



PINAL COUNTY
wide open opportunity

**PINAL COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
MINUTES OF September 13, 2012**

PRESENT:

Mr. Hartman, Chairman	Mr. Riggins, Vice-Chairman
Ms. Aguirre-Vogler, Member	Mr. Brown, Member
Ms. Moritz, Member	Mr. Gutierrez, Member
Mr. Ellis, Member	Mr. Salas, Member
Mr. Tameron, Member	

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT:
Ms. Grieb, Deputy County Attorney

PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

Mr. Stabley, Director	Mr. Abraham, Planning Manager
Ms. Sarkissian, Planner I	Mr. Denton, Planner II
Ms. Cortez, Administrative Secretary	Ms. MacDonald, Planner II
Mr. Wesley LaCrosse, Code Compliance Manager	

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

The meeting was called to order at 9:03 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: August 16, 2012

Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler stated the minutes need to be clear for the Board of Supervisors review. Ms. Grieb stated the Commission members need to make sure the microphones are turned on and speak clearly into them to make sure staff has a clear understanding of what is being said. Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler stated staff needs to advise the Commission Members when the recording is not clear.

Commissioner Moritz stated on page 11, case PZ-PD-007-12 her comment was not captured correctly when she stated "In the future if the three (3) entrances go in that will dictate the number of lots". What it should be is "if the number of entrances after the traffic analysis is reduced, that will dictate the number of lots". Commissioner Moritz suggested that staff listen to the recording again for clarification.

Commissioner Salas entered 9:09 a.m.

PLANNING DIRECTORS DISCUSSION ITEMS

Mr. Stabley introduced the new Commissioner Mr. John Tameron. Commissioner Tameron gave a brief introduction.

Mr. Stabley stated Vice Chairman Riggins had been reappointed to the Commission until August 16, 2016.

Mr. Stabley recognized Commissioner Faucette and thanked him for all his support. Commissioner Faucette came forward to address the Commission and thanked everyone.

Mr. Stabley stated Commissioner Ellis had reconsidered his resignation, and will continue serving as a member of the Commission.

Chairman Hartman spoke about the Citizen's Advisory Committee not having enough members in attendance for the meetings, and thanked the members of the Commission for their attendance.

REPORT ON BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ACTION ON P & Z CASES

Mr. Stabley stated there is nothing to report.

NEW CASES

PZ-PD-006-12- PUBLIC HEARING/ACTION: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, landowner/applicant, Randolph Carter, Dream Catchers Planning and Design, LLC, agent requesting approval of a Planned Area Development Amendment (**PZ-PD-037-03**) to allow a church within the 6.92± acre parcel; situated in a portion of the northeast quarter of Section 13, T3S, R7E G&SRB&M (legal on file) Tax Parcel 509-02-925 (west of Gary Road, south of Hunt Highway in the San Tan Valley area).

Ms. Sarkissian read a portion of the staff report and used a power point presentation.

Ms. Grieb stated when dealing with religious assemblies the "Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act of 2000" (RLUIPA), tells governments that they are not to impose or implement a land use regulation that would impose a substantial burden on someone exercising their religion. Unless, there is a compelling interest. If there is a compelling interest, the government should handle it with the least intrusive manner possible to support the compelling interest.

Chairman Hartman asked if it was normal to have so many mail outs for one PAD. Ms. Sarkissian responded in addition to following the standard mail out regulations, there is an existing PAD and staff notified all the original owners that were notified in the original PAD, within the San Tan Heights PAD.

Chairman Hartman called the applicant forward.

Mr. Randy Carter, Dream Catcher Planning and Design, 2454 E. Southern Ave. Ste. 110, Mesa, AZ 85204. Mr. Carter came forward to address the Commission. Mr. Carter gave a brief description of the case.

Commissioner Brown stated the area where the church is going is a high traffic area with a dangerous curb and needs a light. Commissioner Brown asked Mr. Carter if they are planning to put in a signal light in the future. Mr. Carter stated no, Mr. AJ Blaha already approved the plan without a light signal. Commissioner Brown stated adding a signal light needs to be addressed. Commissioner Brown asked Mr. Carter what is the schedule of church activities and how often the parking lot would be filled with 300 cars. Mr. Carter responded the main service would be done on Sundays. There are three (3) to four (4) congregations in the building at each time there would be about one hundred families to each congregation. There will be three (3) occasions when on a Sunday, there might 75-150 cars entering the parking lot and that same number with an overlapping schedule will be leaving the parking lot, 30 minutes later. During the week, Mondays there are no meetings; Tuesdays on occasions there will be a small get together. Wednesday nights are scout and youth, that is scheduled from 7- 8 p.m. Parents pick up and drop off their children and there is only approximately 50 cars. Thursday's there might be small meetings with the bishops and parishioners. Fridays on occasions, we would have a wedding reception. Saturdays would be the public functions, weddings and receptions, generally are low impact traffic.

