.
6. The Planning Administrator shall approve landscaping plans (including for open spaces, rights-of-way, and street medians) and perimeter walls.
7. Preliminary Development Plan approval does not constitute Final Development Plan approval; compliance with the details required by all applicable codes and conditions of the City of Chandler and this Preliminary Development Plan shall apply.
CHAIRMAN WASTCHAK asked if there were any questions. There were none.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER ROSE seconded by COMMISSIONER PEKAU to approve the items read in on the consent agenda with the additional design items. The motion passed unanimously 6-0.

6. DIRECTOR’S REPORT
KEVIN MAYO, Planning Administrator updated the Council that the Planning Department is working towards creating a digital department. The previous year the Building and Civil Engineering Department took the first step into becoming digital and it has been working well. Around 80% of permitting is done electronically and Planning is the next phase. MR. MAYO stated that David de la Torre, Planning Manager, has been working on reducing the number of files types to make it a more intuitive process for both the employees and the public. The electronic infrastructure is continuing to be built and more changes should be seen within the next few months. Moving forward the Commission should receive digital booklets instead of hardcopies regarding the agenda items.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER EBERLE seconded by COMMISSIONER KLOB to confirm the digital planning packets.

MR. MAYO stated the first step is to get all of the record types condensed down. IT is working on preparing the developer access side of the process which is currently in the testing process. As February approaches, Mr. Mayo will keep the Council updated on what to expect in preparation for the next meeting.

COMMISSIONER KLOB stated he is supportive and excited because he knows how much money is spent on printing books for projects.

COMMISSIONER PEKAU stated with his background in the I.T. industry he is supportive of the department’s goal of becoming electronic.

MS. WINKLER stated that she wanted to make sure that it is clear and on record, that the vote that was took did not include Item A, since it was continued.

CHAIRMAN WASTCHAK did confirm that item A was continued and was not included on the vote took on the consent Agenda.

7. CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENT
Next regular meeting is February 6, 2019 at 5:30 P.M. in the Chandler City Council Chambers, 88 East Chicago Street, Chandler, Arizona.

8. ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was adjourned at 5:44 p.m.

Devan Wastchak, Chairman

Kevin Mayo, Secretary
1. Vice Chairman Heumann called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance led by Commissioner Rose.

3. The following Commissioners answered Roll Call:
   - Commissioner Robert Klob
   - Commissioner George Kimble
   - Commissioner David Rose
   - Commissioner Gregg Pekau
   - Commissioner Matt Eberle
   - Vice Chairman Rick Heumann

Chairman Devan Wastchak was absent and excused.

Also, present:
   - Mr. Kevin Mayo, Planning Administrator
   - Mr. David de la Torre, Planning Manager
   - Ms. Susan Fiala, City Planner
   - Ms. Jenny Winkler, City Attorney
   - Ms. Cathy Flores, Clerk

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   
   **MOVED BY COMMISSIONER KIMBLE, seconded by COMMISSIONER ROSE** to approve the minutes of the January 16, 2019, Planning Commission Hearing. The motion passed 6-0.

5. **ACTIONS ITEMS:**
   - **VICE CHAIRMAN HEUMANN** informed the audience prior to the meeting, Commission and Staff met in an open Study Session to discuss each of the items on the consent agenda. He stated all Items with the additional stipulations would be read into the record and voted on in a single motion.

   A. **APL18-0004/DVR18-0016/PLT18-0050 ENCLAVE AT PINELAKE**

Request Area Plan Amendment to the Southshore Area Plan from multi-family residential to medium density residential, with rezoning from Planned Area Development (PAD) for multi-family residential to PAD for single-family residential, along with Preliminary Development Plan approval for subdivision layout and housing product, and Preliminary Plat approval for a 57 lot single-family residential subdivision. The approximate 16.2-acre site is located at the SEC of Pinelake Way and Ocotillo Road.

**BACKGROUND FROM MEMO:**
- Approximately 16.2-acres zoned PAD for multi-family residential, Falcon Pointe at Pinelake (176 units, 12.9 dwelling units per acre); approved in 2011
SURROUNDING LAND USE DATA:
- North: Ocotillo Road, then Centre Pointe Business Park, vacant and undeveloped properties
- South: Salt River Project Schrader Receiving Station and Substation
- East: Consolidated Canal
- West: Pinelake Condominiums across Pinelake Way

GENERAL PLAN AND AREA PLAN DESIGNATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Plan</td>
<td>Neighborhoods</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Chandler Area Plan (SECAP)</td>
<td>Traditional Suburban Character</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southshore Area Plan</td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROPOSED PROJECT DATA:
- Development Standards: Proposed PAD
- # of Lots: 57
- Density: 3.5 dwelling units per acre
- Minimum Lot Area (square feet): 5,044

PROPOSED HOUSING PRODUCT DATA:
- # of Floor Plans: 4
- Home sizes: 1,810 - 2,914 square feet
- # of Elevations per plan: 3
- # of Stories: 1 and 2
- Architectural Themes: Spanish, Craftsman, Ranch

REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION:
Planning staff has reviewed the request finding consistency with the General Plan, SECAP, and Southshore Area Plan, as amended. The proposed single-family residential subdivision complies with applicable development standards and residential design guidelines. Planning staff recommends the Planning and Zoning Commission approve the Enclave at Pinelake subdivision subject to conditions.

PUBLIC / NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATION:
This request was noticed in accordance with the requirements of the Chandler Zoning Code. A neighborhood meeting was held on November 14, 2018. Two neighboring property owners attended to obtain information on the proposal. Both attendees supported the request. As of writing this memo, Planning staff is unaware of any concerns or opposition to the request.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
Area Plan Amendment
Planning staff recommends Planning and Zoning Commission motion to recommend approval of APL18-0004 SOUTHSHORE AREA PLAN AMENDMENT from multi-family residential to medium density residential.
Rezoning:
Planning staff recommends Planning and Zoning Commission motion to recommend approval of DVR18-0016 ENCLAVE AT PINELAKE, subject to the following conditions:

1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with the Development Booklet, entitled “Enclave at Pinelake” and kept on file in the City of Chandler Planning Division, in File No. DVR18-0016, modified by such conditions included at the time the Booklet was approved by the Chandler City Council and/or as thereafter amended, modified or supplemented by the Chandler City Council.

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. Construction shall commence above foundation walls within three (3) years of the effective date of the ordinance granting this rezoning or the City shall schedule a public hearing to take administrative action to extend, remove or determine compliance with the schedule for development or take legislative action to cause the property to revert to its former zoning classification.

8. Prior to the time of making any lot reservations or subsequent sales agreements, the subdivider/homebuilder/lot developer shall provide a written disclosure statement, for the signature of each buyer, acknowledging that the subdivision is located adjacent to or nearby an existing Salt River Project electrical power facility and SRP easements along the Consolidated Canal that may cause adverse noise, odors, and other externalities. The “Public Subdivision Report”, “Purchase Contracts”, CC&R’s, and the individual lot property deeds shall include a disclosure statement outlining that the site is adjacent to or nearby an existing Salt River Project electrical facility, and the disclosure shall state that such uses are legal and should be expected to continue indefinitely. This responsibility for notice rests with the subdivider/homebuilder/lot developer and shall not be construed as an absolute guarantee by the City of Chandler for receiving such notice.
9. Prior to the time of making any lot reservations or subsequent sales agreements, the subdivider/homebuilder/lot developer shall provide a written disclosure statement, for the signature of each buyer, acknowledging that the subdivision is located adjacent to or nearby existing industrial property and industrial businesses that may cause adverse noise, odors, and other externalities. The “Public Subdivision Report”, “Purchase Contracts”, CC&R’s, and the individual lot property deeds shall include a disclosure statement outlining that the site is adjacent to or nearby existing industrial property and industrial businesses, and the disclosure shall state that such uses are legal and should be expected to continue indefinitely. This responsibility for notice rests with the subdivider/homebuilder/lot developer and shall not be construed as an absolute guarantee by the City of Chandler for receiving such notice.

10. Prior to the time of making any lot reservations or subsequent sales agreements, the subdivider/homebuilder/lot developer shall provide a written disclosure statement, for the signature of each buyer, acknowledging that the subdivision is located adjacent to or nearby existing railroad tracks and railroad right-of-way that may cause adverse noise, odors, and other externalities. The “Public Subdivision Report”, “Purchase Contracts”, CC&R’s, and the individual lot property deeds shall include a disclosure statement outlining that the site is adjacent to or nearby an existing railroad track and railroad right-of-way, and the disclosure shall state that such uses are legal and should be expected to continue indefinitely. This responsibility for notice rests with the subdivider/homebuilder/lot developer and shall not be construed as an absolute guarantee by the City of Chandler for receiving such notice.

11. At the time of sale, the homebuilder/lot developer shall provide a written disclosure statement, for the signature of each buyer, acknowledging that the canal right-of-way together with the adjoining easements dedicated to the City of Chandler, is developed as a multi-trail system for use by the general public.

12. Building setbacks shall be a minimum of the following: 10 feet for front yard porches and livable space/storage, 20 feet for front yard for forward facing garages; side yard setbacks of 5 feet on each side; 20 ft. rear yard setback for two-story homes; 10 feet rear yard setback for one-story homes; and rear patios may encroach up to 3 feet into the rear yard setback.

13. The developer shall contribute 25% of the total cost (design and construction) of a traffic signal at the intersection of Pinelake Way and Ocotillo Road. The developer shall enter into a lump sum cash deferral agreement for their portion of the cost.

**Preliminary Development Plan:**
Planning staff recommends Planning and Zoning Commission motion to recommend approval of the subdivision layout and housing product for the Enclave at Pinelake subdivision, subject to the following conditions:

1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with the Development Booklet, entitled “Enclave at Pinelake” and kept on file in the City of Chandler Planning Division, in File No. DVR18-0016, modified by such conditions included at the time the Booklet was approved by the Chandler City Council and/or as thereafter amended, modified or supplemented by the Chandler City Council.
2. Preliminary Development Plan approval does not constitute Final Development Plan approval; compliance with the details required by all applicable codes and conditions of the City of Chandler and this Preliminary Development Plan shall apply.

3. Approval by the Planning Administrator of plans for landscaping (open spaces and rights-of-way) and perimeter walls and the Development Services Director for arterial street median landscaping.

4. The landscaping in all open-spaces shall be maintained by the property owner or property owners' association, and shall be maintained at a level consistent with or better than at the time of planting.

5. The landscaping in all rights-of-way shall be maintained by the adjacent property owner or property owners' association.

6. All homes built on corner lots within the residential subdivision shall be single-story.

7. The same elevation style and color scheme combination shall not be built adjacent to or directly across the street from one another.

8. No more than two two-story homes shall be built side by side for no more than five of the lots adjacent to Pinelake Way.

Preliminary Plat:
Planning staff recommends Planning and Zoning Commission motion to recommend approval of PLT18-0050 ENCLAVE AT PINELAKE, subject to the following condition:

1. Approval by the City Engineer and Planning Administrator with regard to the details of all submittals required by code or condition.

B. APL18-0006/DVR18-0022 OCOTILLO PATIO VILLAS

Request Area Plan Amendment to the Downtown Ocotillo Area Plan from Commercial to Multi-Family Residential, with rezoning from Planned Area Development (PAD) Commercial Retail to PAD Multi-family, along with Preliminary Development Plan approval for site layout and housing product for a gated residential condominium community. The approximate 5.6-acre site is located east of the SEC of Queen Creek and Price roads.

BACKGROUND FROM MEMO:
- Approximately 5.6 acres
- Downtown Ocotillo Area Plan designates site as Commercial; approved in 2007
- Zoned PAD for commercial; approved in 2007.
- Downtown Ocotillo includes a mix of uses including retail, restaurant, a 4-story residential condominium, and a 4-story hotel
SURROUNDING LAND USE DATA:
North: 37-acre parcel zoned AG-1 (Agricultural) across Queen Creek Road
South: Commercial (Residence Inn by Marriott)
East: Commercial retail
West: Ocotillo water feature extending from the corner of Price and Queen Creek roads

GENERAL PLAN AND AREA PLAN DESIGNATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Plan</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Ocotillo</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROPOSED HOUSING PRODUCT DATA:
# of Units: 32
Density: 5.7 dwelling units per acre
Home sizes: 1,700 sq/ft – 2,290 sq/ft
# of Stories: 1
Architectural Theme: Santa Barbara
# of Floor Plans: 5

REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION:
Planning staff has reviewed the request and finds consistency with the General Plan and the Downtown Ocotillo Area Plan. The subject site’s location within Downtown Ocotillo, allows residential to be considered within the South Price Road Corridor, an area that is otherwise reserved for high-value employment by the General Plan. The proposed development complies with applicable development standards. Planning staff recommends the Planning and Zoning Commission approve Ocotillo Patio Villas subject to conditions.

PUBLIC / NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATION:
This request was noticed in accordance with the requirements of the Chandler Zoning Code. A neighborhood meeting was held on December 4, 2018. Four neighbors attended; three own office condos to the west beyond the lake and the other owns a residential condo to the east in The Cays. Attendees were interested to learn about the proposal and the timing of the development and did not state opposition. As of the writing of this memo, Planning staff is not aware of any opposition to the request.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
Area Plan Amendment
Planning staff recommends the Planning and Zoning Commission motion to recommend approval of APL18-0006 DOWNTOWN OCOTILLO AREA PLAN AMENDMENT from commercial to multi-family residential.

Rezoning:
Planning staff recommends Planning and Zoning Commission motion to recommend approval of DVR18-0022 OCOTILLO PATIO VILLAS, subject to the following conditions:

1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with the Development Booklet, entitled
2. “Ocotillo Patio Villas” and kept on file in the City of Chandler Planning Division, in File No.
3. DVR18-0022, modified by such conditions included at the time the Booklet was approved by the Chandler City Council and/or as thereafter amended, modified or supplemented by the Chandler City Council.

4. Construction shall commence above foundation walls within three (3) years of the effective date of the ordinance granting this rezoning or the City shall schedule a public hearing to take administrative action to extend, remove or determine compliance with the schedule for development or take legislative action to cause the property to revert to its former zoning classification.

5. Prior to the time of making any lot reservations or subsequent sales agreements, the subdivider/homebuilder/lot developer shall provide a written disclosure statement, for the signature of each buyer, acknowledging that the subdivision is located adjacent to or nearby existing industrial property and industrial businesses that may cause adverse noise, odors, and other externalities. The “Public Subdivision Report”, “Purchase Contracts”, CC&R’s, and the individual lot property deeds shall include a disclosure statement outlining that the site is adjacent to or nearby existing industrial property and industrial businesses, and the disclosure shall state that such uses are legal and should be expected to continue indefinitely. This responsibility for notice rests with the subdivider/homebuilder/lot developer and shall not be construed as an absolute guarantee by the City of Chandler for receiving such notice.

Preliminary Development Plan:
Planning staff recommends Planning and Zoning Commission motion to recommend approval of the preliminary development plan for Ocotillo Patio Villas, subject to the following conditions:

1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with the Development Booklet, entitled “Ocotillo Patio Villas” and kept on file in the City of Chandler Planning Division, in File No. DVR18-0022, modified by such conditions included at the time the Booklet was approved by the Chandler City Council and/or as thereafter amended, modified or supplemented by the Chandler City Council.

2. The site shall be maintained in a clean and orderly manner.

3. The landscaping in all open-spaces shall be maintained by the property owner or property owners' association, and shall be maintained at a level consistent with or better than at the time of planting.

4. The landscaping in all rights-of-way shall be maintained by the adjacent property owner or property owners' association.

5. Landscaping plans (including for open spaces, rights-of-way, and street medians) and perimeter walls shall be approved by the Planning Administrator.

6. Amended: A pedestrian path shall be provided from the subject site to the east and south where shared guest parking spaces are located.
7. Preliminary Development Plan approval does not constitute Final Development Plan approval; compliance with the details required by all applicable codes and conditions of the City of Chandler and this Preliminary Development Plan shall apply.

