Greg Stanley
Assistant County Manager

Development Services

PINAL • COUNTY
wide open opportunity

Fritz A. Behring
County Manager

PINAL COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
MINUTES OF July 19, 2012

PRESENT:
Mr. Hartman, Chairman
Ms. Aguirre-Vogler, Member
Mr. Brown, Member
Mr. Riggins, Vice-Chairman
Mr. Salas, Member
Mr. Gutierrez, Member

ABSENT:
Mr. Ellis, Member
Ms. Moritz, Member
Mr. Faucette, Member

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT:
Ms. Grieb, Deputy County Attorney

PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:
Mr. Stabley, Planning Director
Mr. LaCrosse, Code Compliance Manager
Mr. Denton, Planner II
Ms. Klucar, Code Compliance Officer
Mr. Abraham, Planning Manager
Ms. Bruninga, Secretary II
Ms. Sarkissian, Planner I

PUBLIC WORKS STAFF PRESENT:
Mr. Chow, Development Section Chief

The meeting was called to order at 9:04 a.m., this date by Chairman Hartman in the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) Hearing Room, Building F, Florence, Arizona.

DISCUSSION/APPROVAL/DISAPPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: June 21, 2012

Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler stated that on page three (3) the last paragraph was meant to be more specific, and that the stipulation stated was for Avra Valley, not Oro Valley when referring to fire protection. Mr. Stabley responded that the minutes would be listened to again, and staff would attempt a more elaborate explanation for Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler. Chairman Hartman stated that there were many times in the minutes that Vice-Chairman Riggins was listed as Chairman Riggins. Mr. Stabley asked that the minutes not be approved at this time, but be brought back for approval in the August hearing.

Chairman Hartman stated that the draft watermark was missing on the June 21, 2012 minutes; Mr. Stabley responded that the watermark would be added.

Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler stated that she would like to attend the conference if there is room for her, and she would also like to see the agenda. Mr. Stabley responded that he would send the agenda out, and that Debora Huerta would get in contact with the Commissioners to coordinate the accommodation information.

PLANNING DIRECTORS DISCUSSION ITEMS

APA Conference

Mr. Stabley discussed the upcoming conference. Chairman Hartman asked if an agenda has been received. Mr. Stabley responded yes, and the information would be passed to the Commissioners that expressed interest.

DISCUSSION/APPROVAL/DISAPPROVAL: Re-scheduling the Regular Planning Commission

Meeting to **September 13, 2012 at 9 a.m.** in the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) Pinal County Complex - Building F 31 N. Pinal St. Florence, Arizona.

MOTION
Commissioner Salas made a motion to approve the change of the September 20, 2012 meeting to September 13, 2012 at 9:00 a.m. Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

REPORT ON BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ACTION ON P & Z CASES

- **June 20, 2012**

Mr. Stabley discussed the cases heard by the Board of Supervisors.

TENTATIVE PLATS:

S-026-05 - DISCUSSION/APPROVAL/DISAPPROVAL: Meridian Land Holdings, LLC, landowner, Coe & Van Loo Consultants, Inc., engineer, requesting approval of a tentative plat extension for **Santa Cruz Ranch**, 4,157 lots on a 1,237± acre parcel in the CR-3/PAD zone; situated in portions of Sections 26, 27, 34 & 35, T5S, R4E, G&SRB&M, Tax Parcel 502-14-002A et al. (parcel list on file) (located along Anderson Road bisecting Ruben Drive and Teel Road approximately 1 mile west of the City of Casa Grande). **(Continued from the January 19, 2012 Commission Meeting)**

Mr. Denton explained to the Commission that the applicant was seeking a one (1) year extension.

Carolyn Oberholtzer, 6613 Scottsdale Road, Scottsdale, Arizona, came forward to address the Commission and gave a brief history of the project, the extension request, and the possible annexation by the city of Maricopa. Ms. Oberholtzer stated that these tentative plats are included in the second phase of the annexation.

Chairman Hartman stated that this case is before the Commission to allow the applicant to finalize the approval through the annexation process and after this, the city will take the leadership role. Ms. Oberholtzer responded that is correct.

