

Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes October 5, 2021

A regular meeting of the Town of Chino Valley Planning and Zoning Commission was held on Tuesday, October 5, 2021, at the Town of Chino Valley Council Chambers, 202 N. State Route 89, Chino Valley, Arizona.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS present were Chair Chuck Merritt; Commissioner Teena Meadors; Commissioner Gary Pasciak; Commissioner David Somerville; Commissioner Robert Switzer; Commissioner William Welker; Vacant Position

STAFF MEMBERS present were Laurie Lineberry, Development Services Director; Frank Marbury, Public Works Director; Will Dingee, Senior Planner; Bethan Heng, Planner; Dee Dee Moore, Customer Service Supervisor; Lawrence Digges, Audio/Video Technician.

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Merritt called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m., and noted there was a quorum present.

CONSENT CALENDAR – Items listed under the consent agenda were approved, with 3 minor changes to the minutes which included the correction of Mark Switzer to Robert Switzer, spelling of Dinger to Dingee and adding the stipulation for sidewalks to the motion for Z21-014. **A motion was made by Commissioner Switzer and seconded by Commissioner Pasciak to approve the minutes with corrections and the remaining items on the Consent Agenda of the September 5, 2021 Planning & Zoning Commission meeting with the above three corrections. This motion passed unanimously by a 6-0 vote.**

CASE # F21-003: *Request for approval of the Perkinsville 44 Final Plat Phases 1,2,3 and 4 to divide approximately 44.3 acres of real property into 162 lots with an approximate lot size of 7,000 square feet. APN 306-18-009H*

Commissioner Meadors declared a conflict of interest and recused herself from the Council Chambers.

Will Dingee, Senior Planner, presented the staff report and shared that the Applicant and the Developer for this project were both in attendance for this meeting. Staff is recommending **APPROVAL**.

Commission Somerville asked about the use for the empty lot in the middle. **Dingee** stated that it appears to be a greenbelt and/or drainage area but that the applicant could provide more detail. **Chairman Merritt** brought up that the street alignment appeared to be located at a different location. **Dingee** shared that this now lines up with Adams. There were no further questions of staff at this time.

Applicant, Craig Helsing, of Brown Homes elaborated on the empty lot locations. He stated that in general the open spaces would provide walkways, outdoor ramadas, park benches and a fire pit. These areas also would be used as drainage corridors, retention basins, and the sewer easement. **Commissioner Switzer** voiced concerns about a plan for safety control since this project is specifically family oriented and there would be a lot of foot traffic. **Switzer** asked about a plan for a crosswalk, stop sign, and pedestrian crossing. **Merritt** referred this question to Staff. **Public Works Director, Frank Marbury** stated that the crosswalk would be at the 4-way stop on the corner of Road 1 East and Perkinsville adding that the meandering sidewalk and landscaping would help to direct foot traffic to the corner. **Merritt** asked if the town was comfortable with a mid-block crosswalk. **Marbury** shared that because the volume of traffic/industrial vehicles along Perkinsville, it would be more difficult to stop mid-block for a cross walk, especially in the case of an emergency. Staff does not recommend mid-block flashing lights which would require traffic analysis for speed and cost \$300,000. **Marbury** recommended all foot traffic be directed to the corner where ADA ramps would be installed. **Switzer** agreed with the traffic concerns but felt that kids living in

that neighborhood would probably not go all the way to the corner to cross the road if they were going to the Recreation Facilities across the street. **Marbury** added that directly across the street from the Perkinsville Road entrance is a large ditch and fencing so there would be no lure to cross the street mid-block. **Marbury** continued by sharing that the 10-foot multi-use path meanders through the landscaping and would keep pedestrians away from the road and that there will be trees on both sides of the sidewalk. Town Engineer and developer believe that this design is the best for this project.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. James Greenough of 1791 W Escondido Trail, Chino Valley, spoke in opposition to this project, stating that the increase in traffic and the 162 homes is the beginning of the downfall. He referenced the items in the city logo, and stated that the antelope are rarely seen and as more homes are built they will disappear from our area. He believes that this development is wrong for the area and that there are too many homes being built. He asked that the commission not approve this project.

Public comment period was closed.

Helsing shared that this project is focusing on the family and this community, that the homes would be affordable, unlike other areas nearby.

A motion was made by Commissioner Pasciak and seconded by Commissioner Welker to approve Final Plat F21-03, as presented, subject to the staff report, information provided during the public hearing, and the conditions of Approval in Attachment A. The motion carried 4-1, with Switzer voting no, and Meadors recused.

REASONS FOR DISSENTING VOTES:

Switzer explained that he voted against this Final Plat for the same reason he voted against the Preliminary Plat. He felt that the SR-0.16 zoning was too congested.

Meadors rejoined the meeting at 6:24 pm

ACTION ITEMS:

Merritt asked if any of the commissioners had questions or concerns regarding the updated By-Laws. There were no comments from the commissioners. **A motion was made by Commissioner Meadors and seconded by Commissioner Switzer to approve the Updated By-Laws as written. The motion carried 6-0.** These By-Laws will be effective on the date of adoption.

INFORMATION ITEMS – FROM STAFF

Council Action – **Dingee** informed the Commission that Planning & Zoning Case #Z21-14, a 20 lot subdivision with ½-acre lots for Rosie Soto that went to Council on September 28, 2021 was unanimously denied. **Merritt** expressed concerns that he and perhaps other commissioners feel that they are not quite sure what the Town Council is thinking. **Dingee** stated that the Town Council felt that this project did not fit in with the area and based their decision on that.

Lineberry shared that the Planning and Zoning Commissions' job is not the political piece, but to reach the neighbors, hear what is happening, and weigh what is in the code versus the general plan, and vote based on those facts. At the council level there is more politics involved and the goals for the Commission is to not get in the middle of the political part, but to look at the land use aspects. **Merritt** stated that he does agree with that definition of the commission but feels it would still be good to get some type of feedback, so he appreciated the comments **Dingee** shared.

Somerville asked about the study session and how they could set up a meeting with the council to have items of discussion with them. **Merritt** reinforced that a joint meeting would include items identified by Planning and Zoning Commission to discuss and staff would then schedule the meeting with requirements for notice and meeting date.

INFORMATION ITEMS – FROM STAFF: Lineberry discussed the SR-22,000 proposed zoning district and the lot size potential in an actual acreage versus effective acreage, which removes the dedicated easement footages from the total actual acreage. Several topics covered were the definition of the actual size, effective size, flag lots, easements, private roads (which are 50'), general road sizes, right-of-way and other unusable portions of the parcels.

In addition to the square footage discussion, she stated that the planning staff had met with the local Future Farmers of America (FFA) group from the High School regarding the keeping of types and quantity of animals on a ½-acre lot. The FFA group felt that sheep, goats and fowl would be a compatible match with a ½-acre parcel. After that discussion it was determined that larger animals should be kept on a lot greater in size than ½-acre.

Lineberry shared that staff will be using all of the discussion during this meeting to continue working towards a comprehensive SR-22,000 zoning district.


INFORMATION ITEMS – FROM COMMISSION: None

INFORMATION ITEMS – FROM THE PUBLIC: None

ADJOURN – A motion and second were made to adjourn the meeting at 7:02 p.m.



Charles Merritt
Chair



Dee Dee Moore
Prepared By