C. PDP18-0011 ORCHARD HEIGHTS

Request Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) approval for the housing product for a single-family residential subdivision on approximately 19-acres located at the SEC of McQueen and Chandler Heights roads.

BACKGROUND FROM MEMO:
- Zoned PAD Single-Family Residential; approved on February 22, 2018
- Preliminary Development Plan for subdivision layout approved on February 22, 2018
- 19-net acres
- 60-lot single family subdivision
- Lot sizes: 60 x 120 (7,200 sq. ft.) and 75 x 125 (9,375 sq. ft.)
- 3.15 dwelling units per acre

SURROUNDING LAND USE DATA:
North: Chandler Heights Road, Single-Family Residential
South: Rural Residential (County)
East: Rural Residential (County)
West: McQueen Road, Single-Family Residential

PROPOSED HOUSING PRODUCT DATA:
# of Floor Plans: 4
# of Elevations per plan: 3
Home size: 1,768 sq./ft. – 2,500 sq./ft.
# of Stories: 1
Architectural Theme: Contemporary

REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION:
The Planning and Zoning Commission continued the request to the February 20, 2019, hearing to provide the applicant additional time to update the housing product and color palettes based upon Commission feedback. The attached housing product incorporates the revisions. Planning staff has reviewed the request finding consistency with the General Plan and Planned Area Development (PAD) zoning. Planning and Zoning Commission and Planning staff recommend the City Council approve the PDP subject to conditions.

PUBLIC / NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATION:
This request was noticed in accordance with the requirements of the Chandler Zoning Code. A neighborhood meeting was held on July 17, 2018. One neighboring property owner attended
asking general questions. As of writing this memo, Planning staff is unaware of any concerns or opposition to the request.

**Preliminary Development Plan:**
Planning staff recommends Planning and Zoning Commission motion to recommend approval of the Preliminary Development Plan for housing product for the Orchard Heights subdivision, subject to the following conditions:

1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with the Development Booklet, entitled “Orchard Heights” and kept on file in the City of Chandler Planning Division, in File No. PDP18-0011, modified by such conditions included at the time the Booklet was approved by the Chandler City Council and/or as thereafter amended, modified or supplemented by the Chandler City Council.

2. Preliminary Development Plan approval does not constitute Final Development Plan approval; compliance with the details required by all applicable codes and conditions of the City of Chandler and this Preliminary Development Plan shall apply.

3. The same floor plan/elevation shall not be built side-by-side or directly across the street from one another.

4. No more than two identical side-by-side roof slopes should be constructed along arterial or collector streets or public open space.

**VICE CHAIR HEUMANN** asked if there were any questions. There were none.

**MOVED BY COMMISSIONER ROSE** seconded by **COMMISSIONER KLOB** to approve the items read in on the consent agenda with the additional design items. The motion passed unanimously 6-0 with stipulations on Item A and Item B.

6. **DIRECTOR’S REPORT**

MR. MAYO stated nothing paper was sent out to the Commission and they are getting their processes in place so that the development booklets come in digitally. The last missing piece is the ability for applicants to submit entirely online and they are currently in the testing phase and should be expected to go live soon. Mr. Mayo said they are working with IT to create a minimum access point so that the Planning Commission can log into the computer for a paperless meeting.

7. **CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENT**
Next regular meeting is March 6, 2019 at 5:30 P.M. in the Chandler City Council Chambers, 88 East Chicago Street, Chandler, Arizona.
8. **ADJOURNMENT**
   The meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

[Signature]
Devan Wastchak, Chairman

[Signature]
Kevin Mayo, Secretary
1. Vice Chairman Heumann called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance led by Commissioner Rose.

3. The following Commissioners answered Roll Call:

   Chairman Devan Wastchak
   Commissioner Robert Klob
   Commissioner George Kimble
   Commissioner David Rose
   Commissioner Gregg Pekau
   Commissioner Matt Eberle
   Vice Chairman Rick Heumann

   Also, present:

   Mr. Kevin Mayo, Planning Administrator
   Mr. David de la Torre, Planning Manager
   Ms. Lauren Schumann, Senior City Planner
   Ms. Susan Fiala, City Planner
   Ms. Jenny Winkler, City Attorney
   Ms. Cathy Flores, Clerk

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   
   MOVED BY COMMISSIONER EBERLE, seconded by COMMISSIONER KLOB to approve the minutes of the February 20, 2019, Planning Commission Hearing. The motion passed 7-0.

5. **ACTION ITEMS:**
   
   CHAIRMAN WASTCHAK informed the audience prior to the meeting, Commission and Staff met in an open Study Session to discuss each of the items on the consent agenda. He stated all items with the additional stipulations would be read into the record and voted on in a single motion. He asked if there was anyone in the audience who would like to speak. There was one.

   **A. DVR18-0026 DULVICK FAMILY HOME**

   Request Rezoning from Agricultural (AG-1) district to Single-Family Residential/ Planned Area Development (SF-33/PAD) and Preliminary Development Plan for site layout of two single-family homes. The 1.92-acre lot is located at 1994 S. Tumbleweed Lane, the northwest corner of Germann Road and Tumbleweed Lane.

   **Rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan**

   1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with the attached exhibits and kept on file in the City of Chandler Planning Division, in File No. DVR18-0026 DULVICK FAMILY HOME, modified by such conditions included at the time the exhibits were approved by the Chandler City Council and/or as thereafter amended, modified or supplemented by the Chandler City Council.

   2. The rear yard building setbacks shall be reduced from forty (40) feet to thirty (30) feet.
DAVID HOFFMAN, 1990 S. TUMBLEWEED stated they had neighborhood meeting and the only concern many of the neighbors had was how the rezoning would affect their animals and mini farms. He mentioned he is in favor of the project and it will be an asset to the community.

CHAIRMAN WASTCHAK stated he appreciated MR HOFFMAN coming out to speak and the staff has worked hard to keep the ranchette designation. He asked if there was anyone else who would like to speak on Item A. There was none.

B. PLH19-0003 ARIZONA LABOR FORCE

Request Use Permit approval for a transient service facility within a property zoned Regional Commercial (C-3) district. The existing day labor hiring office will relocate to 355 S. Arizona Avenue, south of the southeast corner of Arizona and Frye Road.

1. Substantial 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. Use Permit approval does not constitute Final Development Plan approval; compliance with the details required by all applicable codes and conditions of the City of Chandler and this Use Permit shall apply.

3. The site shall be maintained in a clean and orderly manner.

4. The fence and gate located along the alley shall be approximately six feet in height minimum.

C. ZUP18-0014 TRILOGY VETERINARY MEDICAL CENTER

Request Use Permit approval to allow an outdoor dog area to operate with a veterinary medical center. The new business is located at 2801 E. Ocotillo Road, Suite 5, west of the southwest corner of Gilbert and Ocotillo roads.

1. Substantial expansion or modification beyond the approved attachments (Site Plan, Floor Plans, Elevations, 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 property.

3. The site shall be maintained in a clean and orderly manner.

4. Use Permit approval does not constitute Final Development Plan approval; compliance with the details required by all applicable codes and conditions of the City of Chandler and this Use Permit shall apply.

5. No day care or overnight boarding shall be allowed.

6. All pets brought into the outdoor area shall be on a leash and accompanied by staff.
MOVED BY COMMISSIONER KLOB seconded by VICE CHAIRMAN HEUMANN to approve the items read in on the consent agenda with the additional design items. The motion passed unanimously 6-0 with added stipulations on Item B and Item C.

6. DIRECTOR’S REPORT

7. CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENT
   
   Next regular meeting is March 6, 2019 at 5:30 P.M. in the Chandler City Council Chambers, 88 East Chicago Street, Chandler, Arizona.

8. ADJOURNMENT
   The meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Devan Wastchak, Chairman

Kevin Mayo, Secretary
MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CHANDLER, ARIZONA, April 3, 2019, held in the City Council Chambers, 88 E. Chicago Street.

1. Chairman Wastchak called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance led by Commissioner Eberle.

3. The following Commissioners answered Roll Call:

   Chairman Devan Wastchak
   Commissioner Robert Klob
   Commissioner George Kimble
   Commissioner David Rose
   Commissioner Gregg Pekau
   Commissioner Matt Eberle
   Vice Chairman Rick Heumann

   Also, present:

   Mr. Kevin Mayo, Planning Administrator
   Mr. David de la Torre, Planning Manager
   Ms. Kristine Gay, Senior City Planner
   Ms. Susan Fiala, City Planner
   Ms. Jenny Winkler, City Attorney
   Ms. Cathy Flores, Clerk
   Ms. Maritza Garrity, Clerk

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   
   MOVED BY COMMISSIONER PEKAU, seconded by COMMISSIONER EBERLE to approve the minutes of the March 6, 2019, Planning Commission Hearing. The motion passed 7-0. Adjustment to the date on page 3 of the “Chairman’s Announcements”.

5. **ACTION ITEMS:**

   A. **PDP18-0017 BERGE RANCH**

   **APPROVED WITH STIPULATION**

   1. Chairman Westchak requested stipulation to Condition Number 5; the applicant shall work with staff to break up the right elevation of plan 40-4.

   Request Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) approval for the housing product for a single-family residential subdivision on approximately 78-acres located south of the southeast corner of Lindsay and Ocotillo Roads.

   **PUBLIC / NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATION**

   - This request was noticed in accordance with the requirements of the Chandler Zoning Code.
   - A neighborhood meeting was held on January 17, 2019. Seven (7) neighboring property owner attended asking general questions.
   - As of writing this memo, Planning staff is unaware of any concerns or opposition to the request.

   **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

   Preliminary Development Plan

   Planning staff recommends Planning and Zoning Commission motion to recommend approval of the housing product for the Berge Ranch subdivision, subject to the following conditions:
1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with the Development Booklet, entitled “Berge Ranch” and kept on file in the City of Chandler Planning Division, in File No. PDP18-0017, modified by such conditions included at the time the Booklet was approved by the Chandler City Council and/or as thereafter amended, modified or supplemented by the Chandler City Council.

2. Preliminary Development Plan approval does not constitute Final Development Plan approval; compliance with the details required by all applicable codes and conditions of the City of Chandler and this Preliminary Development Plan shall apply.

3. The same floor plan/elevation shall not be built side-by-side or directly across the street one another.

4. No more than two identical side-by-side roof slopes should be constructed along arterial or collector streets or public open space.

**PROPOSED MOTION**

**Preliminary Development Plan**

Motion Planning and Zoning Commission to recommend approval of the housing product in case PDP18-0017 BERGE 80, subject to the conditions as recommended by Planning staff.

**CHAIRMAN WASTCHAK DISCUSSION:** on page 81 elevation of plane 40-4c, concerned with right elevation color change without a plane change. Requested to include stipulation.

**B. DVR18-0023 BELLA ROSE INN**

**APPROVED**

Request action on the existing Planned Area Development (PAD) zoning for the hotel 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 Planned Area Development (PAD) zoning for office. The PAD zoning which the extension is requested for is a hotel located west of the northwest corner of South Price Road and West Willis Road.

**REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION**

Planning staff finds that a PAD zoning time extension for five years is consistent with the General Plan and the hotel use is still appropriate; staff therefore recommends approval.

**PUBLIC / NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATION**

- This request was noticed in accordance with the requirements of the Chandler Zoning Code.
- A letter was sent to adjacent property owners and registered neighborhood organizations notifying them of the requested time extension. No responses were received by staff.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION**

**Rezoning Time Extension**

Planning staff, upon finding consistency with the General Plan, recommends approval to extend the timing condition for five (5) years with all of the conditions in the original approval remaining in effect.
PROPOSED MOTION  
Rezoning Time Extension  
Motion to recommend approval of extending the timing condition for case DVR18-0023 BELLA ROSE INN for an additional five (5) years, in which the zoning would be in effect until September 11, 2022, and with all of the conditions in the original approval remaining in effect.

C. ZUP18-0013 VERIZON – NORTHEAST CORNER OF RURAL AND RAY THIS CASE IS WITHDRAWN

APPROVED

Request Use Permit approval to install a wireless communication facility on a parking lot light pole located at 1015 N. Rural Road, at the northeast corner of Rural and Ray Roads.

BACKGROUND FROM MEMO
The applicant requests the Use Permit be withdrawn due to the proposal being in compliance with Zoning Code regulations for wireless communication facilities. Therefore, a Use Permit is no longer necessary. Planning staff recommends Planning and Zoning Commission withdraw the case.

PROPOSED MOTION
Motion Planning and Zoning Commission to withdraw Use Permit case ZUP18-0013 VERIZON – NORTHEAST CORNER OF RURAL AND RAY, as recommended by Planning staff.

D. PLT19-0007 CUSD CENTRAL TRANSORATION FACILITY

APPROVED

Request preliminary plat approval for Chandler Unified School District’s Central Transportation facility located at the northwest corner of Ocotillo Roads and Centre Pointe Parkway.

BACKGROUND FROM MEMO
• Approximately 19.39 Acres  
• Zoned Planned Area Development (PAD) for self-storage facility; zoning and preliminary development plans approved in 2005  
• Plat creates the lots and tracts, establishes the necessary easements, and dedicates the required right-of-way

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Planning staff recommends Planning and Zoning Commission motion to recommend approval of PLT19-0007 CUSD CENTRAL TRANSPORTATION FACILITY, subject to the following condition:

1. Approval by the City Engineer and Planning Administrator with regard to the details of all submittals required by code or condition.

PROPOSED MOTION
Motion Planning and Zoning Commission to recommend approval of Preliminary Plat PLT19-0007 CUSD CENTRAL TRANSPORTATION FACILITY, per Planning staff recommendation.
MOVED BY VICE CHAIR HEUMANN seconded by COMMISSIONER KIMBLE to approve the items read in on the consent agenda with the additional stipulations. The motion passed unanimously 7-0.

6. **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

7. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENT**
   Next regular meeting is April 17, 2019 at 5:30 P.M. in the Chandler City Council Chambers, 88 East Chicago Street, Chandler, Arizona.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**
   The meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

   [Signature]
   Devan Wastchak, Chairman

   [Signature]
   Kevin Mayo, Secretary
MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CHANDLER, ARIZONA, April 17, 2019, held in the City Council Chambers, 88 E. Chicago Street.

1. Chairman Wastchak called the meeting to order at 5:43 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance led by Vice Chairman Heumann.

3. The following Commissioners answered Roll Call:

   Chairman Devan Wastchak
   Commissioner Robert Klob
   Commissioner George Kimble
   Commissioner David Rose
   Commissioner Matt Eberle
   Vice Chairman Rick Heumann

   Also, present:

   Mr. Kevin Mayo, Planning Administrator
   Mr. David de la Torre, Planning Manager
   Ms. Lauren Schumann, Senior City Planner
   Ms. Susan Fiala, City Planner
   Ms. Jenny Winkler, City Attorney
   Ms. Cathy Flores, Clerk
   Ms. Maritza Garrity, Clerk

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

   MOVED BY COMMISSIONER KLOB, seconded by COMMISSIONER KIMBLE to approve the minutes of the April 3, 2019, Planning Commission Hearing. The motion passed 6-0.

5. ACTION ITEMS:

   A. APL18-0005/DVR18-0013/PLT18-0046 LA COSTERA LANDING

   Approved with stipulation

   Request Area Plan Amendment to the Chandler Airpark Area Plan from Commercial/Office/Business Park to Low-Medium Density Residential, with rezoning from Planned Area Development (PAD) for church uses to PAD for single family residential, along with Preliminary Development Plan approval for subdivision layout and housing product, and Preliminary Plat approval for a 137 lot single-family residential subdivision. The approximate 19.3-acre site is located east of the northeast corner of Arizona Avenue and Appleby Road.

   REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION

   Planning staff has reviewed the request finding consistency with the General Plan and CAAP, as amended. Since the subject site is a remnant parcel from the church campus with frontage along Appleby Road, the viability of the site developing as a business park as intended under the CAAP is low due to lack of visibility from Arizona Avenue. In addition, low to medium density single-family residential subdivisions have been approved and built to the north and south of the subject site. Due to the infill nature of the site, the Residential Development Standards (RDS) for subdivision layout are not applicable. However, the RDS guidelines remain applicable to the architectural design of the homes. The proposed single-family residential subdivision meets the
intent of development standards and residential design guidelines. Planning staff recommends the Planning and Zoning Commission approve La Costera Landing subdivision subject to conditions.

PUBLIC / NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATION
• This request was noticed in accordance with the requirements of the Chandler Zoning Code.
• A neighborhood meeting was held on December 4, 2018. Five neighboring property owners attended to obtain information on the proposal and construction timelines.
• As of writing this memo, Planning staff has received one phone call in support of the proposal and is unaware of any concerns or opposition to the request.

AIRPORT COMMISSION CONFLICT EVALUATION
The Airport Commission reviewed the request in accordance with the Airport Conflicts Evaluation Process at their April 10, 2019, meeting. The Airport Manager has issued a conflicts evaluation report indicating that the Airport Commission determined that the proposed development does constitute a conflict with existing or planned airport uses. While a nonresidential use is preferred, various physical and administrative corrective actions were recommended for mitigation. Physical corrective actions included noise attenuation construction within the homes, a roadway style sign indicating the presence of aircrafts, and incorporation of „Chandler Airpark” into the development’s name. Administrative corrective actions included the requirement of disclosure statements to be signed by prospective homebuyers indicating the proximity to the airport, heliport, and the potential impact from aviation noise and vibrations. Additionally, an aviation easement shall be dedicated to the City of Chandler. Finally, a large map shall be displayed within the sales office identifying the proximity of the subdivision to the airport including the noise contours, and over flight patterns. As discussed at the meeting, the goal was to create a physical and administrative „net” to catch prospective home buyers that may not want to necessarily live near an active airport, acknowledging that certain home buyers do enjoy living in that environment. A copy of the Airport Manager’s report detailing the Airport Commission’s finding is attached to this memo and the applicant is in agreement with the mitigation request.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS
Area Plan Amendment
Planning staff recommends Planning and Zoning Commission motion to recommend approval of APL18-0005 CHANDLER AIRPARK AREA PLAN AMENDMENT from Commercial/Office/Business Park to Low-Medium density residential.

Rezoning
Motion Planning and Zoning Commission to recommend approval of Rezoning DVR18-0013 LA COSTERA LANDING, from PAD for church uses to PAD single-family residential, subject to the conditions as recommended by Planning staff.

Preliminary Development Plan
Motion Planning and Zoning Commission to recommend approval of Preliminary Development Plan DVR18-0013 LA COSTERA LANDING for subdivision layout and housing product subject to the conditions as recommended by Planning staff.
Preliminary Plat
Motion Planning and Zoning Commission to recommend approval of Preliminary Plat, PLT18-0046 LA COSTERA LANDING, subject to the condition as recommended by Planning staff.

B. PDP18-0019 WATCHTOWER CARWASH AND OFFICES

CONTINUED TO JUNE 5, 2019 P&Z COMMISSION AND JUNE 27, 2019 COUNCIL MEETING.

Request Preliminary Development Plan approval for site layout and building architecture for a carwash and offices. The approximate 4.45-acre site is located east of the southeast corner of Chandler Boulevard and McQueen Road.

REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION
Planning staff has reviewed the request finding consistency with the General Plan and PAD zoning. The proposal complies with site development and commercial design standards. Planning staff recommends the Planning and Zoning Commission approve the PDP for site layout and architecture subject to conditions.

PUBLIC / NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATION
• This request was noticed in accordance with the requirements of the Chandler Zoning Code.
• A neighborhood meeting was held on March 4, 2018. No one attended other than the applicant and Planning staff.
• As of writing this memo, Planning staff has received two phone calls and four emails in opposition of the proposal, see attached emails. Concerns focused on the amount of carwashes in the area and requests for restaurants or housing to be built instead. Existing carwashes in this area include full detail service and self-service but no quick service carwashes. The use of a carwash and offices are permitted under the current zoning. No comments were received pertaining to the PDP for site layout or architecture.

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Preliminary Development Plan
Planning staff recommends Planning and Zoning Commission motion to recommend approval of the site layout and architecture for Watch Tower Carwash and Offices, subject to the following conditions:

1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with the Development Booklet, entitled “Watch Tower Carwash and Offices” and kept on file in the City of Chandler Planning Division, in File No. PDP18-0019, modified by such conditions included at the time the Booklet was approved by the Chandler City Council and/or as thereafter amended, modified or supplemented by the Chandler City Council.
2. Landscaping shall be in compliance with current Commercial Design Standards.
3. The site shall be maintained in a clean and orderly manner.
4. The landscaping shall be maintained at a level consistent with or better than at the time of planting.
5. The landscaping in all rights-of-way shall be maintained by the adjacent property owner or property owners' association.
6. Landscaping plans (including for open spaces, rights-of-way, and street medians) and perimeter walls shall be approved by the Planning Administrator.

7. The landscaping in all open-spaces shall be maintained by the property owner or property owners' association, and shall be maintained at a level consistent with or better than at the time of planting.

8. Perimeter landscaping around the entire site, including Phase II, shall be installed in Phase I.

9. Building mounted signage facing east and south shall be non-illuminated.

10. The monument sign’s sign panels shall have an integrated or decorative cover panel until a tenant name is added to the sign.

11. Preliminary Development Plan approval does not constitute Final Development Plan approval; compliance with the details required by all applicable codes and conditions of the City of Chandler and this Preliminary Development Plan shall apply.

C. PLH19-0008 THE PET CLUB

Approved.
Request Use Permit approval to allow an outdoor pet area to operate with a doggy daycare and overnight boarding in a new pet supply and services store. The property is located at 2000 W. Ray Road, at the northwest corner of Ray and Dobson roads.

REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION
Planning staff has reviewed the request finding consistency with the General Plan and Planned Area Development (PAD) zoning. The proposed outdoor pet dog run area is located and designed in a manner not to interfere with building exiting and service utilities. A six-foot high decorative block wall with three feet of wrought iron placed on top of the block wall encloses the outdoor area. Materials and colors will match existing palette of the business. Pet waste will be picked up immediately and then will be washed down with a hose. A French drain will be installed to further address drainage and odor control. Overnight boarding and pet day care will be provided. Planning staff recommends the Planning and Zoning Commission approve the Use Permit subject to conditions.

PUBLIC / NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATION
• This request was noticed in accordance with the requirements of the Chandler Zoning Code.
• A neighborhood meeting was held on April 11, 2019. No one attended other than the applicant team.
• As of writing this memo, Planning staff is unaware of any concerns or opposition to the request.

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Planning staff recommends Planning and Zoning Commission motion to recommend approval of PLH19-0008 THE PET CLUB, subject to the following conditions:

1. Substantial expansion or modification beyond the approved attachments (Site Plan, Floor Plan, Elevations, 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 property.

3. The site shall be maintained in a clean and orderly manner.
2. The Use Permit is non-transferable to any other property.
3. The site shall be maintained in a clean and orderly manner.
4. Use Permit approval does not constitute Final Development Plan approval; compliance with the details required by all applicable codes and conditions of the City of Chandler and this Use Permit shall apply.

D. CANCELLATION OF THE MAY 1, 2019, PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSIONS MEETING

Approved.

1. MOVED BY VICE CHAIR HEUMANN seconded by COMMISSION KLOB to approve the items read in on the consent agenda with the additional change on Item A. The motion passed unanimously 7-0.

6. DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Kevin Mayo spoke about and gave recognition to Chairman Wastchak for his service to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the past 6 years.

Vice Chairman Heumann also gave recognition to Chairman Wastchak.

7. CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENT

Next regular meeting is May 15, 2019 at 5:30 P.M. in the Chandler City Council Chambers, 88 East Chicago Street, Chandler, Arizona.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:51 p.m.

Rick Heumann, Vice Chairman

Kevin Mayo, Secretary
MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CHANDLER, ARIZONA, May 15, 2019, in the City Council Chambers, 88 E. Chicago Street.

1. Vice Chairman Heumann called the meeting to order at 5:30.

2. Pledge of Allegiance led by Commissioner Kimble.

3. The following Commissioners answered Roll Call:

   Commissioner George Kimble
   Commissioner David Rose
   Commissioner Gregg Pekau
   Commissioner Michael Flanders
   Vice Chairman Rick Heumann

   Absent/Excused:
   Commissioner Robert Klob
   Commissioner Matt Eberle

   Also, present:
   Mr. Kevin Mayo, Planning Administrator
   Mr. David de la Torre, Planning Manager
   Ms. Lauren Schumann, Senior City Planner
   Ms. Susan Fiala, City Planner
   Ms. Jenny Winkler, City Attorney
   Ms. Cathy Flores, Clerk
   Ms. Elisa Thompson, Clerk

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   MOVED BY COMMISSIONER ROSE, seconded by COMMISSIONER KIMBLE to approve the minutes of the April 17, 2019, Planning Commission Hearing. ABSTAINED by COMMISSIONER FLANDERS. The motion passed 4-0.

5. ANNUAL PLANNING COMMISSION BUSINESS MEETING
   Election of Officers:
   A. Chairman
   B. Vice Chairman

   COMMISSIONER ROSE motioned to elect VICE CHAIRMAN HEUMANN to CHAIRMAN for Planning and Zoning Commission, second by COMMISSIONER PEKAU. The motion passed 5 – 0.

   CHAIRMAN HEUMANN motioned to elect COMMISSIONER ROSE to VICE CHAIRMAN for Planning and Zoning Commission, second by COMMISSIONER KIMBLE. The motion passed 5 – 0.

6. ACTION ITEMS:
   CHAIRMAN HEUMANN informed the audience prior to the meeting, Commission and Staff met in an open Study Session to discuss each of the items on the agenda.
A. DVR17-0034/PLT17-0067 MOUNTAIN VIEW ESTATES

Continued to July 17, 2019, P&Z Commission with the purpose to meet with Design Review Committee (DRC) beforehand.

Request rezoning from Agricultural (AG-1) to Planned Area Development (PAD) for single-family residential with Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) approval for subdivision layout along with Preliminary Plat (PLT) approval for 21 lots on approximately 8 acres. The subject site is located east of the northeast corner of Lindsay and Riggs roads. Subject site is located over two parcels located in the county. They are zoned rural 43 in the county. Staff has received annexation request to annex these properties. Staff is currently processing those requests, the annexation and the initial city zoning of PADs 1 will proceed this request for rezoning PDP and PLT on the June 13, 2019, Council Agenda.

On the north side of the subject site is the Falcon Estates neighborhood and on the east side is the Vasaro neighborhood originally called the Citrus Preserve and on the south side is the Sun Groves master planned development and immediately to the west are more parcels that are located in the county that are zoned rural residential (rural 43).

General plan identifies the sites as neighborhoods, which allows a range of different residential densities. The southeast Chandler area plan identifies the sites as rural agrarian character, which allows rural residential, one dwelling unit per acre and allows a traditional suburban density, which is identified in area plan as being around 2.5 dwelling units per acre and it allows them to go as high as 3.5 dwelling units per acre.

PRESENTATION: ITEM A - DVR17-0034/PLT17-0067 MOUNTAIN VIEW ESTATES
provided by DAVID DE LA TORRE, PLANNING MANAGER

Basics of the proposed development includes 17 lots, the net acreage is 7.29 acres, and that comes up to a density of 2.33 dwelling units per acre, which again is under the 2.5 traditional suburban density allowed by the Southeast Chandler Area Plan. Lots 1-7 border the north side of the property and those are just over 11,000 square feet in size and then lots 8-17 are right in the middle of the subdivision and those are 8,450 square feet in size and the smaller lots are located 74 feet from the eastern property line and the western property line. Within 74 feet is a 14-foot landscape tract next to the property line and there is a 50-foot right-of-way and on the other side of the right-of-way is a 10-foot landscape tract. It is 74 feet from the east property line and the west property line to the smaller lots. From the south side there is 136 feet from the Riggs Road right-of-way to the southern lots. It includes an 86-foot wide-open space directly adjacent to Riggs Road and then a 50-foot right-of-way next to the lots. The subdivision has been designed with a very open view, which meets the intent of the southeast Chandler guidelines to provide larger setbacks along arterial streets to create a very open atmosphere that is reminiscent of the rural heritage. In the middle of the smaller lots is a 60-foot wide landscape tract with a play structure and a Ramada, which aligns with the entrance into the subdivision. The last point I would like to make is that the applicant has agreed to limit all the homes in the subdivision to single story only.

The PDP that is requested for approval today does not include housing product, so staff is adding a stipulation proposed in the zoning ordinance that would limit the homes to a single story homes. In the future, when the PDP application is submitted for the housing product they would have to
abide to the single story only with respect to setbacks. The setbacks proposed are very typical for a subdivision with the lot ranges of 8,000 to 11,000 square feet with an exception to the rear yard setback on lots 1-7. The rear yard setback is 40 feet and that is twice the length of a typical setback, which is normally 20 feet. The 40 feet would apply to the house or to the home. The covered patio would be able to extend a maximum of 10 feet into the 40-foot setback. Additionally, Casitas, Ramadas, and accessory structures would be limited to 20 feet from the rear yard property line along lots 1-7 and the normal setback would be 10 feet in this case and it is 5 feet for the smaller lots (8-17).

The applicant has met with the neighborhood several times. The two neighborhood meetings were in March and June of last year. Following the neighborhood meetings, they met with residents from Falcon Estates, who live immediately adjacent to the north side of the site and they did a height simulation using poles.

Staff has received letters in opposition, twelve to be exact. Twelve letters or emails on opposition to the proposal and staff has also received a legal protest which does not apply to the Planning and Zoning Commission, but it would affect the City Council votes, which requires a three quarters vote from City Council in order to pass the re-zoning that is requested. The properties outlined in red on the map are the properties signed in opposition in legal protest. They will pass the requirement for 20% of any one side to trigger the legal protest. In addition, after the staff memo was prepared and after the presentation was prepared staff also received more signatures from the Vasaro neighborhood. There was 153 signatures in the petition in opposition. Staff has not verified those signatures, but they are not applicable to the legal protest. Staff noted that multiple signatures did use the same address. I do not know how many properties that accounts for. I will not go into the details of the summary of the concerns as the Planning and Zoning Commission will hear directly from the residents, but in general staff heard concerns that the proposal will block views of the San Tan Mountains, it will diminish their property values and that the lots are too small. The lots should be bigger in size and more akin to the lot sizes in their subdivisions.

Through the neighborhood input process the applicant made several modifications to their plans. The applicant for instance, reduced the number of lots from 22 to 17 lots. This reduced the density that was proposed from three dwelling units per acre to 2.3 dwelling units per acre. The original site plan submitted to the City with this application included lots that were backing on to Riggs Road. The applicant removed those lots and now there is a very open feel and view into that subdivision. Finally, as I mentioned before the applicant has agreed to limit all the homes to single story. The resulting plan is one that staff finds in conformance with the general plan and in conformance with the Southeast Chandler Area Plan. In a few minutes, the Planning and Zoning Commission will hear from the applicant and from the neighbors and the representative hired by one of the neighbors. Staff is asking the Planning and Zoning Commission to keep a couple things in mind from the opposition. First, the guidelines are not ordinance requirements and are not standards that are required. They are guidelines with the intent and vision for southeast Chandler. Staff agrees, not all guideline standards have been met. However, staff finds all the modifications have been made to the subdivision to meet the intent of the Southeast Chandler Area Plan and addresses the neighborhood concerns from the residents with staff recommending approval.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN inquired if the lot is currently in the county. What could be built if somebody did not want to annex into the city?
DAVID DE LA TORRE replied that it is zoned Rule 43, in the county. Rule 43, allows one dwelling unit per acre, which is 7.29 acres, allowing seven homes. The homes could be two-story, have livestock, barns, silos and agricultural structures on property.