Commissioner Salas asked if approval of the extension would influence the City of Maricopa to approve them as well. Ms. Oberholtzer responded that it is helpful for the Commission to continue the tentative plats for a year so that the city knows the status with the county, and this will allow a chance for evaluation of the project when it is annexed.

Commissioner Brown stated that the annexation attempt failed, not the city opposed to the plat. Ms. Oberholtzer responded that the annexation has not failed; it was just broken up into two (2) pieces. Commissioner Brown asked if the residents of the area have been taken into consideration. Ms. Oberholtzer responded that there are not many property owners, but the ones that are there have been supportive of the annexation.

Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler asked if the issues with the Flood Control District have been resolved. Ms. Oberholtzer responded that the applicant is working with the County Flood Control District. Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler asked if the applicant was working with transportation and stated that the

track was a large problem with all of the new development coming in. Ms. Oberholtzer responded that the city does have a master plan and looks at small area transportation planning.

Chairman Hartman stated that the Santa Cruz is an issue of city hall and land owners, since it runs through the City of Maricopa.

MOTION

Vice-Chairman Riggins made a motion to continue case S-026-05 to July 17, 2013 at 9:00 am. Commissioner Salas seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

S-033-06 - DISCUSSION/APPROVAL/DISAPPROVAL: SCR, LLC, landowner, Coe & Van Loo Consultants, Inc., engineer, requesting approval of a tentative plat extension for **Santa Cruz Ranch Units 4&5**, 2,030 lots on a 674± acre parcel in the CR-3/PAD & CB-1/PAD zones; situated in portions of Sections 26, 34, & 35, T5S, R4E, G&SRB&M, Tax Parcel 502-23-001 et al. (parcel list on file) (located along Anderson Road bisecting Teel Road and Miller Road approximately 1½ mile west of the City of Casa Grande). **(Continued from the January 19, 2012 Commission Meeting)**

MOTION

Vice-Chairman Riggins made a motion to continue case S-033-06 to July 17, 2013 at 9:00 am. Commissioner Brown seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

S-013-05 - DISCUSSION/APPROVAL/DISAPPROVAL: Amarillo & Papago Investments, LLP, landowner, Ryan Weed, Coe & Van Loo Consultants, Inc., engineer, requesting approval of a tentative plat extension for Amarillo Creek Units II & III, 1,549 lots on a 452.48± acre parcel in the CR-3/PAD zone; situated in portion of Section 17, T5S, R3E, G&SRB&M, Tax Parcels 510-48-009D, 009F, 009J, & 009K (located approximately 1½ miles southwest of the City of Maricopa).

Mr. Denton read a portion of the staff report and used a PowerPoint presentation.

Phillip Miller, PM Consultants, 16 Spur Circle, Scottsdale, Arizona, came forward to address the Commission. Mr. Miller gave a brief history of the property and request for extension.

Chairman Hartman asked if the applicant is working with Maricopa on the 347 crossing of the Union Pacific Railroad. Mr. Miller responded that he has been in contact with the city on the process, adding that it is in design stages at this time. Mr. Miller stated that these projects are going to bring millions of dollars in transportation fees to the County once developed. Chairman Hartman stated that it would be five (5) to ten (10) years before the crossing is initiated. Mr. Miller stated that he would agree, and the timing might work out and developments on the crossing would coincide with the housing being developed.

MOTION

Vice-Chairman Riggins made a motion to approve stipulations 1-51, modifying stipulation 48 to extend the plat to July 21, 2014 at 9:00 am, as set forth in the staff report. Commissioner Salas seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

S-021-08 - DISCUSSION/APPROVAL/DISAPPROVAL: Wolfkin Farms, LLC, landowner, Jackie Guthrie, agent, requesting approval of a tentative plat extension for Bella Vista Section 13, 2,007 lots on a 659.09± acre parcel in the CR-3/PAD & CB-2/PAD zones; described as Section 13, T3S, R8E, G&SRB&M, Tax Parcel 210-13-001A (located adjacent to the northern boundary of the Town of Florence).

Mr. Denton read a portion of the staff report and used a PowerPoint presentation.

Jackie Guthrie, 19710 W. Black Knob, Casa Grande, Arizona, came forward to address the Commission.