Commissioner Brown asked why there is a parking lot for 300 cars, if it is a low impact traffic area. Mr. Carter responded the parking is currently set for 200 cars, in the future they might want to increase it to 300 cars. Twice a year there, they will be a large meeting conference that will require using all the parking spaces, the conference is held every six (6) months, on Saturday evenings and Sunday mornings.

Commissioner Brown stated there is a blind curve that needs to be addressed to prevent any accidents. Mr. Chow stated the applicant has submitted all of the documents, including the traffic analysis. They have followed all of the requirements, and guidelines. The traffic analysis has been approved, with that approval there might have been requirements that the applicant has to do. They might have to do a right turn lane. Safety was looked at while reviewing the traffic analysis. Commissioner Brown stated a right hand turn lane entering the church would help, when turning out to the left from the parking it has a blind spot. Mr. Chow stated when looking at the curb, they are located on the outside of the curb and have no blind spot.

Chairman Hartman asked Mr. Carter regarding the open space on the north side of the property and if the open space could be used as another driveway. Mr. Carter responded that area is part of the open space requirements for the PAD, and it is not vehicle accessible. Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler stated she agrees with Commissioner Brown, and asked Mr. Chow how many driving lanes are there. Mr. Chow responded there is a center turn left lane, and one (1) lane in each direction. As it widens out towards Wal-Mart and the residential side it widens out to two (2) lanes in each direction.

Commissioner Moritz asked Ms. Sarkissian if the traffic analysis had been agreed to and approved when the original PAD was submitted, and how a traffic analysis is already approved when there is an amendment on the PAD. Mr. Chow responded the traffic plan was submitted when the applicant submitted their site plan application. Commissioner Moritz suggested having the traffic analysis done on a Sunday morning, and she agrees with Commissioner Brown and suggested having a traffic light only on Sundays.

Commissioner Ellis stated the parking is calculated by the square footage of the building, in an assembly it is 100 square feet per person. Mr. Carter stated it is one (1) space for every four (4) seats in a pew. Mr. Stabley stated it is one (1) per every four (4) seats.

Commissioner Ellis stated there needs to be an ingress, egress on San Tan Heights Boulevard plus the one on Gary. Ms. Sarkissian stated the property boundary does not go all the way to San Tan Heights Boulevard; and coming out of San Tan Heights Boulevard would be too close to the other intersection. Commissioner Ellis asked Mr. Carter where the greater amount of members would be coming from. Mr. Carter responded they would be coming from the North West. As the PAD develops south of Gary Road, it would eventually equal the quantity coming from both sides of the building. Mr. Carter stated if they went under the zoning requirement of one (1) car per four (4) seats, they would only be required to have 87 parking spaces; he would rather plan and have 200 spaces for safety reasons, and to cover the conference twice a year. The applicant is adding to the driveway, and adding a turn lane next to the property. The applicant does hire law enforcement during the conference weekend for safety reasons.

Commissioner Ellis asked Mr. Chow what the current speed limit is. Mr. Chow responded he believes is 30 or 35 miles per hour. Commissioner Brown stated the speed transitions to 25 for a brief period. Commissioner Brown explained the traffic congestion in the area, and mentioned the high school traffic adding more drivers. Mr. Chow stated the high school would not be adding traffic, school functions are during the week and at night. The church services are mainly on the weekends.

Commissioner Moritz asked if there could be another stipulation added to request another traffic analysis within six (6) months of the completion of the church, and to be done on a Sunday. Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler stated the problem is not the church; the problem is existing traffic in Pinal County.

Commissioner Moritz asked Mr. Carter about one of the letters that was against the case, which mentioned a donation center in the church. Mr. Carter responded other locations have donation centers and distribution centers but this specific location would not, occasionally they might have a pod for donation to Goodwill or Salvation Army, but that would be the extent.