COMMISSIONER KIMBLE needed clarification on two items. First, the developer has agreed to build single-story vs. two-story homes.

DAVID DE LA TORRE confirmed the developer would be single-story homes.

COMMISSIONER KIMBLE, Second, with 17 lots at 2.3 acres, do the other residents have 2.5?

DAVID DE LA TORRE responded, the proposed density is 2.3 dwelling per acre, Falcon Estates to the north has 1.9 dwelling per acre and Vasaro has 1.8 per acre. They are larger lots, Falcon Estates has lot sizes that are 18,500 sq. ft. and Vasaro has lot sizes that are 22,000 sq. ft.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN then turns the floor over to the applicant, SETH KEELER.

APPLICANT, SETH KEELER is located at 1121 West Warner Road, Suite 109, Tempe, AZ 85284. Exhibit shows general location of the project located at Riggs and Lindsay roads. A snapshot of the neighborhood shows Falcon Estates to the north at 1.9 per acre; Vasaro 1.8; west of the project is Shadow Ridge 3.5 per acre; and south of Riggs Road density is seen at Lone Tree having 4.8 per acre; Sun Groves at seven per acre. Applicant is only requesting 2.3 dwell per acre.

The original application included an Annexation, PAD and PRELIMINARY PLAT. The project started with lots of 60 x 120, 7,200 sq. ft.; 27 lots with 3.25 units per acre. In the first neighborhood meeting, neighbors saw the original first presentation of project. They had concerns about the lot sizes and height restrictions on views. Plans were then modified. The lots to the north grew to 70 x 120, 8,400 sq. ft.; lots along Riggs Road got bigger to 65 x 120 and the lots in the interior stayed the same, down to 21 lots at 2.8 units per acre. There is now open space by Riggs Road. Neighbors also had concerns about the density. They wanted larger lots around the northern perimeter.

We came back with another plan. This is a third rendition. The lot sizes to the north are now 74 x 150 or 11,100 sq. ft. The lot sizes in the interior are 65 x 130 or 8,450 sq. ft. The 17 lots bring it to 2.33 units per acre. The plan now shows we have 22.92% open space. Along, Riggs Road there is an 86-foot wide landscaping tract. You drive up to open space and the park has the following amenities: shaded area, BBQ grill, picnic tables, and a Ramada that is open. The presentation shows the color, material palette, the entry and theme wall, which coincide with the area. We also added a 10-foot tract on the east side on Lot 7 so neighbors could continue to get to the irrigation gate on an ATV. The irrigation easement remains on the north.

This vision plan shows that we are within the rural agrarian character of the plan. The text of rural agrarian character talks about emphasizing these design elements. The second paragraph says, “It is possible that some of the areas located within this area as depicted by the vision plan character map could be considered for traditional suburban densities”. The question we asked ourselves was, “are we the first to ask for traditional densities in the rural agrarian character?” and we discovered that we are not. These several properties have been recently approved. They are within the rural agrarian character and they represent traditional suburban densities. I put it on this map just to help
the visual context. Each square that you see here is a square mile and up in the top corner are the approvals.

1. Orchard Heights has lots that are 7,200 sq. ft., plotted in 2018.
2. Chandler Heights has 10,400, plotted in 2016.
3. Whispering Heights has 9,000 sq. ft. lots, plotted in 2006.
4. Lucinda runs along Riggs Road and has lots as low as 7,014, plotted in 2018.
5. Windermere Ranch is just under 10,000 sq. ft. lots, plotted in 2018.
6. Pescara and Jacaranda are plotted in different years but they both have the same lot sizes.

Some of these areas can be traditional suburban densities within the rural agrarian character. Neighborhood outreach started on March 20, 2018. Then on, June 12, then again on September 18 and 26, 2018. We have pictures of meeting with the neighbors. One picture shows a ladder in the background, we are going over the wall. We set-up a tripod so it could help illustrate distances with proposed setback, distances for height and what it would look like for the neighbors as they look at their backyards. The other picture shows us in one of neighbor’s backyards looking towards the mountain. You can see the tripod that was set to a 40 ft. height, which is not what we are proposing, but we wanted to illustrate what that would look like. As staff mentioned, there has been concessions made. We dropped the lots to 17 and increased our lot sizes across the board. Our density is now 2.33 units per acre. We willingly agreed to a 40 ft. setback for our rear yard, due to the neighbor’s specific request. The neighbors in their zoning case have 25 ft. We voluntarily restricted our homes to 25 ft. high and to single story homes. The neighbor zoning case allows them for a 35 ft. home on two stories. This is the plan we are proposing.

One of the concerns we heard was what our homes would look like and how expensive they would be. If on lots 1-7, we built a 4,000 sq. ft. home and it sold for $200 per sq. ft. the value would be around $800,000.

On the topic of property values, one of the concerns was the property values plummeting. I did a little research and on the exhibit you see those properties that are within the rural agrarian section, #6 is Pescara and was plotted in 2016, with lot sizes 10,400. Bella Flor was plotted in 2005 with lot sizes twice as big and over 20,000 sq. ft. This project was built before Pescara. The lot highlighted shows in 2014, a home sold for $785,000. The home on the south sold in 2015 for almost the same price, $779,500. In 2018, in the same subdivision, a house sold for $983,000 and another for $1,079,000. This was two years after Pescara was plotted and built. This helps illustrate that values still go up even after development. We are confident what we are proposing will be a nice development. We have listened to the neighbors, and have heard their concerns. We have made considerable concessions to our plan. We still think that it fits within the intentions of the guidelines that we have to follow.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN has a couple of questions. Why is there no housing product being brought forth?

APPLICANT, SETH KEELER responded, due to the opposition in this case they do not have a builder at this time until it has been approved.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN next question is directed to staff. If this is approved by the Planning Commission and Council, will this have to come back to through for housing product?
DAVID DE LA TORRE confirmed they would need to submit a new preliminary development plan (PDP) application for the housing product.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN asked what the restrictions would be if it gets to that point?

DAVID DE LA TORRE informed the commissioners that they have the ability to add stipulations. It would affect the future preliminary development plan (PDP) submittal for the housing product. Staff has proposed stipulations such as all homes be single story, setbacks to be identified, wider side yards to be grouped together and maximum height of 15 ft. to accessory structures.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN clarified that commission has the prerogative to be able to make changes for the future and when the applicant goes to sell this to a builder, they would know what the restrictions are going to be and the only way it can be changed would be to come back and redo the (PAD).

DAVID DE LA TORRE concurred.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN turned floor over to the audience, starting with JESSICA SARKISSIAN, who was allotted time to speak for the majority of the homeowners.

JESSICA SARKISSIAN is with Upfront Planning and Entitlements located at 2733 North Power Road Suite 102 in Mesa AZ 85215. She is here on behalf of many of the homeowners in the audience. She stated the first site plan presented by applicant was 27 lots that they reduced it due to the removal of a parcel that was not purchased. They had to drop 10 lots because they did not have the parcel and they had to put a street in. The second plan with 21 lots did not meet City’s requirements. In order to meet the retention requirements of the Southeast Chandler Area Plan and provide that open space that is adequate, they had to remove all the lots along that road.

The map presented is the Mountain View Estates PAD with the surrounding red signatures for the three quarters of opposition. The list of signatures of opposition was provided from neighboring community such as Vasaro and the surrounding area. This site does not fit the Southeast Chandler Area Plan due to size and location. This is the reason the neighbors are frustrated with the plan that is currently being proposed.

The proposed developments that the applicant mentioned such as Orchard Heights has some of the smaller lots in that area and are similar to what is being proposed. It is next to a county large lot with agricultural uses. It is not residential on that side, it is agricultural and farming. It is also a gated community.

The applicant presented Whispering Heights, a county large lot gated community that has transition. The smallest lot there is 75 feet wide, which is larger than what is currently being proposed. The lots there go to 140 and 156.

The applicant also mentioned Lucinda. Lucinda is a gated community. It is surrounded by county industrial uses with self-storage and is why this is smaller. It has no opposition, no neighbors to buffer; it is in the middle of an industrial spot and a county island.
Then you have Pescara, which is also a gated community. The lots here are at 80 feet wide.

I also have Bellazia, which is out of the Southeast Chandler Area Plan and it meets the requirements. When meeting with staff about adjacent property to the Southeast Chandler Area Plan, you are often asked to comply and get as close to the requirements to provide that transition. Despite not being part of the Southeast Chandler Area Plan, it has large lots and is gated with 85 x 130 lots and 90 x 120.

Mission Estates is part of the Southeast Chandler Area Plan in the traditional category. It is also a larger gated lot community with 85 x 150-lot size, which is larger lot size than what is being proposed.

What these exemplify is they are all in the rural category, they all are large lots and are larger than what is being proposed here.

Then you have the comparable non-PDA development standards that the current proposal does not meet the standard zoning requirements. It is not keeping with the Southeast Chandler Area Plan and is why the neighbors are upset. The concern is when putting the height at 22 ft. you are getting lofts. Technically, it is not a second story because it lacks the windows. Even though they are grouping the larger sides together, it will leave the smaller lots together on the other side leaving only about 10 ft. between homes. For an area of this size, it leaves a very narrow space between homes, giving it a more wall effect for the back of the homes. The plan lot coverage does not exceed 20% for parcels less than 2 acres. If you have more than 2 acres, it is 10%. The site proposed is 55%, which is 15% higher than traditional, which is only at 40%. It reads, “No rezoning of land use of permit and entitlement should be authorized in southeast Chandler unless a finding has been met with the proposed project and is in substantial compliance with the applicable provisions of the area plan, zoning code and general plan.” Substantial compliance does not mean two out of five, it means four out of five and we feel the proposed plan currently is closer to 5 out of 10. It also says, we feel the project is in conflict with the vision and intent of the Southeast Chandler Area Plan and detrimental to the existing properties and home values. We request that the commission respect that and continue to uphold those portions of it.

Requirements in the Southeast Chandler area plan:

- 45 ft. wide setbacks from curve this assumes a fence line; not met.
- The proposed plan has no fence, no separation from Riggs Road.
- Minimum 10 ft. side yards, 20 ft. separation; not met.

Requirements in Chandler for all PADs: vehicular access to rear yards must be screened with a 6ft. fence. The retention basins are rectangular and need to be screened from the street with visual setbacks and staggers. These are not met. The proposed plan has no fence.

There are 21 element options to choose from and the requirement is to provide 10. The applicant provided seven and only two were practically feasible...

The landscape open spaces must be visible from arterial street and residential street view.
The continual landscape tract needs to be half the total frontage, along the arterial with the depth of the lot average. It is actually 86-feet; it does not meet that requirement although it is large.

Minimum 25 ft. landscape along fences are not met. Then there are the general subdivision feature.

Out of 18 required points, residential development standards only seven are met with the optional required. The plan is being pushed in as a PAD with smaller lot sizes, which does not fit the requirements of the area plan. Only one out of the five southeast Chandler requirements meets the vision and intent. We feel this is not substantial conformance to suit the requirements to put a traditional project lots size in the rural agrarian character area. It needs to be proposed with developmental standards able to accommodate a vision of the Southeast Chandler Area Plan and the intent of the regional development standards to maintain the development design integrity in Chandler. We intend to get better character, design and development. That is why these policies were put in place to have that happen. I am also able to provide aerial shots of the properties mentioned.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN requested to see the aerial shots.

AUDIENCE, JESSICA SARKISSIAN presented the aerial shots, with examples of larger lot sizes in and next to the Southeast Chandler Area Plan. Starting with Orchard Heights next to the county on the south. Then on the east is county; that is why, there is the allowance of 60 ft. wide with nothing to buffer. Next is Lucinda, it is next to some trailers. Then there is Whispering Heights, you can see the transitional going from 75 and on the borders on the east you have 166 ft. wide lots next to the larger 165 and on the south they actually went all the way up to 140 next to those. Mission Estates is 185 ft., and is 120 ft. on north side and on the county. Pescara is 180 ft. x 130, 80 x 130 and 125 x 185, these are larger and a gated community as well. The northern lots are 85 x 130 are deeper. Although it is not part of the Southeast Chandler Area Plan, it meets the intent.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN asked if there were any further questions for the audience speaker.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROSE expressed they would like to see a housing product showing what is included and price point. He also asked, if this was going to be a gated community?

AUDIENCE, JESSICA SARKISSIAN answered that it was not proposed as one right now.

COMMISSIONER PEKRAU stated his frustration with the proposal. It is not just rezoning. It is annexation. The City has to see the value of how it is going to fit into the design of the neighborhood that is surrounding it. He felt there was a right to concern due to the compelling evidence of the density of housing budding to the surrounding communities. He felt they are not adhering to what that looks like, when looking at density per unit while crossing major roads such as Lindsay and Riggs roads. He asked, if there was any other options? He stated if they were a PAD before PDP, they could do a design review. He asked if there are any other design option reviews for this. He felt it does not meet the design intent of what the square mile is.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN wanted confirmation that the P&Z Commission has the capability to place stipulations.
KEVIN MAYO responded yes, but that there is more to it. He said, that tonight they are looking at subdivision layout and landscape design, which are design elements. He said that if the commission was not comfortable making a decision it could be submitted to the DRC to study.

COMMISSIONER PEKAUU then asked if they could stipulate the density per acre, if it was to be approved tonight and if they could stipulate it to be 1.8 or 1.9 to match the surrounding area.

KEVIN MAYO replied that to do that it would require dropping the number of lots.

COMMISSIONER PEKAUU clarified that it was not the number of lots but the density of the surrounding neighborhoods.

KEVIN MAYO responded, the density is calculated by the number units per acre and not a lot size calculation, you can stipulate a minimum lot size calculation which would have the effect on density. He added that it would be better and more efficient for the applicant and citizens to have the design go for a more focused review of the design that would result in larger lots.

COMMISSIONER FLANDERS had a question for staff. He asked if the intent for the Southeast Area Plan was to provide a mix of different dwelling unit sizes. Everything he has seen provides a good blend of density and when he first saw this plan, he did not have an issue with it because it fell below the minimum for the southeast area plan. Was the intent for the area plan?

DAVID DE LA TORRE responded it was correct. He said the general intent for the Southeast Chandler Area Plan was to provide diverse options for housing products while at the same time creating a low-density area with open spaces that are visible from the arterial street and to retain the agricultural heritage of the area. The idea was to keep it low density but to allow diverse products and different lot sizes within that low density generalization.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN turned it over to the first speaker card.

STEVE PETTIGREW – was observing.

IN FAVOR of ITEM A: DVR17-0034/PLT17-0067 MOUNTAIN VIEW ESTATES
ROMMIE MOJAHED

IN FAVOR of ITEM A: DVR17-0034/PLT17-0067 MOUNTAIN VIEW ESTATES
LEONARD DAVIS, 24012 S 150th STREET states he lives on five acres, neighbors are on varied acreage of properties. Leonard is in support of this project and does believe the variety and sizes of properties/homes is a good thing.