Chairman Hartman asked if the subdivision is in the San Tan Corridor. Ms. Guthrie responded that it is close, and if it isn't in the corridor, it is right on the edge. Ms. Guthrie also stated that there is a new Florence Town Manager, and she is unsure of the annexation plans at this time. Chairman Hartman asked if there has been communication with the city. Ms. Guthrie responded that there has been communication with the city in the past.

Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler asked about the plans for annexation. Ms. Guthrie responded that the town has not approached the applicant as of yet. Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler asked if the applicant would like to be annexed. Ms. Guthrie responded that it would depend on the Town of Florence and whether they would accept the approved tentative plats.

Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler asked if this property is in the Magma Dam area. Ms. Guthrie responded yes, and stated that improvements are being completed to prevent the collapsing of the dam. Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler asked if the subdivision was in the area of impact. Mr. Denton responded that the site is not in the area of impact.

Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler asked if the North/South freeway is going through this location. Ms. Guthrie stated that there have been proposals to move the alignment away from this property. Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler asked if the applicant would have to replat some lots. Ms. Guthrie responded that the replat was done previously. Ms. Guthrie also added that the final alignment of the North/South freeway has not been selected, but the proposed location is not through the site.

Commissioner Brown asked if there is coordination between the subdivisions in the area regarding access to the area and the location of the North/South freeway. Commissioner Brown added that Hunt Highway cannot support the impact of the developments. Commissioner Brown stated that the infrastructure needs to come along with the request. Ms. Guthrie responded that the Town of Florence took the lead to discuss the North/South corridor, and held a meeting to discuss the alignment. Ms. Guthrie stated that many developers are in attendance. Chairman Hartman asked if Mr. Chow could elaborate. Mr. Chow responded that he is not involved nor invited to any of the meetings mentioned. Ms. Guthrie stated that there are representatives from the county in attendance at the meetings.

Commissioner Brown stated that there is a large population in the county and it is hard to go back and add infrastructure in later when the homes are already there.

MOTION

Vice-Chairman Riggins made a motion to approve case S-021-08 along with stipulations 1-30, modifying stipulation 28 to extend the tentative plat to August 21, 2014 at 9:00 am. Commissioner Brown seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

NEW CASES:

PZ-C-002-12 - PUBLIC HEARING/ACTION: Pinal County Planning & Development Department requesting approval of a text amendment to the County zoning ordinance, **Title 2 of the Pinal County**

Development Services Code, amending **Chapter 2.145 Signs**, adding language to address new types of portable and temporary signs, monument signs and political signs, as well as adding the new zone categories created with the recent Zoning Ordinance update.

Ms. Sarkissian read a portion of the staff report and used a PowerPoint.

Vice-Chairman Riggins stated that feather banners are for promotion only. Ms. Sarkissian agreed stating that they would be allowed for forty-five (45) days at a time, and would be allowed only twice a year.

Commissioner Salas expressed his concerns that political signs create clutter and the distraction is dangerous. Ms. Sarkissian stated that political signs are discussed later in the presentation, and the requirements are amended to comply with state law.

Ms. Sarkissian continued her PowerPoint.

Mr. Stabley stated that the monument sign discussion came from feedback at a community meeting.

Commissioner Brown asked how the county will deal with creative signs such as a large flag pole with an advertisement sign beneath the flag. Ms. Sarkissian responded that flags fall under exempt signs and are not regulated. Commissioner Brown asked if the flags could be replaced with promotional signs. Ms. Sarkissian responded that flags other than the American flag could be enforced.

Chairman Hartman asked if staff considered guidelines from other counties so that the signs are aesthetically compatible. Ms. Sarkissian responded that staff did not consider design guidelines; staff is more concerned with the height and square footage. Mr. Stabley stated that the county is less rigid than Pima County, and less permissive than Maricopa County. Mr. Stabley stated that Maricopa County does not allow feather banners.

Chairman Hartman stated that an abundance of signage can become a distraction and cause problems with safety. Mr. Stabley responded that this was also looked into, and work has been done on the ordinance to address these issues.