Vice Chairman Riggins stated he has a concern about the area that does not show any build out on the right of the church building and there is a discussion for a 30x60 pavilion, how is this designed for all the plans? Mr. Carter responded that is part of the landscape plan. If the applicant decided to make the addition, it would be located in the back of the building, where the extra space is located. It would be attached next to the building; once it is finished, it would look like it has always been part of the building. The pavilion would be placed to the right of the new parking area. The only way the applicant would add the pavilion is if the building became a stake building, a center for 6-10 congregations. Vice Chairman Riggins asked if the open-air pavilion would be too close to the neighbors. Mr. Carter responded it would be close, they do have to obtain a building permit for the addition and the pavilion, if the department has issues with it they will address all the concerns at that time.

Commissioner Salas stated there are many concerns about the traffic. They should not build the church and then do a traffic analysis, whoever is taking care of the traffic should review it prior to the building going up, and correct the problem before it occurs. Commissioner Moritz stated she agrees with Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler it is not the church's problem. The traffic issue is a separate issue to be addressed after the church is in and see how it works.

Commissioner Brown stated that this is one of the busiest Wal-Marts in the state, there are 80 thousand people in San Tan Valley and not a lot of places to shop. Vice Chairman Riggins stated there are traffic issues in that area. The applicant has gone through the whole process and the traffic engineers from the County have given them a plan to go forward.

Chairman Hartman asked Mr. Chow what would happen if the applicant did do an addition. Mr. Chow stated if they want to do an addition, they need another site plan review. If the traffic analysis only addresses the first phase, they would need to do another analysis to see what will happen with the second phase.

Chairman Hartman asked Mr. Chow what is the comparison between church traffic and residence traffic of about thirty homes (30) on Gary Road. Mr. Chow responded generally, in residential areas there could be 10 trips per home throughout the day. With a church or retailers, there are peak times. It is difficult to make a comparison between them.

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

MOTION - PZ-PD-006-12

Commissioner Moritz made a motion to forward case PZ-PD-006-12, to Board of Supervisors with favorable recommendation with the attached stipulations. Commissioner Brown seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously, 9-0.

Break 10:13 a.m.

Reconvened 10:25 a.m.

PZ-C-004-12- PUBLIC HEARING/ACTION: text amendments to the Pinal County Subdivision Regulations, **Title 3** of the **Pinal County Development Services Code** that amend **Section 3.20.030 "Final Plat Additional Data"** by adding new subsections; revising current subsections and re-lettering current subsections; by adding definitions; amending requirements for proof of assured water supply to subdivisions located within an active management area; adding requirements for proof of adequate water supply to subdivisions located outside of an active management area, and requiring additional information with submittal of final plats.

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

Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler asked Mr. Denton to elaborate on the cities that did not want to be involved. Mr. Denton stated the cities had concerns with the ordinance affecting their growth and the developers having the money up front to complete the water report for water supply to determine an adequate water supply.

Mr. Stabley stated the Town of Winkelman's concern is they believe that requiring water adequacy would drive away potential development. Kearny currently has their own water issues and did not want to be involved. Mammoth's Public Works director was concerned about the wells, and believed it would be a negative impact. Mr. Denton stated the Public Works director in Mammoth also believes they have plenty of water and it is not a concern right now.

Vice Chairman Riggins stated when the 1980 Ground Water Act passed, there were a large number of difficult water issues that pertained to the entire State of Arizona. When the act passed, development interest, municipalities, and the people who wanted to get the questionable aspects of water supply removed where all in favor of the act. The protections offered in water adequacy are greater than the deterrents. The only valid argument would be people wanting to sell the land knowing there is not enough water. Existing water providers are protected. Vice Chairman Riggins stated it is unfortunate the state statues were written in such a way that includes the municipalities in the regulations even though it is a County vote (Ordinance). Vice Chairman Riggins stated what this adds to the equation and development is transparency and knowledge accessible to the public.

Commissioner Moritz asked are there any existing requirements or something that can be put in place to ensure adequacy after a certificate has been issued, perhaps 10 or 20 years later? Vice Chairman Riggins responded water adequacy, or physical availability is a product of supplies available minus uses. A designated water provider has to resubmit their 100 year status every year. "Adequate Water Supply" is a much lower threshold, the plat can state there is an adequate supply. Once a development is labeled adequate or has an assured water supply certificate it is for 100 years and they do not have to start using it for 10-15 years.

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

MOTION - PZ-C-004-12

Commissioner Ellis made a motion to forward case PZ-C-004-12, to the Board of Supervisors with a favorable recommendation. Vice Chairman Riggins seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously, 9-0.