OPPOSED – DID NOT SPEAK - ITEM A: DVR17-0034/PLT17-0067 MOUNTAIN VIEW ESTATES
TERRI K. LOVELL, ERIC HERRMAN, PHIL JOSSI, CAROLYN JOSSI, DEIDRE RUSSELL, PAMELA HERRMAN, KALONA NEWCOMB, AUBREY DEMOTF, KALINA, GUNJAN GOEL, LORI SMITH, THOMAS SMITH, TERI JACOBSON, SHIRLEY DAHMEN-GERK, JERRY Gerk
OPPOSED – YIELD TIME TO JESSICA - ITEM A: DVR17-0034/PLT17-0067
MOUNTAIN VIEW ESTATES
SHUOLN LINDY, MAROUN ISHAC, FLORA FONG, MONIQUE CLOUTIER-ISHAE, RICHARD HILDEBRANT, DEANNE HILDEBRANT, TIM SMITH, MARYANN MAKA, THEODORE MAKA, AL STEYER, LYNN STEYER, JUSTIN JACOBSON, ROBERT Lenz, MADISON PETTER, GRACE PETTER, MAKENZEE PETTER, ARLNOD PETTER, JIANGKAI ZUO

OPPOSED –ITEM A: DVR17-0034/PLT17-0067 MOUNTAIN VIEW ESTATES

ROBERT O'HARA, 4321 E TAURUS PL stated he is the President of his homeowners association and a Chairman of the design review committee of Vasaro. He said he sympathizes with their dilemma of dealing with codes, policies and guidelines; he has to do the same in regards to CC&R's, which are the equivalent of our codes and our design guidelines. The City has done many things of which he is proud and they have gotten many awards over the past many years. He added that much of that is due to the work that is done right here by you on this commission. He said the board of directors voted unanimously to oppose this particular development plan because of the many reasons stated previously. He said they do support the annexation of the county land and the development of it. It should be in the same character as the surrounding communities. In his opinion, the current plan being proposed would slow the appreciation of the surrounding areas and communities and would have a direct effect on the property taxes assessed and collected. He urges the commission tonight to support what they have done in the past in the development of that Southeast Chandler Area Plan.

LAURA NEWCOMB, 5900 S GEMSTONE DRIVE stated she is a resident and business owner in Chandler and moved from Gilbert two years ago. She loves the community and the lots in Vasaro are highly sought after. Ms. Newcomb opposes the development presented. She said the applicant came out and brought a pole to measure the heights. She did not know when this happened and was unaware of any follow up. She is most concerned with the setbacks on the side yard, since it backs up to her wall. She states she lives in Chandler on purpose. She loves the community and her business is in Chandler.

REID JACOBSON, 4133 E SCORPIO PL he stated the plan presented did not include all the variations. Mr. Jacobson said he spoke to a predecessor of MR DE LA TORRE and he mentioned there was no way they were going to approve 21 houses. This is the reason why we wound up with the plan discussed.

We suggested putting up a pole to see how high this would be from our yards. The applicant contacted the President of the community, Arnold Patter a week later and mentioned they were willing to come out and do that. The applicant came out and measured Arnold’s house and then they measured the home next to Arnold’s. When they measured his home, it was 40 ft. up the common fence and 65 ft. up the common fence. At the second meeting, we asked if they could do more, they surely could do that with a 150-foot deep lot, which certainly is enough for a house. We never heard back until a week later when Arnold received an email from Seth, with the applicant stating they are going with the 40 ft. There was no further discussion, or compromises. We would have love to discuss the setbacks and lighting, but no effort was made to listen to our community. Now we are hear with a product that is being presented today.
There has been discussion that our property is 1.98 per acre that is not the case; they looked at recorder’s office, listed measurements on plat plan states bigger than half acre. They have a retention pond that is next to a play area that is almost an acre.

He looked at Orchid Heights; there was one meeting for the neighbors and one person showed up. There was no opposition due to the fact there is one house on 30 acres. With respect to $800,000 homes. Who is going to move in on a quarter of an acre with 4,000 sq. ft. house and spend that money? He opposes this product in their area.

CARYOLYN BRACE 4320 E TAURUS PL, moved 10 months ago from North Carolina to Chandler, due to the uniqueness to the properties and opposes the project

APPLICANT WITH CLOSING REMARKS, Wanted to clarify points on the guidelines that Jessica presented. When the builders come to start project those items would be addressed. With the neighborhood meeting, REID mentioned to get some polling done. I met with ARNOLD and used the polling as reference points. Seth apologized to Mr. Jacobson for the chuckle. That was not his intentions to make fun. When they reached out to neighbors they heard their concerns, however, there would be still an obstruction to the view whether it is 7 or 4 lots. The property they control is the narrow one. Pat Vessels lived there when Falcon Estates was being built. His complaint was that Falcon Estates was taking away his views. He understands the concerns from the neighbors. Through his research, they feel they have addressed many of those concerns.

COMMISSIONER PEKAU was concerned how many lots on the north side were obstructing the view, and the concern was its density. Lots 5, 6, 7 will back up to comparison to one of those houses. There is legitimate concerns and suggested taking the case to Design Review.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN stated the last meeting was June 12, 2018, eleven months ago. Was there a reason why it came to commission then to council without any recent neighborhood outreach/meeting?

APPLICANT, SETH KEELER stated that after they set up poles, he did reach back out to that particular group. He tried calling and emailing the group. Jessica informed him they had hired her to represent the neighborhood. They did not want to meet again. Then they decided to meet with P&Z Commission and City Council, since they were not getting any feedback from neighbors.

COMMISSIONER KIMBLE mentioned it looks like both parties have done a lot of work and effort to bring this to fruition. Perhaps, since they have worked with different groups, maybe a committee can be formed so they can come up with a plan that everyone can agree.

COMMISSIONER PEKAU stated he has no problem with the density, but has concerns with the setbacks between houses and lot coverage. Does not like the 55% coverage but does like the shape of the lots. Suggests a Design Review committee will help clear up any concerns.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROSE stated this could be a special subdivision in his opinion. Down the road on Riggs; there is timeless architecture; expensive homes. Since commission is the recommending body to council, he suggests working with neighbors and developers.
COMMISSIONER KIMBLE inquired if they are looking at three different proposals. Plan Area Development from AG to PAD as one, then from a PDP as another. Are these combined or separate motions?

DAVID DE LA TORRE confirmed they are three separate motions that are being requested tonight. Commission has the prerogative to decide whether to act the same on all three or treat each on differently.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN appreciates all comments from audience and commission. Stated concerns about project, big believer in communicating. Density is an issue, agrees with VICE CHAIRMAN ROSE in terms without housing product. Things need to be stipulated very carefully. Does not like to continue items but agrees with COMMISSIONER PEKAU this should go to a Design Review Committee. Suggests Planning & Zoning Commission date of July 17, 2019, to give time to work with applicant; if that is not enough time can extend to later date.

CHAIRMAN PEKAU MOTION to move DVR17-0034/PLT17-0067 MOUNTAIN VIEW ESTATES, to Design Review then to Planning and Zoning Commission on July 17, 2019, second by COMMISSIONER FLANDERS. The motioned pass 5 – 0.

B. PLH19-0007 SANTAN OFFICE CAMPUS

Approved.

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 for commercial retail and hotel zoning. The existing zoning is PAD for office park with ancillary retail and restaurant uses, including a Mid-Rise Overlay for building height up to 75 feet and located at the southwest corner of Alma School and Pecos roads.

REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION
Planning staff finds that a PAD zoning time extension for three years is consistent with the General Plan and the office park use is still appropriate; staff therefore recommends approval.

PUBLIC / NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATION
- This request was noticed in accordance with the requirements of the Chandler Zoning code.

- A neighborhood meeting was held on March 28, 2019. No one attended other than the applicant.
- As of writing this memo, Planning staff is unaware of any concerns or opposition to the request.

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Planning and Zoning Commission and Planning staff recommend the City Council approve the request to extend the timing condition for three (3) years with all of the conditions in the original approval remaining in effect.
VICE CHAIRMAN ROSE inquired about how long the lot will be vacant.

MS. LAUREN SCHUMANN stated they would be following the phasing timeline.

COMMISSIONER PEKAU inquired if there were any pushback on the 75ft height; any impact on the flight plan/path for the banner project that is on the opposite corner.

COMMISSIONER PEKAU also expressed concern on road expansion due to traffic on other projects.

C. PLH19-0010 NATES NEXT GEN AUTO CARE LLC

Approved.

The request is for Use Permit approval to continue operation of an auto repair facility within the Planned Industrial District (I-1) zoning district. The existing business is located at 4043 W. Kitty Hawk, Suite 5, south of Chandler Boulevard and west of McClintock Drive.

REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION
Planning staff has reviewed the request finding consistency with the General Plan and Planned Industrial District (I-1) zoning with Use Permit approval. An auto repair facility is a compatible use with the industrial park development. Use Permits have been approved in the same industrial park for automotive sales, vehicle repair, and customization businesses. The business has limited hours of operation and stores vehicles within a warehouse not affecting on-site parking. All repair work takes place indoors and typically by appointment only.

The Planning and Zoning Commission and Planning staff recommend the City Council approve the Use Permit subject to conditions. No further time condition is recommended.

PUBLIC/NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATION
- This request was noticed in accordance with the requirements of the Chandler Zoning Code.
- A neighborhood/property owner notification letter was mailed out in lieu of a meeting due to the lack of residential in close proximity.
- Planning staff received one phone call stating opposition to the request due to safety along the block, specifics were not provided about safety. Staff was unable to make a return call to address their issue since the caller left no phone number, address, or name.

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Planning and Zoning Commission and Planning staff recommend the City Council approve PLH19-0010 NATE’S NEXT GEN AUTO CARE LLC, subject to the following conditions:

1. Substantial expansion or modification beyond the approved attachments (Site Plan, Floor Plan, Elevations, and Narrative) shall void the Use Permit and require new Use Permit application and approval.

2. All vehicle repair/servicing/upgrades shall occur only within the building. Overnight storage of vehicles waiting for servicing shall occur only in the gated rear yard service area. No work or storage of vehicles to be performed outside of the gated rear yard area.
3. The Use Permit is non-transferable to any other property.

4. The site shall be maintained in a clean and orderly manner.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER PEKAU seconded by COMMISSIONER KIMBLE to approve Items B PLH19-0007 SANTAN OFFICE CAMPUS and Items C PLH19-0010 NATES NEXT GEN AUTO CARE LLC read in on the consent agenda. The motion passed 5 – 0

6. DIRECTOR’S REPORT

KEVIN MAYO clarified that item A Mountain View Estates, listed on May 15, 2019, Planning & Zoning Commission agenda will be on the June 13, 2019, City Council agenda as a continuance item; It is not going before council for approval. It will go before the Planning & Zoning Commission on July 17, 2019, and presented on the August 8, 2019, City Council. They have to formally continue the item on the agenda.

7. CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENT

Next regular meeting is June 5, 2019 at 5:30 P.M. in the Chandler City Council Chambers, 88 East Chicago Street, Chandler, Arizona.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:06 p.m.

Rick Heumann, Chairman
Kevin Mayo, Secretary
MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CHANDLER, ARIZONA, June 5, 2019, held in the City Council Chambers, 88 E. Chicago Street.

1. Chairman Heumann called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance led by Commissioner Klob.

3. The following Commissioners answered Roll Call:
   Chairman Rick Heumann
   Vice Chairman David Rose
   Commissioner Robert Klob
   Commissioner Michael Flanders

   Absent/Excused:
   Commissioner Matt Eberle
   Commissioner Gregg Pekau
   Commissioner George Kimble

   Also, present:
   Mr. Kevin Mayo, Planning Administrator
   Mr. David de la Torre, Planning Manager
   Ms. Lauren Schumann, Senior City Planner
   Ms. Susan Fiala, City Planner
   Ms. Stephanie Watney, City Planner
   Mr. Michael Gildenstern, City Planner
   Mr. Zachary Werdean, Planning Technician
   Ms. Jenny Winkler, City Attorney
   Mr. Thomas Allen, Assistant City Attorney
   Ms. Cathy Flores, Clerk
   Ms. Elisa Thompson, Clerk

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   MOVED BY VICE CHAIR ROSE, seconded by COMMISSIONER FLANDERS to approve the minutes of the May 15, 2019, Planning Commission Hearing. The motion passed 3-0. COMMISSIONER KLOB was absent at the May 15, 2019 Planning and Commission Hearing and ABSTAINED from the vote.

5. ACTION ITEMS:
   CHAIRMAN HEUMANN informed the audience prior to the meeting, Commission and Staff met in an open Study Session to discuss each of the items on the agenda. He stated all Items will be read into the record and voted on in a single motion, other than the Mariposa Project, Item A.

   A. DVR18-0008/PLT18-0031 MARIPOSA


   Request rezoning of approximately 5 acres from Agricultural District (AG-1) and approximately 19.2 acres from Planned Area Development (PAD) for multi-family to PAD for single-family residential with Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) for subdivision layout and housing product and Preliminary Plat (PLT) approval. The site is located at the northwest corner of Queen Creek
The Design Review Committee (DRC) reviewed the subdivision layout and housing product at their May 8, 2019 meeting. The discussion focused primarily on building architecture with several comments on the layout. Several concerns expressed for the applicant’s team to evaluate and modify related to the housing product included: rooflines, building materials placement, use of architectural design elements, massing of homes along Queen Creek road, windows, to name a few. Modifications to the elevations have occurred based on these comments provided by the DRC. Guest parking availability near cluster and paired homes, use of site features to memorialize history of Dobson Farm, and access to the subdivision were voiced.

REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION
Planning staff has reviewed the request finding consistency with the General Plan. Due to the infill nature of the site, the Residential Development Standards (RDS) for subdivision layout are not applicable. However, the RDS guidelines remain applicable to the architectural design of the homes. The proposed single family residential subdivision meets the intent of development standards and residential design guidelines. Given the irregularly shaped site, three housing products are proposed to provide diversity and a transition from existing single family homes and to the existing commercial shopping center. Planning staff recommends the Planning and Zoning Commission recommend approval subject to conditions.

PUBLIC/ NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATION
• This request was noticed in accordance with the requirements of the Chandler Zoning Code.
• Two neighborhood meetings were held on April 17, 2018 and February 26, 2019. Residents in attendance were from the Clemente Ranch single family subdivision. They expressed opposition to the proposed development due to the smaller sized lots, the perceived ‘substandard’ homes, density, to name a few. One resident called Planning staff to state their strong opposition to the development and prefers the original multi-family development to occur. Applicant sent an email response to questions generated from the two meetings. No further inquiries comments have been received.
• Public hearing notices were sent out on May 6, 2019. Staff has not received further comments, concerns or opposition to date of the writing of this memo.

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Planning staff recommends Planning and Zoning Commission motion to recommend approval of DVR18-0008 MARIPosa, subject to the following conditions:

1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with the Development Booklet, entitled “Mariposa” and kept on file in the City of Chandler Planning Division, in File No. DVR18-0008, modified by such conditions included at the time the Booklet was approved by the Chandler City Council and/or as thereafter amended, modified or supplemented by the Chandler City Council.

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.

5. Construction shall commence above foundation walls within three (3) years of the effective date of the ordinance granting this rezoning or the City shall schedule a public hearing to take administrative action
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to extend, remove or determine compliance with the schedule for development or take legislative action to cause the property to revert to its former zoning classification.

6. 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.

7. The covenants, conditions and restrictions (CC & R's) to be filed and recorded with the subdivision shall mandate the installation of front yard landscaping within 180 days from the date of occupancy with the homeowners' association responsible for monitoring and enforcement of this requirement.

8. Homebuilder will advise all prospective homebuyers of the information on future City facilities contained in the City Facilities map found at www.chandleraz.gov/infomap, or available from the City's Communication and Public Affairs Department. The homebuilder shall post a copy of the City Facilities map in the sales office showing the location of future and existing City facilities.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN turned the floor to the applicant, RALPH PEW.

APPLICANT, RALPH PEW is located in Mesa, AZ. Introduced his staff in attendance: representatives of The New Home Company: Chris Katy and Connie Dean, and planners with CBL, Chris Lindell and Kurt Johnson. The applicant requested that the commission start with the speakers first.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN stated he had a couple of speaker cards. Two of which shared the same name and address, NEIL AND MAUREEN MCAFREY.

IN FAVOR of ITEM A: DVR18-0008/PLT18-0031 MARIPOSA
NEIL AND MAUREEN MCAFREY, 13999 N RIM TRAIL confirmed they were both in favor and did not wish to speak.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN turned it over to the next speaker card.