Vice-Chairman Riggins asked if the ordinances are retroactive on existing permanent signs. Ms. Sarkissian responded no. Vice-Chairman Riggins asked if this would cause an issue with enforcement. Mr. Stabley responded that no rights have been taken away for permanent signs.

Commissioner Salas asked what regulations could be extended by the county regarding political signs on the highway. Mr. Stabley responded that there is an authorization process with the state, but the county handles the signage on the highways.

Ms. Sarkissian continued her PowerPoint.

Commissioner Gutierrez asked if staff has considered the use of lighting when it comes to signs and advertising, the use of spot lights, logos, and parking lots. Ms. Sarkissian responded that staff refers to the lighting code when looking for guidelines on sign lighting. Mr. Stabley stated that spotlights are temporary and would be allowed on a temporary basis.

Commissioner Salas stated that his concern is for the clutter that is created by political signs. Ms. Sarkissian responded that as long as a sign is not creating an emergency or hazard, they are allowed to remain until after the primary. Commissioner Salas asked who would enforce the clutter around stop signs. Mr. Stabley responded that Mr. LaCrosse and code complaince would determine if there was a hazard, and address the issue.

Chairman Hartman opened the meeting to the public.

John Enright, 6556 E Hacienda La Colorada Dr, Gold Canyon, Arizona, came forward to address the Commission. Mr. Enright distributed pictures of signage examples to the Commission. Mr. Enright stated that many small business owners have as much distaste for the feather banners and A-frame signs as staff does. Mr. Enright stated that the business owners only use these types of signs to stay in business. Mr. Enright explained each picture provided and their individual need for signage.

Chairman Hartman stated that when an individual wants to put up signage they should meet with staff to discuss the legality prior to putting up the sign. Mr. Enright responded that sometimes people have no other choice.

Commissioner Salas stated that one of the pictures provided proves his point regarding political signs.

Mr. Enright stated that more signs bring more business, and more business brings more money to the county. Mr. Enright stated that he would like to see a revision for signage for small businesses, the ability to use back of building signage equal to the allowed frontage signage. Mr. Enright stated that many signs cannot be seen from the street. Mr. Enright stated that small businesses do not come to the county because they would rather play the game with compliance, and asked the Commission to come up with signage that addresses the need of the small business owners.

Commissioner Salas asked how many business owners are represented at the meetings. Mr. Enright stated that if it was advertised more, more business owners would have attended. Mr. Enright added that some small business owners cannot survive, because in many cases they can't be seen. Mr. Enright stated that noncompliant signs bring in more business.

Commissioner Brown stated that there has been a lot of information provided, and there are things the county needs to consider, but there also needs to be an effort made by the small business association. Mr. Enright responded that there are many big unincorporated areas that are vastly different throughout the county. Mr. Enright stated that he would like to see the county reduce the size of signs and the distance between then, offering the opportunity to back sign a business. Mr. Enright added that minor adjustments would make a huge difference to the small businesses, and he would be happy to have the Gold Canyon Business Association come in with recommendations.

Chairman Hartman stated that Mr. Enright feels that the community has not had ample opportunities to discuss this topic. Ms. Sarkissian stated that notices went out to all chambers within the county and business owners were in attendance at the community meeting. Mr. Stabley added that Jim Pettigrew was included in these meetings and the information was also provided to him.

Chairman Hartman stated that he has a concern with locating address numbers on businesses as well. Mr. Enright responded that they are trying to get the information about what is in Gold Canyon to the 53,000 cars that pass by each day. Ms. Sarkissian stated that a permitted directory sign is available. Mr. Enright stated that the business owners want a business district sign. Commissioner Salas stated that a lot of property owners protest these types of signs. Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler asked if staff is open to having recommendations of the Gold Canyon businesses included. Mr. Stabley responded that staff is always open to more information. Mr. Stabley suggested moving forward with this case and working specifically with small businesses as they come in. Mr. Stabley stated that there has to be a balance between allowing signs and the number of neighborhood complaints about signage. Mr. Stabley stated that minor changes regarding small business signs could be brought back to the Commission at a later date.