PZ-C-005-12- PUBLIC HEARING/ACTION: text amendments to the Pinal County Zoning Ordinance, **Title 2 of the Pinal County Development Services Code**, amending **Chapter 2.10 "Definitions"** by adding a definition for "space;" amending **Chapter 2.135 "Park Model (PM) and Recreational Vehicle (RV) Park Zone"** by deleting requirements listed under the use Park Model (PM) and Recreational Vehicle (RV) Park, adding uses to uses permitted; adding some words for consistency and clarification purposes; deleting some street requirements, and adding requirements for overall park development standards and park space development standards; and amending **Chapter 2.355 "(PM/RVP-435) Park Model/Recreational Vehicle Park Zoning District"** by deleting requirements listed under the use Park Model and Recreational Vehicle Park (PM/RVP) and adding requirements for overall park development standards and park space development standards.

Mr. LaCrosse read a portion of the staff report and used a power point presentation.

Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler asked Mr. LaCrosse why is there 30-foot maximum height; there are not any two story manufactured homes or RV parks. Mr. LaCrosse stated those are the standard in the existing ordinance. Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler stated she does not agree with maximum height, and

the change to distance between spaces of 5 feet instead of 15 feet. Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler stated if changes are being made to the ordinance it is perfect time to change the maximum height.

Commissioner Moritz asked Mr. LaCrosse if the 30 feet is for the clubhouse. Mr. LaCrosse responded yes. Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler stated if it is for the clubhouse it needs to be noted and explained what the 30 feet is for.

Commissioner Ellis asked what part of the ordinance would guide the detached building from the spaces. Mr. LaCrosse stated they are allowing the park to control their own limitations. Vice Chairman Riggins stated the changes are not clearer, but are more confusing, by saying the maximum is 30 feet high we are allowing a 30-foot park model.

Commissioner Moritz asked Mr. LaCrosse to explain 2.355.060 Development Standards, under the proposed number 6, with the maximum height of 30 feet. Mr. LaCrosse responded that is any detached building on that space, in the overall park. Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler stated what needs to be clarified is if there is a clubhouse with buildings then that is the 30 feet, not a park model space they are different.

Vice Chairman Riggins stated the only thing that can be 30 feet high is if someone builds an accessory patio and a storage unit would not be that high. Commissioner Ellis asked for the definition of Park Model.

Mr. Stabley read the definition "A park trailer or park model built on a single chassis, mounted on wheels or originally mounted on wheels and from which the wheels have been removed and designed to be connected to utilities necessary for operation of installed fixtures and appliances and has a gross trailer area of not less than three hundred twenty square feet and not more than four hundred square feet when it is set up, except that it does not include fifth wheel trailers". Commissioner Ellis stated that definition is outdated; you can put a manufactured home in a RV site. Mr. Stabley stated the definition comes from the state.

Vice Chairman Riggins asked Mr. LaCrosse if in a park model development can the axle of the park model be removed. They can be skirted, but the axles cannot be removed, is that correct? Mr. LaCrosse responded legally no; they are not made to be done that way. Mr. LaCrosse stated a park model is classified as a recreational vehicle and licensed that way by state law.

Commissioner Moritz stated there is a difference between what Planning and Zoning can dictate what can be built in a particular area in Pinal County, and guidelines in a particular park. The county should dictate the height of any building within a park, and let the park dictate what else could go on. Commissioner Moritz believes it is a Planning and Zoning issue, not the parks'. Mr. LaCrosse stated when there are guidelines, or ordinances are set to what the maximum should be. The intent of the 30 foot is a standard in the ordinance. Commissioner Moritz stated if there is a subdivision next to a model home park, one of the park model owners can put a 30-foot structure in their area within the guidelines, next to wall to a single home residence. Mr. LaCrosse stated that is correct, they can.

Chairman Hartman asked Mr. LaCrosse if they could add a second roof, like a shade roof. Mr. LaCrosse responded yes, they could and some people do.

Mr. Stabley stated it appears the issue is the height of the park models, RVs, space standards and for the accessory buildings. Mr. Stabley suggested changing it from 30 to 20 feet if that made the Commission comfortable. Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler agrees with the change. Commissioner Moritz stated she also agrees on lowering the feet, and leaving the common area and or clubhouse at 30 feet.

Commissioner Ellis stated on the detached structures on minimal distance from the lot line, they should all be 5 feet, not 4 feet this will allow more space. Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler agreed with Commissioner Ellis' suggestion.