OPPOSED of ITEM A: DVR18-0008/PLT18-0031 MARIPOSA
ALICE MOORE, 2941 S SEAN DRIVE stated she lived three houses in from Queen Creek down the street from Bogle Junior High School. A big concern for her is the traffic situation. She works from home and every day she hears tires screeching on the corner of Sean Drive and Queen Creek. She sees people trying to make right and left hand turns; mothers and fathers trying to pick up their kids. They park in her neighborhood due to lack of parking at the school. She said they come in and they drive through her neighborhood and park along to pick up their kids. She stated sometimes there are 10 to 15 cars lined up trying to get out of the neighborhood. Her concern is that the traffic situation once these homes go in will add another two to three hundred cars, trying to get out. She states there is a very small window on which you can make left hand turns now. He fear is that window will be gone and her other fear is that they won’t even be able to make right hand turns anymore. Especially on the busier parts of the day which, she states is really when parents come to pick up their kids from school, that is a big concern for her. She was told by city staff, that they don’t need another light there as there is one right down the street. She stated that the light does not help the area that she is at and that is a huge safety concern as well as a convenience concern, being able to just get out of her driveway. The other concern she has with the subdivision plan is the one street that goes along the green belt is named, Sean as well and she already has a hard time getting her mail as it is. The final concern she has, pertains to her fencing. She has 180 feet of fence that runs along the parameter of a subdivision line and she is dealing with some litigation right now that is turning out to be very costly, any damaging to the foundations is a concern and she would also like to know what kind of screening they are going to do as far as landscaping behind her home. Her understanding is there are going to be planting deciduous trees. She was hoping for evergreen, as she is not that thrilled about the product that they are putting in. She states they are all two story homes without variation in height, it will look too institutional and that will be her view from her backyard every day.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN asked if there were any further comments.
ALICE MOORE added that there was also a drainage situation as well behind homes, 71 through 80. Approximately 4 months ago they experienced two rains in a row and they had 8 feet of water there. Getting enough drainage in that area is another concern for her.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN asked if there were any further comments or questions for the speaker. He wanted to make sure there wasn’t anyone else that wished to speak regarding Item A before they move over to the applicant. CHAIRMAN HEUMANN then turned the floor to the applicant, RALPH PEW.

APPLICANT, RALPH PEW stated they had several neighborhood meetings and thanked her for her participation in those meetings as well. He would like to start with addressing her concerns. First, in regards to traffic predominately on Queen Creek Road, he stated that it is a concern that exists today in the San Clemente neighborhood and he said it was important to recognize the really unusual shaped property it is the remnants of the Adoption Ranch Headquarters. Right now he stated it can be developed with good product and good designed for 354 multi-family apartments, which is what it was approved for in 1995. Instead of this high number it is going to a significantly less traffic impact number with 199 homes going in instead of the higher number of apartments. There is also no interconnectivity between the neighborhood and San Clemente Ranch. Queen Creek Road will have more traffic not matter what is being belt there. He certainly doesn’t feel it will cause a traffic problem. In respect to construction they did respond to the neighbors questions and sent an email with answers. When the construction work begins on the site or any site in the City of Chandler they must comply with the time frames of work to be completed. They have spoken to the neighbors about that and fully intend to have our contractors comply within those time requirements. Landscaping is an important issue as he showed on his presentation the setbacks distances from the western most property. It is lots 71 through 80 that MS MOORE was concerned about on the far west side. He stated the separation in the existing wall of the single family homes and the back wall of our single family homes is 67 feet in that location. It will be designed to handle drainage, it will landscaped according to the detailed landscape plan that they have presented and as they have stated on their neighborhood meetings they have to comply with the civil engineers and they have to design for the standards and requirements for the city. They do not intend to cause a drainage problem here, they intend to design it correctly as Chandler would require them to. The other comment made in regards to Sean Drive, shown on the current presentation/plan has been changed. The far western road that runs north and south has been changed to, South Navajo Way.

The issue today, is that the case comes forward with the recommendation of approval. They have been working on design solutions for a year for a very complicated site. The design has led to the lots in the presentation shown in yellow. They are the typical detached single family homes. They fit with the square area and fit well closer to the single family residential homes to the west and to the north. Then the question became what could they do with whatever space they had left. It was very difficult. The parent home concept, the homes seen in orange, 98 to 199 on the northern part of the property. Those are the parent home concept that the New Home Company uses. They were asked many questions regarding the location of the cluster homes during the study session. There is only approximately 38 out of 199 homes that are cluster homes in the project. They are able to fit within the most unusual spots.

In regards to the feedback they have received on the stone from COMMISSIONER FLANDERS they do agree with this request and would comply with the stipulation. The other issue raised during the study session was by COMMISSIONER KLOB. They can also comply with the request for changes on the side elevations he was concerned about. The most difficult aspect of the comments at the study session deal with the cluster home parking. He stated that it was important to note that the overall project exceeds the parking requirements from the city standard and code. They have looked at this and visited with their consultants during the break and tried to look at this and see how can they reconfigure this and have not found a way they can reconfigure the parking in a way that it would be significant enough to satisfy the request made during the study. He shared that CHRIS KATY’s experience as the head of the New Home Company in Arizona has showed that it does generally work. He stated that the way it is designed here with only two units in each of those six groupings, having no apron to park on since there is no drive way area. It is manageable and it works, you do have to cooperate with your neighbor. He stated there is no other standard for them to try to implement. They have put the parking where it needs to be, they have designed the streets width to what the city standards are, curb to curb distances are correct and they exceed the overall parking necessary for the project. He requested that the commissioners move this project forward to the city council with the recommendation for approval. If the
commission felt inclined to state their concerns about the parking, they do not have the solutions for it. He stated it was a very standard arrangement for parking and they have designed it to meet those requirements. He added that it was a good transition mix between single-family and shopping in Clemente Ranch and felt it was a better use of the land than a multi-family apartment project at this location. They particularly have spent time at the Alma School frontage on how to get access there, how to cooperate with the commercial site to our self, to provide shared access, to widen it out a bit so the residents can get in and the trucks can get in. They are working on resolving this issue with Queen Creek Road.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN asked if they had any questions.

COMMISSIONER FLANDERS asked a question directed to staff regarding the parking and traffic concerns. He asked if the fire department had looked at the right of way which curbs along Queen Creek Road with areas that are 24 feet, as far as getting access with a chance of someone parking in that no parking area. He asked if they knew what they did and if there were any comments made related to that.

KEVIN MAYO responded that the depth is something that is dictated by the fire codes simply because the fire department will not pull a truck down there. They will stage at the end and pull the hose down. The 24 feet is driven by two traffic requirements and not the fire department width inside a cluster or six pack.

COMMISSIONER FLANDERS thanked KEVIN MAYO for answering his question.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN asked if there were further question.

COMMISSIONER KLOB stated that one of his major concerns was the challenges with the single family cluster design in the middle lot and what he is trying to avoid is creating a stipulation, that there is a 24 foot driveway allocated for those middle lots and create a project redesign for those units. If there is no other way to get the parking that is the way he is starting to lean. He stated there is more thought that needs to be put in to create a more workable situation and to give the homes similar features that their neighbors have as well.

APPLICANT, RALPH PEW asked for clarification. He asked in regards to not having any way to design and configure parking the stipulation would say to the affect that, the middle units with clusters of six must provide an apron of parking 20 feet in length or somewhere near that.

COMMISSIONER KLOB confirmed that is the stipulation he is leaning towards. He stated that the units on the north are more challenging because of the long runs with minimal guest parking, he sees a lot of challenges with parking on this site as he mentioned during study session: he likes the concept, the overall design and for the most part the homes. He also clarified that as previously applicant, RALPH PEW mentioned during his presentation the feedback received by the commissioner was not only for the side elevations but for the front elevations as well and he felt the parking situation needed to be looked at a little bit harder.

VICE CHAIR ROSE asked applicant, RALPH PEW if he was going to address the drainage concern brought up on the 67 feet that speaker, ALICE MOORE home backs to. He asked if he was going to talk to her and let her know what they would do to ensure that there is no floods or pools back there.

RALPH PEW stated he would see if one of his consultants could help understand how it is been designed but added the 67 feet included drainage and landscaping. He stated he is not able to describe the slope, width or depth but he had spent significant time with city staff and with engineering especially on this topic. He didn’t know if his consultants had a better answer as it has been through the process and engineering has looked at this.

VICE CHAIR ROSE asked if one of the consultants could speak to the resident directly and explain the drainage in further detail. He stated he likes the project. He also likes the professionally run HOA who he felt would need to police the parking, if there is nothing that can be changed.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN stated he had a couple of comments. He stated that fixing the site elevations, stone and the trees along Queen Creek Road are easy to do. He added that in regards to the trees he would like to see live oak on not trees that lose all their leaves. He stated that the parking is really an issue. He asked staff if this
would need to be continued to allow time to take a look at the parking and come up with alternatives. He stated that the dais would not be able to come up with a stipulation that would work for the staff as it would be too ambiguous. He then asked KEVIN MAYO for his input.

KEVIN MAYO responded that they have worked on drainage, architecture and it was not to say that everything was perfect but to state that they have spent a lot of energy looking particularly at guest parking. He added that while the applicant does indicate an internal staff policy. It was written by previous city engineer that dictated a percentage of parking per guest spaces, per unit depending upon different configurations which they met the minimum for. Then he added there is the subjective layer of even distribution which then becomes a judgment call. In terms of this plan, it has evolved. This last year the perimeter road was moved to the northwest to use as a buffer for the subdivision from Clemente Ranch. It ended up cascading into the effect on where the units ended up going and how the circulation went and have been working with the applicant on this. The concern might not be accurately graphically represented of having adequate even distribution of guest parking through the subdivision, what the walking distances are and the like. He asked the commission, if they are working on looking to increase the number and/or looking to provide adequate distribution. If it is the case of proximity to guest parking per units since there is no direction in code and each case that has been done is different from the next. The parcel he added is one of the most irregularly shaped parcels that they have worked on in a really long time. A maximum distance from a unit to a guest parking space would be the commission’s direction to see if they could work with the applicant on. Without that level of direction he would not be able to guide the applicant into working on the parking and asked the commission for what the end goal would be.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN then asked COMMISSIONER KLOB for what his thoughts were.

COMMISSIONER KLOB responded that distribution was the biggest challenge he saw outside of the cluster issues. He looked at Lots 130, 149, the nine houses between them and the road to where the nearest guest parking would be in July when it is 120 degrees. He said it was a long walk and asked if there could be guest parking along the road between 113 and 130 or something along those lines. He reiterated that the distribution was his challenge and stated he did not have a number but no one would want to walk that far in July and asked that if it could be spread out a little bit. He also brought up the question asked during the study by CHAIRMAN HEUMANN if maybe they had tried to pack too much into this property and therefore cannot allocate parking that they might need and that would be for the applicant to decide. He would say no more than 4-5 lots would be a reasonable number but did not know what the distance might be to the nearest guest parking.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN agreed that one of the challenges was the long runs. He indicated that in lots 130, 149 and even 166 you have to go a long way to get to guest parking. One of his concerns is in how much they are trying to get into this parcel with a very unique shape. He added that making these type of changes with the dais it never is successful.

APPLICANT, RALPH PEW responded that it was clear that the residential development standards are generally not completely applicable in a purely in field parcel. He added that if they were looking at this piece and saying why is it tight and why can’t it feel a little bit better: it is all due to configuration, unusual location, the way it surrounds the shopping center and above single family. It is a bypass in field property no matter how the terms were defined. He continued so consequently the residential development standards are not clear to respect to parking but the standards in general could be changed in recognition of the nature to the property. He asked that they would think the same way in regards to the parking. He added that Chandler did a really good job of looking at something and if it feels right, it looks right, it is good and you like it - moving forward. He asked to give the property some leeway because of the configuration and its location. He asked to allow to bring these products into the market, at this location. He requested that they weigh this into their analysis. He added that it was a completely different situation than a nice square or rectangle piece of property and that was something to consider.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN stated that as he had mentioned earlier, they were trying to get too much stuff in there to get it approved and moved to council. He added he was not trying to knock the builder for trying to get as much stuff on there and understood the more units they sell the RI is better. He mentioned COMMISSIONER KLOB’s concern was that in lots 113, 130, 149 and 166 have such a long run. He then asked if the units are necessary or, are able to put parking down there so it is not so spread out. He stated he
had asked staff if there was a way to add parking on the southeast section of the property because that was really the concern. He turned to COMMISSIONER KLOB to confirm it is the long runs.

COMMISSIONER KLOB agreed; outside of the clusters.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN turned the floor to staff.

KEVIN MAYO responded that he would start with addressing the northeastern leg with lots 130, 149 and those kind of long runs before you can get to guest parking before discussing the driveway. He began to describe the two horseshoe loops that wrap around lots 114, 129, 150 and 165. There are landscape tracks out along the main drive as he continued that wraps the entire northern edge and landscape tracks at the ends of those runs lots 114, 129, 150 and 165. He stated that there is probably some ability to steal a little a bit of area on those tracks and slide the units to where the end of the horseshoe; the southern ends against shopping center. They might be able to get the additional 5 feet wider to be able to get to 29 feet wide to curb to curb to allow for parallel guest parking spaces on one side all along the southern edge up against the shopping center. He said they could probably pick up to 5 guest parking spaces, maybe more at each end and they also would have a bank for the southern and northern half. He stated that if they could get clear direction from this, they would be able to craft a stipulation and move forward. He added that the only way he could come up with a driveway was if the applicant was agreeable to a redesign of the housing products of the center lots by moving the garages to the rear of the lot and have a normal driveway on the front of the garage. He added it would be to add driveway to two of the six that do not have driveways but it would take a redesign of the housing product. He said it would be something they could do administratively with a clear direction of what the mission is.

APPLICANT, RALPH PEW concurred with the staff that the units in the horseshoe shape could be moved to create parallel parking and that it was a reasonable approach to that issue. He confirmed with his own staff that the issue with respect to the middle units in the cluster would require a significant amount of: re-architecture, re-design and re-floor plan. He stated they were intentionally done this way, to provide the feel for the cluster that is there and is unable to just say yes, due to it being a lot more complicated.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN asked applicant, RALPH PEW if the lots on 113 that KEVIN MAYO had mentioned, could indeed be moved to allow for parking along Roadrunner Drive.

APPLICANT, RALPH PEW confirmed with his own staff that it was totally doable.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN turned the floor to COMMISSIONER KLOB.

COMMISSIONER KLOB stated his only concern on this was that there was very little landscaping in that grouping of all those homes being attached product. He asked that if they took more of the landscaping away what kind of effect it would have on the visual aspect of the space.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN stated that he was looking at it backing into a shopping center and he wanted to come up with something without continuing the case.

KEVIN MAYO responded that they would be just seeking 5 feet total on the southeastern side and would be taking 2 ½ feet on either side of the banks/landscaping. He said it was far in excess of 10 feet right now on each side of them. They still would have enough landscaping width to have a solid planter for trees and things like that. He added that visually they would not even notice and would be pretty achievable.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN asked KEVIN MAYO if he would be able to work with a stipulation on those lots to say move it an X amount to get parking on Roadrunner and stipulation on terms of the clusters down on the south side from COMMISSIONER KLOB to be able to work with staff to come up with something.

KEVIN MAYO confirmed that they would be able to and they would not need a specific foot of movement they just needed to add the two road names and the lots asking to work with staff to add parallel guest parking spaces to.
CHAIRMAN HEUMANN stated they would be able to do that. He said the big question now is coming up with a stipulation for the clusters.

COMMISSIONER KLOB asked if there was a stipulation that guest parking was no more than 100 feet away from any unit if that could then apply to the cluster as well. He said if this would be a solution as every unit would have the same stipulation whether it’s a single family that is attached or otherwise was that an easier way for staff to move forward. He stated he was open to ideas and suggestions as well.