Chairman Hartman asked if staff was willing to help with the sign submittal package. Mr. Stabley responded that staff works with applicants with the process. Ms. Sarkissian stated that the

Comprehensive Sign package is above and beyond a typical sign application, adding that a variance would be required to add more signage to a business than what is allowed.

Mr. Enright stated that if he wanted a second A-frame sign, he would have to go through the Comprehensive Sign process. Ms. Sarkissian stated that staff would request a letter explaining the request, and how it would change the impact from the existing signage.

Commissioner Gutierrez stated that there have been a lot of good recommendations and a lot of new information. Commissioner Gutierrez stated that the county is taking steps in the right direction, and these signs need to be addressed. Mr. Enright responded that it is a step in the right direction, but it doesn't address the needs of small businesses.

Chairman Hartman closed the public portion of the meeting.

Commissioner Salas stated that the Commission should approve the text amendment and make modifications as needed down the road.

Chairman Hartman asked if there is a sign review committee to work with the applicants to help them design what type of sign is best in each situation. Mr. Stabley responded that there is a committee, but staff works with the applicants as they come in. Mr. Stabley stated that staff has been meeting with businesses to help them understand what types of signs they are allowed.

Commissioner Gutierrez asked what the minimum square footage a business needs to be to have a monument allowed. Ms. Sarkissian responded that the minimum linear frontage needed is three hundred (300) feet. Ms. Sarkissian added that businesses with less frontage could still have free standing signs.

Commissioner Salas asked if the staff report should be amended to allow changes in the future. Mr. Stabley responded that as a policy there is flexibility to change at a later date.

MOTION

Commissioner Salas made a motion to forward PZ-C-002-12 to the Board of Supervisors with a favorable recommendation. Vice-Chairman Riggins seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

PZ-C-004-12 - DISCUSSION/APPROVAL/DISAPPROVAL: The Planning and Development Department requests that the Planning and Zoning Commission amend its earlier action initiating a subdivision regulation amendment to **Title 3** of the **Pinal County Development Services Code** to amend **Chapter 3.20 Final Plat Additional Data** to consider adding language to address adequate water supply outside an Active Management Areas (AMAs) to also initiate a subdivision amendment to **Chapter 3.60 Appeals, Modifications and Waivers** to consider adding a process for requesting exemptions from water adequacy requirements for subdivisions outside of AMAs.

Mr. Denton read a portion of the staff report and discussed the request for amendment was to add a process for requesting an exemption for the water adequacy requirement.

Vice-Chairman Riggins stated that there is the ability to develop an individual property with an exempt well and this amendment is stating that someone should have the right to create an exemption to truck water into a subdivision and consider this as an adequate water supply. Mr. Denton stated that there are statutes that list exemptions and if the Board of Supervisors wanted to grant an exemption, the language would need to be in the Ordinance. Vice-Chairman Riggins stated that there was a problem with making an adequate water supply a necessity outside the AMA's, and this is not needed. Ms. Grieb stated the Commission already initiated a text amendment regarding the adequate water supply requirement and

the draft ordinance showed the state exemption. Ms. Grieb stated that the process is not there to allow the exemption.

Mr. Stabley stated that the Ordinance would be brought back before the Commission in August, and that would be the time for the Commission to say whether they think it should be in there at all.

Commissioner Brown stated that it is mind boggling that water is treated so differently, and asked if there is a requirement that the process be approved. Ms. Grieb responded that there is nothing in the state statutes that dictated the Ordinance must include dry subdivisions; this decision is up to the Commission.

Vice-Chairman Riggins stated that the substance of this was the protection of the health, safety, and welfare from people being involved in dry subdivisions. He stated that just because the state allows certain exemptions, does not mean that the county has to recognize that portion of it. Vice-Chairman Riggins stated that he disagrees with the process as outlined, because this verbiage contradicts what has already been initiated. Mr. Stabley stated that what is before the Commission is the request to amend the initiation and allow the verbiage to move forward. Mr. Stabley stated that somebody could apply for an exemption, but there is nothing outlining that process at this time.

Commissioner Brown asked if the Commission could delete the exemption instead of adding the process. Mr. Stabley responded that in August the Commission could submit a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors with that portion of the Ordinance removed.