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

MOTION - PZ-C-005-12

Vice Chairman Riggins made a motion to forward case PZ-C-005-12 to the Board of Supervisors with a favorable recommendation, amending title 2.355.060 Development standards, Section B, Line 6 amending 30 feet to 20 feet. In Section, 8 B amending 30 feet to 20 feet, and Section E amending 4 feet to 5 feet. Same changes to apply to Section 2.135.050 Space development standards and Section 2.135.040 Site Overall park development standards. Commissioner Salas seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously, 9-0.

Lunch Break 11:28 a.m.

Reconvened 12:30 p.m.

MAJOR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS - PUBLIC HEARING/ACTION

PZ-PA-002-12: Pinal County requesting a map amendment to the Pinal County Comprehensive Plan amending the Open Space and Trails Exhibit by identifying the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail alignment through Pinal County.

Ms. Sarkissian read a portion of the staff report and used a power point presentation.

Vice Chairman Riggins stated the concept of using canal right of ways as connectivity is risky; almost all canal right of ways are private. In Maricopa County, they were barred from public use. Vice Chairman Riggins stated he does not agree with using them as connectivity. Ms. Sarkissian stated the majority of the connections with the canals are in the Casa Grande area, and they are following their existing park plan, we are using the trails they have already established. Vice Chairman Riggins stated most of the canals in Casa Grande are San Carlos irrigation district.

Chairman Hartman stated he had spoken to Mr. Bill Stacey, General Manager for Electrical District 3 (ED3) in Maricopa, Mr. Stacey advised him that Salt River project used to prohibit walking throughout the canals. After much public input the vehicle portion was closed and now they allow walking through the Salt River project through the Scottsdale and Phoenix area.

Ms. Sarkissian stated that the Citizen's Advisory Committee had met the night prior and they agreed on recommending the yellow trail.

Chairman Hartman opened the meeting to the public. Hearing none.

MOTION - PZ-PA-002-12

Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler made a motion to forward case PZ-PA-002-12, to the Board of Supervisors with a favorable recommendation, following the yellow recreation line trail. Commissioner Ellis seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously, 9-0.

PZ-PA-003-12: Pinal County requesting a map amendment to the Pinal County Comprehensive Plan by amending the locations of trails alignments within the Pinal County Comprehensive Plan Open Space and Trails Exhibit.

Ms. Sarkissian read a portion of the staff report and used a power point presentation.

Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler asked Ms. Sarkissian why the county has not adopted the Butterfield trail. Ms. Sarkissian stated there are no new trails being added now to the existing plan; the trails are only being refined. Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler stated she has asked the county to add Butterfield trail since the comprehensive plan was implemented.

Commissioner Moritz asked Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler why she believes the trail should be added. Commissioner Brown stated it is a part our history. Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler agreed it is part of history, and should be identified.

Chairman Hartman asked Mr. Stabley what needs to be done to add Butterfield trail on the map as a historic record. Mr. Stabley responded he was not sure, but would have Mr. Taylor respond.

Mr. Taylor stated the Butterfield Trail has a historical alignment, but it is not identified as a National Historic Trail so it is not comparable to the Anza trail to design the corridor. The Butterfield corridor is mostly freeway, or along a freeway alignment. There is not enough information from point a to point b to identify the corridor to consider it as a recreational corridor.

Mr. Stabley stated staff proposes to bring back more information on the Butterfield trail.

Chairman Hartman opened the meeting to the public. Hearing none.

MOTION - PZ-PA-003-12

Commissioner Ellis made a motion to forward case PZ-PA-003-12, to the Board of Supervisors with a favorable recommendation. Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously, 9-0.

PZ-PA-004-12: Pinal County requesting a text amendment to the Pinal County Comprehensive Plan Chapter 10: Implementation; to establish when trail realignment is considered a major, non-major or administrative amendment within the Pinal County Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Sarkissian read a portion of the staff report and used a power point presentation.

Commissioner Brown stated a trails plan is necessary, and it needs to be able to be accommodated in an easy way.

Chairman Hartman opened the meeting to the public. Hearing none.

MOTION - PZ-PA-004-12

Vice Chairman Riggins made a motion to forward case PZ-PA-004-12, to the Board of Supervisors with a favorable recommendation. Commissioner Salas seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously, 9-0.