KEVIN MAYO responded he was looking for a range number and he appreciated the number. His fear with a hard number is that they could hit 105 feet and immediately say we are not consistent with the stipulation. A range would be easier to implement, as each piece has a different dimension all over the place. The cluster conversation in regards to parking, doesn’t seem to be a proximity to the guest parking spaces. He asked if it is, he would like to see if there is any space around the parameter street that they could add additional guest parking spaces. To add to step 2 without identifying or isolating it to the cluster could significantly have a consequence to the site.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN stated that they had solved the problem on the one side, providing a stipulation on stone and some of those things are easy and they could come up with that. He stated the cluster is the biggest challenge and he wasn’t sure what the solution would be.

APPLICANT, RALPH PEW clarified that on the clusters that back up to Queen Creek Road, he took lot 22 as an example. It is about 150 feet from there up to the top lots 20 and 19 where you would have parking. He stated none of those units would be able to work with that at 100 feet to achieve that standard. He said he understood their concern but it works and they had done this before, communities govern themselves and at the end of the day it is 38 units out of 200 and was not significant.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN said he understood that but HOA’s have had a lot of teeth taken away from them by the legislature. He asked how they work with CCR’s for enforcing the parking, people blocking the streets and all those kind of things. He stated they could fine but could not do lots of other things. He asked how this would be written. He said what they have had happen and doesn’t want is the neighbors start calling the city wondering what is going on and then the city gets in the middle of an HOA fight.

APPLICANT, RALPH PEW stated he doesn’t want city staff to be embroiled in a middle of an HOA fight but unfortunately they do get phone calls. They can’t govern that but the legislature has made changes in restrictive covenant, deed restrictions and CCRs on property. He stated that in respect to these by and large is self-governance, it’s the people who live there. The govern themselves, they generally do a very good job of it, it’s not to say that they don’t get a rub here and there, a little conflict. He said he doesn’t think it is as significant as they may assume. He said they know and they are respectful of it, they realize where they live and how it works. He stated they can’t solve it 100 percent even if they provided adequate parking. The neighbors are still going to have a squabble here and there but by and large he said it wasn’t an issue, it just hasn’t been.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN asked if there were any other questions for the applicant.

COMMISSIONER KLOB stated that as far as guest parking for the cluster units the applicant, RALPH PEW had referenced unit 22. He added that it has a 24 foot driveway so it had its own site guest parking spaces as does 20; in the same row, whereas 15 did not. He recognized that if they stipulate that they must have a 24 foot drive at all cluster units it would put a different design in but where it possibly helps is that it takes away issues of guest parking on those streets or next to it. He said that would be the easiest and cleanest way was to create a stipulation that a cluster lot must maintain a 24 foot driveway.

APPLICANT, RALPH PEW asked that maybe adding that cluster units that do not have guest parking must have it within so many feet on the lot. He proceeded to ask the commission for clarification.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN asked if there were any more questions for the applicant before he closed the floor. He said that number one the commission is a recommending body to council and stipulation on the clusters in
terms of insuring parking and changing that, they would be able to make that stipulation. He said that the stipulation would then go to council and if they wanted to get rid of it, they could get rid of it. He said that would help move things along and there is quite a few stipulations that need to be added to try to make a motion. He said they had a stipulation about the stone and COMMISSIONER FLANDERS had a couple to add. COMMISSIONER FLANDERS said that related to the stone, he wanted to make sure that all the housing product had the ability to have that material used on them and not restrictive to a certain product.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN stated that they would just draft a stipulation that would work for that and then asked COMMISSIONER FLANDERS if he had any further stipulations to add to this project.

COMMISSIONER FLANDERS confirmed he did not.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN asked COMMISSIONER KLOB what would be his stipulation on the clusters in round terms.

COMMISSIONER KLOB stated the stipulation on the clusters would require a 24 foot driveway on each unit.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN stated that the stipulation for staff would be to develop additional parking on the peer homes on the lots that were talked about earlier with KEVIN MAYO and he would like to make sure that the trees along Queen Creek Road because there are two different pictures that they have 48” box trees in front of the homes; 15 foot on center, 15 foot of planting to ensure that the hard tree scape is broken up. He talked to the applicant for a little bit regarding the booklet being deceiving as picture shows it and the other does not and confirmed they had two different pictures. He then turned to staff and asked if they were okay with the stipulations.

KEVIN MAYO added there was another stipulation regarding the side and front elevations.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN confirmed that would be another stipulation to be included.

KEVIN MAYO stated that when it came to the 24 foot stipulation, if the applicant decided to raise the issue to council they would be returned to the commission to be worked out as they do not engage into design or detail level discussions. He added that agreement needs to be ironed out to where it is in agreement with the applicant before sending it forward to city council.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN asked when it was going to council.

KEVIN MAYO confirmed it was the 27 of June.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN asked if June 27 was enough time for the applicant to attempt those changes or plead their case to council.

KEVIN MAYO responded it was not. He recommended that the applicant ask for a continuance here and comeback to planning with a solid solution. Instead of sending it forward with a stipulation, trying to work a solution and potentially modify a stipulation, between now and council. He stated that they are either good with that stipulation and they march forward or continue it and address this concern, would be his recommendation.

CHAIRMAN HEUMANN asked the applicant, RALPH PEW if he would like to address this.

APPLICANT, RALPH PEW requested that they continue this case to the next agenda for the 19th of June. It would give them a little bit of time to work with the staff and move forward.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER KLOB to move DVR18-0008/PLT18-0031 MARIPOSA to be continued to Planning and Zoning Commission on June 19, 2019, seconded by COMMISSIONER FLANDERS.
B. PDP18-0019 WATCH TOWER CARWASH AND OFFICES

Approved with stipulation.
Request Preliminary Development Plan approval for site layout and building architecture for a carwash and offices. The approximate 4.45-acre site is located east of the southeast corner of Chandler Boulevard and McQueen Road.

REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION
Planning staff has reviewed the request finding consistency with the General Plan and PAD zoning. The proposal complies with site development and commercial design standards. At both the Planning and Zoning Commission hearing and Design Review Committee, Commissioners stated Phase I should include Building 1 to establish commercial frontage along Chandler Boulevard and ensure the eastern portion develops concurrently with the carwash. Planning staff supports Commission’s decision to add a stipulation if desired. The current proposed phasing plan meets site development standards with regards to required square footage to develop within Phase I. Planning staff recommends the Planning and Zoning Commission approve the PDP for site layout and architecture subject to conditions.

PUBLIC/NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATION
• This request was noticed in accordance with the requirements of the Chandler Zoning Code.
• A neighborhood meeting was held on March 4, 2018. No one attended other than the applicant and Planning staff.
• As of writing this memo, Planning staff has received two phone calls and four emails in opposition of the proposal, see attached emails. Concerns focused on the amount of carwashes in the area and requests for restaurants or housing to be built instead. Existing carwashes in this area include full detail service and self-service but no quick service carwashes. The use of a carwash and offices are permitted under the current zoning. No comments were received pertaining to the PDP for site layout or architecture.

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Planning staff recommends Planning and Zoning Commission motion to recommend approval of the site layout and architecture for PDP18-0019 WATCH TOWER CARWASH AND OFFICES, subject to the following conditions:

1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with the Development Booklet, entitled “Watch Tower Carwash and Offices” and kept on file in the City of Chandler Planning Division, in File No. PDP18-0019, modified by such conditions included at the time the Booklet was approved by the Chandler City Council and/or as thereafter amended, modified or supplemented by the Chandler City Council.

2. Landscaping shall be in compliance with current Commercial Design Standards.

3. The site shall be maintained in a clean and orderly manner.

4. The landscaping shall be maintained at a level consistent with or better than at the time of planting.
5. The landscaping in all rights-of-way shall be maintained by the adjacent property owner or property owners' association.

6. Landscaping plans (including for open spaces, rights-of-way, and street medians) and perimeter walls shall be approved by the Planning Administrator.

7. The landscaping in all open-spaces shall be maintained by the property owner or property owners' association, and shall be maintained at a level consistent with or better than at the time of planting.

8. Perimeter landscaping around the entire site, including Phase II, shall be installed in Phase I.

9. Preliminary Development Plan approval does not constitute Final Development Plan approval; compliance with the details required by all applicable codes and conditions of the City of Chandler and this Preliminary Development Plan shall apply.

10. A comprehensive sign package shall be reviewed and approved through a separate Preliminary Development Plan application.

11. Building 1 shall be constructed as part of Phase One, in lieu of Building 4. Building 1 shall be reviewed administratively and total square footage of Building 1 shall not be less than 5,000 square feet.

SPEAKER DID NOT LEAVE SPEAKER CARD OR SAY NAME AND ADDRESS INTO THE RECORD came up to speak regarding Item B. He came up long after the item had been approved and moved to council.

CHAIRMAN HUEMANN informed the SPEAKER that the item had been on consent. There were no comment cards submitted for this item and he had already turned to the audience if there was anyone wishing to oppose or comment, and no one responded. He confirmed with planning staff the date of the council hearing and let the SPEAKER know that on June 27, 2019 he could come back and attend the council meeting and would need to fill out the yellow comment card and let the council know that he wishes to speak. He confirmed with the CITY ATTORNEY that at this point, this item has already been approved and moved to the council hearing. He also directed the SPEAKER on where he could find the current records of this item online through the City of Chandler website.

SPEAKER stated his and a number of his community members were concerned about all the traffic the carwash would bring.

CHAIRMAN HUEMANN informed the that the carwash has a legal right under C2 Zoning to be there and the item submitted for approval was not regarding whether or not the carwash had a legal right to be there.

DAVID DE LA TORRE stated that staff would be happy to meet with the speaker and give him any information that he wants and answer any questions.

C. ZUP18-0011 CENTRO EVANGELICO FUENTE DE VIDA

Approved.

Use Permit approval to continue operation of a place of worship/church within a Planned Industrial District with a Planned Area Development Overlay (I-1/PAD) zoning district. The
existing business is located at 3260 N. Colorado Street, north and east of the northeast corner of Arizona Avenue and Elliot Road.

REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION
Planning staff finds the continued operation of a church use to be compatible with the mix of uses operating in the business park. Churches have proven compatible in industrial business parks throughout Chandler whether in a multi-building development or on a single parcel. The church is located in a development with adequate access and parking as well as conducting services and activities during days and times which typically occur during non-business hours.

Planning staff has reviewed the request finding consistency with the General Plan and the I-I/PAD zoning with Use Permit approval. Planning staff recommends the Planning and Zoning Commission approve the Use Permit subject to conditions. No further time condition is recommended.

PUBLIC/NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATION
• This request was noticed in accordance with the requirements of the Chandler Zoning Code.
• A neighborhood/property owner notification letter was mailed out in lieu of a meeting due to the lack of residential in proximity.
• As of writing this memo, Planning staff is unaware of any concerns or opposition to the request.

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Planning staff recommends Planning and Zoning Commission motion to recommend approval of ZUP18-0011 CENTRO EVANGELICO FUENTE DE VIDA, subject to the following conditions:

1. Substantial expansion or modification beyond the approved attachments (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 property.
3. The site shall be maintained in a clean and orderly manner.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER KLOB seconded by COMMISSIONER FLANDERS to approve Item B PDP18-0019 WATCH TOWER CARWASH AND OFFICES and Item C ZUP18-0011 CENTRO EVANGELICO FUENTE DE VIDA read in on the consent agenda.

Chairman Heumann – In Favor
Commissioner Klob – In Favor
Vice Chair Rose – In Favor
Commissioner Flanders – In Favor

The motion passed 4 - 0

6. DIRECTOR’S REPORT
Kevin Mayo shared that the City Council had a strategic meeting and planning session. One of the items that came up was a funny recognition. That the city is not equipped to standards and policies necessary to handle in redevelopment properties. A part of a goal for the next start of the fiscal year is going to be presenting policies and code recommendations to city council. As a kick off to this, they are planning a joint City
eCouncil and planning commission meeting. To start the discussion with all being on the same page and directing staff at: guest parking, drive way widths, all the things that we were talking on tonight are will be what we are going to be working on. The two dates that are being targeted right now are: Thursday, August 15th and Thursday, August 29th. Those are not normally planning commission meeting weeks so they are off from our normal planning week. The preferred day at this point is August 15th, it would be at 4:00 pm. It’s going to be some level of facilitated discussion with commission and council. Kevin Mayo anticipated about 2 hours so from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. August 15th being the preferred date and if the schedules don’t align August 29th. Kevin Mayo said they would coordinate by email and wanted to make sure their calendars were clear for this. He was excited to kick this off from the staff’s stand point and would be really good to get direction from council and commission as accumulated body. Chairman Heumann, Vice Chair Rose, Commissioner Flanders and Commissioner Klob agreed the August 15th date would work with their schedule.

7. CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENT

Next regular meeting is June 19, 2019 at 5:30 P.M. in the Chandler City Council Chambers, 88 East Chicago Street, Chandler, Arizona

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:36 p.m.

Rick Heumann, Chairman

Kevin Mayo, Secretary
MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CHANDLER, ARIZONA, June 19, 2019, held in the City Council Chambers, 88 E. Chicago Street.

1. Vice Chairman Rose called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance led by Commissioner Eberle.

3. The following Commissioners answered Roll Call:
   Vice Chairman David Rose
   Commissioner Robert Klob
   Commissioner George Kimble
   Commissioner Gregg Pekau
   Commissioner Matt Eberle
   Commissioner Michael Flanders

   Absent/Excused:
   Chairman Heumann (attended study session only via phone)

   Also, present:
   Mr. David de la Torre, Planning Manager
   Ms. Lauren Schumann, Senior City Planner
   Ms. Kristine Gay, Senior City Planner
   Ms. Susan Fiala, City Planner
   Mr. Michael Gildenstem, City Planner
   Ms. Kelly Schwab, City Attorney
   Mr. Thomas Allen, Assistant City Attorney
   Ms. Elisa Thompson, Clerk

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   MOVE BY COMMISSIONER KLOB, seconded by COMMISSIONER FLANDERS to approve the minutes of the June 5, 2019, Planning Commission Hearing. The motion passed 3-0. COMMISSIONER PEKAU, COMMISSIONER KIMBLE and COMMISSIONER EBERLE were absent at the June 5, 2019 Planning and Commission Hearing and ABSTAINED from the vote.

5. ACTION ITEMS:
   VICE CHAIR ROSE informed the audience prior to the meeting, Commission and Staff met in an open Study Session to discuss each of the items on the consent agenda in detail. He stated all Items will be read into the record and voted on in a single motion and asked if anyone wished to remove any Items from the consent agenda. DAVID DE LA TORRE stated Item A has been pulled for action and is not on the consent agenda.

   B. DVR18-0025 CHANDLER 101

   Approved with added stipulation.
   Rezone from Planned Area Development (PAD) to PAD amended with a Mid-Rise Overlay for a mixed-use office park with commercial land uses, a potential hotel, and future multi-family. Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) approval for conceptual site plan, building elevations, and sign guidelines for the mixed-use office park and commercial phase. The subject site is located at southeast corner of Price Road and Chandler Boulevard.
The vote included an additional stipulation given to the Commission at the Study Session. Planning staff recommended adding a stipulation to the recommended rezoning stipulations. Condition 9: The rezoning request does not include a specified timing condition. This includes relief of the 1-year timing condition from the effective date of the ordinance as specified in the City Code section 35-2603.B.

C. PLH19-0005 REZAMP LLC

Approved with amended stipulation.
Use Permit approval to allow general office uses within a single family residence on property zoned Single-Family District (SF-8.5) located at 484 W. Chandler Boulevard, east of the northeast corner of Chandler Boulevard and Iowa Street.

D. PLH19-0006 REZAMP LLC

Approved with amended stipulation.
Use Permit approval to allow general office uses within a single family residence on property zoned Single-Family District (SF-8.5) located at 456 W. Chandler Boulevard, east of the northeast corner of Chandler Boulevard and Iowa Street.

E. PLH19-0012 HEALING HAND BY HANNAH

Approved.
Use Permit approval to continue to allow a therapeutic massage business within a Planned Industrial District with a Planned Area Development overlay (I-1/PAD) located at 3130 N. Arizona Avenue, Suite 108, west of Arizona Avenue and north of Elliot Road.