Chairman Hartman stated that staff is asking for reinitiation of the case, and when the ordinance comes forward in August, it can be approved or denied at that time.

Ms. Grieb stated that staff is asking for an amendment to allow an additional section.

Vice-Chairman Riggins stated that what is presented is contrary to the initial concept.

Vice-Chairman Riggins asked if a draft document would be presented to the Commission in August, allowing the Commission to approve or deny the proposed modifications. Mr. Stabley responded that the Commission could recommend certain sections and not others. Vice-Chairman Riggins stated that it would be a difficult job for legal counsel to say what recommendations are allowable at the next meeting.

BREAK 11:19
RECONVENED 11:28

Mr. Stabley stated that in August, staff will bring language forward so the Commission can decide what will be advertised, and the hearing would then be September.

Vice-Chairman Riggins stated that the reason this came forward was because the only protection the public had from a dry lot subdivision was that on the final plat it was stated that there was not a water supply. Vice-Chairman Riggins stated that the exemptions that are proposed changes the language on the plat; this is the exact thing that was trying to be avoided.

Mr. Stabley stated that the state law allows these exemptions to take place, and staff is bringing the full ordinance forward for the consideration of the Commission.

Commissioner Brown stated that he would like reassurance that subdivisions are being discussed, and the exemption would not apply to regional parks, etc. Mr. Stabley responded that this applies to final plats only.

Chairman Hartman opened the public portion of the meeting. Hearing none, Chairman Hartman closed the public portion of the meeting.

MOTION

Vice-Chairman Riggins made a motion to continue PZ-C-004-12 to August 16, 2012 at 9:00 am. Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler asked why this was being continued instead of being denied as presented. Commissioner Brown stated that the exemptions are allowed by state law, and the Commission will decide if they want the exemptions in Pinal County. Commissioner Brown seconded the motion. Motion passed 5-1 with Commissioner Salas in opposition.

LUNCH 11:36
RECONVENED 12:38

PZ-C-003-12 - DISCUSSION/APPROVAL/DISAPPROVAL: The Planning and Development Department requests that the Planning and Zoning Commission amend the earlier initiation, in accordance with A.R.S. § 11-813(D), of a zoning regulation amendment to **Chapter 2.185 Outside Storage and Parking** of **Title 2** of the **Pinal County Development Services Code** to include an amendment to **Chapter 2.105 CI-1 Light Industry and Warehouse zone, Chapter 2.325 C-3 General Commercial zoning district, Chapter 2.330 I-1 Industrial Buffer zoning district, Chapter 2.335 I-2 Light Industrial and Warehouse zoning district and Chapter 2.340 I-3 Industrial zoning district** to list heavy truck parking as either an allowed use or a special use in each of these zones.

Mr. Stabley explained the reason for the request of amendment, stating that the public wanted to know where truck parking is allowed, in addition to where it is not allowed.

Ms. Klucar read a portion of the staff report and used a PowerPoint.

Vice-Chairman Riggins asked how heavy truck parking is dealt with in General Rural (GR) and Suburban Ranch (SR) zones. Ms. Klucar responded that in General Rural owners are allowed to have two (2) heavy trucks per parcel, as long as they are owned by the owners of the parcel and are residents of the parcel. The same applies to Suburban Ranch and Suburban Homestead zones.

Commissioner Brown stated that in his area there are truck drivers that do not own the truck and may bring their work vehicles home and park them on the parcel. Mr. Stabley stated that residents can park one heavy truck per truck drivers license, whether they own the truck or not isn't a factor. Ms. Klucar stated that the driver for the truck is usually the owner, as most large companies have a central location where they house the trucks.

Vice-Chairman Riggins stated that it would be difficult to tie ownership of the truck, as it can be vested in many ways. Ms. Klucar stated that the question came up as to whether the owner is required to obtain an Industrial use Permit prior to establishing the use, and added this is not a requirement.

Chairman Hartman asked if a person could park a truck on CI-1 zoned property if it was leased by a trucker or trucking company. Ms. Klucar responded that the use would be permitted according to this amendment. Mr. Stabley stated that during the site plan review process the drainage issues would be discussed and paving requirements would be determined.