PZ-PA-005-12: Pinal County requesting a text amendment to the Pinal County Comprehensive Plan to amend the text of Chapter 3: Sense of Community and Chapter 7: Environmental Stewardship to amend and add new policies concerning urban heat islands, rain water harvesting and "Energy Star" compliant construction practices; and adding three sidebars to Chapter 7 describing and highlighting the terms: Urban Heat Islands, Cool Pavements, Cool Roofs and Green Roofs.

Mr. Abraham read a portion of the staff report and used a power point presentation. Mr. Abraham stated during the CAC meeting, there was an 8-1 vote; the one (1) member that was against the case thought that CAC and the Open Space Task Force did not take enough time to look at the economic impacts. Mr. Stabley added the gentleman felt that the solar generated electricity was more expensive than other forms of electricity. Vice Chairman Riggins also agreed.

Mr. Abraham continued with the power point presentation.

Commissioner Gutierrez stated in Casa Grande the High School and the Frito Lay Plant have installed solar panels that serve a double purpose, covered parking, and solar panels.

Chairman Hartman called to the public.

Ms. Sandie Smith 4415 S. Primrose Drive, Gold Canyon, AZ 85118. Ms. Smith came forward to address the Commission. Ms. Smith stated she agrees with the case.

MOTION - PZ-PA-005-12

Commissioner Brown made a motion to forward case PZ-PA-005-12 to the Board of Supervisors with a favorable recommendation. Commissioner Gutierrez seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously, 9-0.

PZ-PA-006-12: Pinal County requesting a text amendment to the Pinal County Comprehensive Plan to amend Chapter 6: Open Spaces and Places; to add a new objective 6.2.2 for the creation of a trails manual within the Pinal County Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Sarkissian read a portion of the staff report and used a power point presentation.

No comments from the Commission.

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

MOTION - PZ-PA-006-12

Vice Chairman Riggins made a motion to forward case PZ-PA-006-12, to the Board of Supervisors with a favorable recommendation. Commissioner Salas seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously, 9-0.

Vice Chairman Riggins left at 1:45 p.m

WORK SESSION

PZ-C-006-12 – WORK SESSION: To discuss a potential ordinance amendment to **Title 2** of the **Pinal County Development Services Code**, amending **Chapter 2.175 Planned Area Development (PAD) Overlay Zoning District** to consider adding language to allow previously approved PADs to make amendments following the requirements of Chapter 2.175 when rezoning to the Mixed Use Zoning District, subject to criteria, and to allow administrative PAD amendments when rezoning to the Mixed Use Zoning District, subject to criteria; amending **Chapter 2.176 Planned Area Development (PAD) Overlay Zoning District on or after February 18, 2012** to consider adding criteria for PAD amendments with mixed use zoning; and adding **Chapter 2.360 Mixed Use Zoning District**, to consider adding a new zoning district that will permit a mix of development types including residential, commercial and industrial and will provide flexibility in these development area boundaries.

Ms. MacDonald read a portion of the staff report and used a power point presentation.

Commissioner Ellis stated that there needs to be language explaining that the expansion could not be greater than 10% of the original area over the two times. Ms. MacDonald agreed with Commissioner Ellis.

Ms. MacDonald continued with the power point presentation.

Commissioner Ellis asked Ms. MacDonald if a minor amendment to the site plan could be done administratively without going through the public hearing process. Ms. MacDonald responded that is what staff is proposing.

Ms. MacDonald continued with the power point presentation.

Commissioner Moritz asked Ms. MacDonald when an applicant applies for mixed used, do they have to identify the percentages of the split. If they request to make a change to one of those, does it have to be adjacent to the approved use. Ms. MacDonald responded yes, they do identify the percentage and it has to be contiguous to the original location.

Commissioner Ellis stated that staff needs to make it clear in the language whether the original acreage or the acreage after the first amendment would be used in the second expansion. Keeping it at the 10% of the original value would be best.

Commissioner Moritz stated that when you have changed the development footprint, then that is the one you are changing not the one from previous step.

Commissioner Brown stated if it is being handled administrative how is the agreement between the community and developer honored. Ms. Grieb responded if those types of agreements were being made it would be in the stipulations. Staff does not have authority to change the stipulations.

Ms. Sandie Smith 4415 S. Primrose Drive, Gold Canyon, AZ 85118. Ms. Smith came forward to address the Commission. Ms. Smith stated Pinal Partnership fully supports staff, and commends staff for their hard work.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler made a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Moritz seconded the motion. Chairman Hartman accepted the motion. Meeting adjourned at 2:11 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY submitted October 18, 2012



Jerry Stabley, Planning Director