F. CANCELLATION OF THE JULY 3, 2019, PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

Approved.

VICE CHAIR ROSE asked if there was anybody that wished to speak on the consent agenda. He stated there was one speaker card received IN FAVOR for Item D and did not wish to speak. He confirmed there was no one else that wished to speak and closed the floor. He confirmed with DAVID DE LA TORRE that for Items C and D the verbiage “onsite” has been added to the stipulation.

DAVID DE LA TORRE confirmed that for both Items C and D, the stipulation number 5 will read, “The maximum number of onsite employees shall not exceed six.”

VICE CHAIR ROSE stated that for Item B in the narrative, CHAIRMAN HEUMANN noticed a correction during the study session. He said it was regarding the midrise overlay height to be 160ft. He confirmed with DAVID DE LA TORRE that it would be revised.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER EBERLE seconded by COMMISSIONER FLANDERS to approve the Items read in on the consent agenda.

Vice Chair Rose – In Favor
Commissioner Klob – In Favor
Commissioner Eberle – In Favor
Commissioner Kimble – In Favor
Commissioner Flanders – In Favor
Commissioner Pekau – In Favor
ACTION:

A. DVR18-0008/PLT18-0031 MARIPOSA

Approved with added stipulation.
Rezoning of approximately 5 acres from Agricultural District (AG-1) and approximately 19.2 acres from Planned Area Development (PAD) for multi-family to PAD for single-family residential. Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) for subdivision layout and housing product. Preliminary Plat for a 199 lot single family residential subdivision located on the northwest corner of Queen Creek and Alma School roads.

REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION
Planning staff has reviewed the request finding consistency with the General Plan. Due to the infill nature of the site, the Residential Development Standards (RDS) for subdivision layout are not applicable. However, the RDS guidelines remain applicable to the architectural design of the homes. The proposed single family residential subdivision meets the intent of development standards and residential design guidelines. Given the irregularly shaped site, three housing products are proposed to provide diversity and a transition from existing single family homes and to the existing commercial shopping center. Planning staff recommends the Planning and Zoning Commission recommend approval subject to conditions.

PUBLIC / NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATION
• This request was noticed in accordance with the requirements of the Chandler Zoning Code.
• Two neighborhood meetings were held on April 17, 2018 and February 26, 2019. Residents in attendance were from the Clemente Ranch single family subdivision. They expressed opposition to the proposed development due to the smaller sized lots, the perceived „substandard” homes, density, to name a few. One resident called Planning staff to state their strong opposition to the development and prefers the original multi-family development to occur. Applicant sent an email response to questions generated from the two meetings. No further inquiries comments have been received.
• Public hearing notices were sent out on May 6, 2019. Staff has not received further comments, concerns or opposition to date of the writing of this memo

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Rezoning
Planning staff recommends Planning and Zoning Commission motion to recommend approval of DVR18-0008 MARIPOSA, subject to the following conditions:

1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with the Development Booklet, entitled “Mariposa” and kept on file in the City of Chandler Planning Division, in File No. DVR18-0008, modified by such conditions included at the time the Booklet was approved by the Chandler City Council and/or as thereafter amended, modified or supplemented by the Chandler City Council.

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.

5. Construction shall commence above foundation walls within three (3) years of the effective date of the ordinance granting this rezoning or the City shall schedule a public hearing to take administrative action to extend, remove or determine compliance with the schedule for development or take legislative action to cause the property to revert to its former zoning classification.

6. 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.

7. The covenants, conditions and restrictions (CC & R's) to be filed and recorded with the subdivision shall mandate the installation of front yard landscaping within 180 days from the date of occupancy with the homeowners' association responsible for monitoring and enforcement of this requirement.

8. Homebuilder will advise all prospective homebuyers of the information on future City facilities contained in the City Facilities map found at www.chandleraz.gov/infomap, or available from the City's Communication and Public Affairs Department. The homebuilder shall post a copy of the City Facilities map in the sales office showing the location of future and existing City facilities.

VICE CHAIR ROSE opened up the floor to the applicant, RALPH PEW.

APPLICANT, RALPH PEW is located in Mesa, AZ. He introduced his staff from The New Home Company, Chris Katy, Jeff Zimmerman, Connie Dean and Vanessa McDonald. He said the case had already been heard by the commission at some length during the DRC meeting. It was also discussed during the study session today and the June 5, 2019 Planning and Zoning Commission. He said the issue boils down to a question on the elevation of the paired home units. He hasn’t heard any concerns that have not been resolved. He stated it was a unique piece of property, it is the last of the Dobson Ranch properties. It is the headquarters of Dwayne Dobson on Queen Creek and Alma School Road. He said it is very oddly shaped, in-field/bypass piece of property. He added that The New Home Company has done the best they can and have done a really great job with their designers and architects to create three different product types with open space. He said it really fits this neighborhood and this area. He urges the commissioners to recommend approval case to the city council. He said they did revise and take care of the parking issues and have created more parking. He said they used creative use of benefit easement technique in one location and in the other they created spaces on the end of the U shaped drive areas in the paired homes. He mentioned to COMMISSIONER KLOB during the break that the issue in respects to parking and the garbage cans is really handled through the declaration of conditions and restrictions for the project. He said there are some important enforcement issues to respect to that. He said that gives the HOA the power to tow vehicles that don’t comply with allowing the garbage can containers to be picked up on the right spot on the right days. There is a real piece to that they use as an effective tool. He said they are very proud of the design of the project, proud of the architecture and they know there might be a question on the paired homes elevations with respects to each side of the home. He said he urges the commission to look at it as a whole, the totality of those homes. He said they market that property as if you are looking at the streetscape and although those homes are separately owned, they do think
that the look of them as they are put together is not a sameness and there is a lot of movement in those paired homes. There is a lot of things there that make them interesting. He said he urges their support and if questions do come up he would be happy to address them.

**VICE CHAIR ROSE** asked if there were any questions to the applicant.

**COMMISSIONER KLOB** said his questions are for the staff. He asked if there was a way to split the housing product architecture from the site planning aspect or even pull the paired units housing out of the equation to allow to develop it a little more but allow the project to keep moving forward.

**DAVID DE LA TORRE** responded that they have split the housing product PDP request from the subdivision PDP request on other projects in the past. He is hesitant to split specific housing types or housing products within the housing product PDP request. He said for example, he would be hesitant to say the paired homes are not approved but everything else is approved within the housing product. He said because it can get a little bit messy. He said what would be the next step after that, is they would have to come back for a separate PDP approval for specifically that product. He said their preference would be to split all the housing products from the subdivision.

**VICE CHAIR ROSE** added that like **COMMISSIONER KLOB** said they really don’t want to hold this back and would like to get it moving. He asked if anyone else had input on the architecture, elevation or would like to see it split as proposed by **COMMISSIONER KLOB**.

**COMMISSIONER PEKAU** stated that he loved the development, the site and the in-field use. He said there is a valid concern that **COMMISSIONER KLOB** has brought forward. He asked how significant of an impact would it be to the development if they were to split out the PDP from the plat element versus the home element.

**APPLICANT, RAPLH PEW** responded that it was a difficult time for them to split them out like that what is critical for us is the timing in the transaction. He said this case has been studied, revised and worked almost more than any he has ever seen. He said they are running into severe deadlines that if they separated out, they would not know if they could go forward and close. He said not knowing if ultimately the paired homes would be approved. He said they have listened carefully both at the DRC and two weeks ago. He said they have done all that they can do. He added that the people that want to live there would be very proud as it relates to the elevations. He stated they are not detrimental, they are high quality and that is their view. He said this case should move forward with a positive recommendation for approval. He said they quite frankly don’t know what to add in addition to what they have done.

**COMMISSIONER FLANDERS** stated he could understand for the applicant the risk and anxiety of separating housing product from the land and everything else. He knows they do not like to do the design review on the dais but maybe they could be specific with a series of stipulations. He said at least give staff clear direction on specific units that are being questioned.

**COMMISSIONER KLOB** stated he had no problem with creating a clear stipulation. He said his primarily concern as he expressed during the study session is with the Spanish elevation of the paired units. He said creating an autonomous feel for each of the homes. He said it would be a vague stipulation to give to staff as to what is an autonomous feel. He said what he has pushed back directly to the applicant and through staff is for each home architecturally from a curb appeal; hold up on its own. He said if each one was a single family home to have that design as an independent home. He said that is what is missing the mark when he compares it to other attached projects that come through that have met that standard. He doesn’t know if this is keeping that same level going forward. He said overall it’s a great project; the homes and the use of the site. He said what the applicant has done with
the parking is commendable. He said as he told the applicant during the break, if they were looking
at a 100% scale they are at 95%. He said they just need to get that extra little 5% and be there. He has
a hard time supporting going forward from an architecture standpoint knowing that they are so close.
He thinks it can be achieved and knowing the design team the applicant is using and their abilities.
He said that he knows that they can take it to that next level as well. He said he is not necessarily
opposed to the stipulation but believes it would be a hard one to write, that gives staff enough
information to go forward with. He thinks it’s really something that the design team needs to come
back and say here’s how we addressed this concern with the Spanish elevation holding up
independently on each side on its own. He said with that he would absolutely approve to move forward
but it puts a lot on staff shoulders to try to make some assumptions in addition to their regular work
load that is his hesitation there but is open to suggestions.

COMMISSIONER EBERLE said he looks at this project from a different prospective, of economic
development. He said the spot of the development is needed and doesn’t think there is a better use of
the plat. He said that there is a shopping center there that used to be a Bashas; which left about a
decade ago. He said it is rebuilding from the time of the recession. In his opinion what this
development does is ensure prosperity for that corner of Queen Creek and Alma School Road. He
said they will likely have new entity to take the spot of the commercial space where Bashas left. He
said it is all empty, it will revitalize that piece. He said there is a design in this profile that he does not
like, it is not his taste. He thinks overall there is a positive impact. His biggest concern was the traffic
flow and he has been told that they have completed studies and understand the flow. He said the
saving grace in that is that they have two entrance and exits points. He said one on Alma School and
Queen Creek that is these owners of the properties will find morning or evening which way to exit
the properties, it will be a little busy. He said but overall he is looking at it from an economic
prospective all things considered.

COMMISSIONER FLANDERS said that he has experienced this in the past, in his early beginnings
with the planning commission. He said what he would like to do is propose a couple of design features.
He said he thinks the parapet walls need to be thickened to match the higher parapet. He said there is
a larger element that can be used on the gable end of the roof. He said looking at the front and the
sides maybe there is a wainscoting that can be thickened at the bottom to create a heavier base for the
building to kind of anchor it. He said the window features work well but maybe there is a wrought
iron element on the large window. He said maybe the light fixture can be changed to match the
elevation. He said there is a low wall gate that adds to it but maybe there is some color change that
provides a little more movement with the building. He said at least this is a start and it is a lot of
information for a stipulation but maybe it’s a stipulation, for applicant to work with staff on the
Spanish style housing elevation based on the items mentioned.

DAVID DE LA TORRE said staff is looking for specific direction if that is the direction that the
planning commission wishes to go. He asked if all the items mentioned would apply or just some. He
said he would like as specific direction as possible so they understand what the stipulation means.

COMMISSIONER FLANDERS responded that all of it would be to the benefit of the applicant and
his design staff. He said for them to go ahead and start looking at it again. He said maybe it’s just a
little bit or maybe it’s a lot more. He added some of it might inspire something else to change. He
said it’s just about beefing out the elevation a little bit with some of the additional items.

COMMISSIONER KLOB said to add to COMMISSIONER FLANDERS there is one glaring item
that he himself missed until this moment but thinks is an easy fix is the Spanish barrel tile not the flat
tile that the elevations are showing. He added that it would help carry some of theme. He said if staff
is open and comfortable with a stipulation along the lines of adding true architectural theming to it
and creating a true autonomous standalone design for each paired unit. He said it is primarily the
Spanish elevation units that are his biggest challenge with this product line. He asked if staff is acceptable to that then he would be open to allow it to go forward. He asked staff if that was enough of what they need.

SUSAN FIALA responded that to clarify because judgement can be very subjective as to what is to be on there, everyone has a bit of a different idea here. She asked if there are wall plane changes, if that is what is missing. She has heard the parapet, is it the amount of sinistration on there. She stated each unit has three windows and they have different sizes, she asked if that is what makes it visually unappealing. She asked how much wrought iron would be enough. She said those are the types of things that are very judgmental on every ones part but yes you can have a stipulation but again how far. She said it just needs to be better defined since the applicant is here. She said since they are on action items maybe they can address it a little bit further as to how they can accommodate that as well with guidance.

COMMISSIONER KLOB said that was his challenge as well it is to open ended for this to go forward. He asked if there was maybe some solutions that the applicant has.

APPLICANT, RALPH PEW said they certainly support the idea to add an additional stipulation that would allow staff to view their changes in such a way so they create an autonomous feeling as the commissioner is indicating through some combination of suggestions mentioned by COMMISSIONER FLANDERS. He asked for the commission to create a stipulation to move them forward and let the staff resolve it with some combination of items that COMMISSIONER FLANDERS mentioned. He said he doesn’t think the expectation is to do all eight. He said he doesn’t think that is what he was meaning but to add something to create that autonomous feeling or he said the best case scenario would be for the commission to say to themselves this is a really nice project and they have done a great job, move forward. He asked to be moved forward with some condition that the staff can work through.

COMMISSIONER PEKAU said that through all the various meetings that they have been very impressed with the design, speed and felt they have been very complimentary. He added that it is a recommending body and that when one of the design architects is having some serious concerns they take note of that and have to, he added that it was not his trade. He said he has not heard a specific stipulation but he knows that they don't want to design from the dais. He asked if someone could come up with a stipulation or he was going to make a motion to approve.

COMMISSIONER FLANDERS said he would like to add a stipulation that, the applicant will work with staff to modify elevations of the Spanish style paired residences with items mentioned during the meeting. He asked the staff if that is something that they could work with.

DAVID DE LA TORRE confirmed that what he had is that the applicant shall work with staff to modify the elevations of the Spanish style paired residences with items mentioned during the public hearing. He said that knowing that they don’t have to do all the items that were mentioned. That they can pick and choose what was mentioned during the public hearing and work with the applicant. He confirmed that from staff point that is something that they can work with. He said he would prefer it to be more specific but not having a specific solution and not being able to design from the dais, that is something that they can live with and work with.

COMMISSIONER FLANDERS said if the applicant is comfortable with that, they don’t need to use them all but provide a competent design that takes care of everyone’s concerns. He understands that they would prefer to get it approved but he said at least they have information that everybody has heard. He said that on some of the elements there is stipulations to work with staff on that but what this does is to get out of this arena and get them moving.
COMMISSIONER KLOB said he would like to add the following option items: additional gables, additional roof lines, breaking up the roof elements in a traditional Spanish architectural style. He said possibly even arched windows, just a few more options to pick and choose from.

DAVID DE LA TORRE confirmed the stipulation would read, “The applicant shall work with staff to modify the elevations of the Spanish style paired residences with the items mentioned during this public hearing.”

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER PEKAU to move Item A DVR18-0008/PLT18-0031 MARIPOSA to be approved with the added stipulation, seconded by COMMISSIONER EBERLE.

Vice Chair Rose – In Favor Commissioner Kimble – In Favor
Commissioner Klob – In Favor Commissioner Flanders – In Favor
Commissioner Eberle – In Favor Commissioner Pekau – In Favor

The motioned passed 6 - 0.

6. DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Mr. David de la Torre, Planning Manager stated there was nothing to report.

7. CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENT

Next regular meeting is July 17, 2019 at 5:30 P.M. in the Chandler City Council Chambers, 88 E. Chicago Street, Chandler, Arizona

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:09 p.m.

Rick Heumann, Chairman

Kevin Mayo, Secretary