Vice-Chairman Riggins asked how the number of trucks allowed is determined. Ms. Klucar responded that the number allowed depends on the size of the property and access.

Commissioner Salas asked how this would affect prior applicants that were denied in previous hearings. Mr. Stabley responded that applicants could park on the property, but not operate the business from the site.

MOTION

Vice-Chairman Riggins made a motion to approve the amendment to the initiation of PZ-C-003-12 Title 2, Chapter 2.185 to include Chapter 2.105 CI-1, Light Industry and Warehouse zone, Chapter 2.325 C-3 General Commercial zoning district, Chapter 2.330 I-1 Industrial Buffer zoning district, Chapter 2.335 I-2 Light Industrial and Warehouse Zoning district, and Chapter 2.340 I-3 Industrial Zoning district by adding heavy truck parking as either an allowed use or special use in any of these zones. Commissioner Salas seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

PZ-C-003-12 - PUBLIC HEARING/ACTION: Pinal County Planning & Development Department requesting approval of text amendments to the County zoning ordinance **Title 2** of the **Pinal County Development Services Code**, amending **Chapter 2.185 Outside Storage and Parking**, to consider adding language to address definitions, parking locations, setbacks, and restrictions for commercial vehicles with a gross vehicle weight of 19,501 lbs or more and to add language in support of A.R.S. sec. 11-269.10 (Public Service and Public Safety Emergency Vehicles). **(Staff will be requesting to have this agenda item Withdrawn. This item will be noticed for a future date.)**

Mr. Stabley asked that the Commission withdraw this case, and have it brought back in August.

MOTION

Vice-Chairman Riggins made a motion to withdraw case PZ-C-003-12. Commissioner Salas seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

WORK SESSION:

WORKSESSION - PZ-C-005-12 : this is a work session to discuss zoning regulation amendments to **Title 2** "Zoning" of the Pinal County Development Services Code, amending **Chapter 2.10.010 "Definitions," Chapter 2.135 "Park Model (PM) and Recreational Vehicle (RV) Park Zone" and Chapter 2.355 "PM/RVP-435 Park Model/Recreational Vehicle Park Zoning District"** to consider adding definition(s); address a new state law, clarify language in these chapters concerning park, plan approval and street requirements, development standards and any other matters that will make these chapters more consistent with the rest of Title 2 of the Development Services Code.

Mr. LaCrosse read a portion of the staff report and used a PowerPoint.

Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler stated that she was unable to find information on Senate Bill 1598. Mr. Stabley stated that this portion of the Senate Bill stated that in order to deny a case, it has to be Ordinance as opposed to policy, and that there are areas that needed more clarification.

Mr. LaCrosse continued his presentation.

Vice-Chairman Riggins asked if the copy provided was the proposed clean version. Mr. LaCrosse responded yes.

Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler stated that the development standard and the space standard differences are confusing, as the development standard is fifteen (15) feet and the space standard is only five (5) feet. Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler asked why there are conflicting setbacks. Mr. LaCrosse responded that the term space refers to anything within the boundaries of the park. Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler

asked if the setback is five (5) or fifteen (15) feet. Mr. Stabley responded that the fifteen (15) foot setback is an overall park standard which applies to community and recreational buildings.

Mr. LaCrosse continued his presentation.

Vice-Chairman Riggins asked if the parking space could be included in the setback. Mr. LaCrosse responded yes. Vice-Chairman Riggins asked how the community responded to the proposal. Mr. LaCrosse responded that based on his contacts with the community, the idea is accepted, and the community is asking for something like this. Mr. LaCrosse stated that staff contacted all of the Manufactured Home and RV Parks and public notices were sent out to each park in the county.

Mr. Stabley stated that a hearing on this item should be coming forward in the August meeting.

Vice-Chairman Riggins asked for the difference between a Park Model and a Mobile Home. Mr. LaCrosse stated that the standard for Park Models is a maximum of 400 square feet and they are licensed by the Department of Motor Vehicles.

ADJOURNMENT

Vice-Chairman Riggins made a motion to adjourn. Chairman Hartman accepted the motion. Meeting adjourned at 1:14 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY submitted August 16, 2012.

Jerry Stabley, Planning Director