

**TOWN OF GILBERT
PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
50 E. CIVIC CENTER DRIVE
GILBERT, AZ
DECEMBER 5, 2018**

COMMISSION PRESENT:

Chairman Brian Andersen
Vice Chair Carl Bloomfield
Commissioner Seth Banda
Commissioner David Cavenee
Commissioner Greg Froehlich
Commissioner Brian Johns
Commissioner Les Smith
Alternate Commissioner Philip Alibrandi
Alternate Commissioner James Torgeson

COMMISSION ABSENT:

None

STAFF PRESENT:

Sydney Bethel, Planner II
Stephanie Bubenheim, Planner II
Keith Newman, Planner II
Josh Rogers, Planner II
Nathan Williams, Senior Planner
Amy Temes, Interim Principal Planner
Catherine Lorbeer, Interim Planning Manager

ALSO PRESENT:

Attorney Nancy Davidson
Council Liaison Brigitte Peterson
Recorder Debbie Frazey

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Brian Andersen called the December 5, 2018 Study Session of the Planning Commission to order at 5:07 p.m. Chair Andersen said they would be moving Agenda Item 1 until later in the meeting. He then said they would be hearing Agenda Item 9 first.

9. S18-06, CONTRERAS FARMS: PRELIMINARY PLAT AND OPEN SPACE PLAN FOR CONTRERAS FARMS BY VIP HOMES, FOR 14 HOME LOTS ON APPROXIMATELY 10.07 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED EAST OF THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF HIGLEY AND MEWS ROADS IN THE SINGLE FAMILY 15 (SF-15) ZONING DISTRICT.

Stephanie Bubenheim began her presentation on S18-06, Contreras Homes. She stated that this case was for a Preliminary Plat and Open Space Plan. She shared a Vicinity Map, indicating the location of the project east of the northeast corner of Higley and Mews Road. She shared that the site was 10.07 acres in size and the project was within the Santan Character Area. She said there is an existing home on the site that was built in 1982 under Maricopa County jurisdiction. She said that home will remain as one of the lots in this Preliminary Plat. She said the zoning is Single Family – 15 (SF-15) so the minimum lot size is 15,000 square feet. She said most of the lots range from 15,000 square feet up to 19,000 square feet. She said that Mews Road will be built to the agrarian street standard and will back up Mews Meetinghouse, which was a Design Review case the Commission approved last month. She said that this applicant, the Mews Meetinghouse and the Town are working in conjunction to provide sewer down Mews Road. She said the Town will design roadway improvements along Mews Road from Higley. She said there would also be a looped public road going through the site that will connect along Mews Road. She shared the Landscape Plan. She said they are meeting the Single Family Rural Santan Character Area density. She said there would be a height restriction easement that was requested along Lot 6. She said that request is from the subdivision to the north. She said the neighboring subdivision would like to keep a view of Santan Mountain to the south. The easement will state that no structure or landscape can be over 6' in height. She shared the Wall Plan. She said that access will be off of Higley Road. Planner Bubenheim finished her presentation.

Chair Andersen thanked Planner Bubenheim for her presentation and called for questions or comments.

Question: Chair Andersen asked if the applicant was agreeable to the height restriction easement.
Answer: Stephanie Bubenheim said that the applicant provided this during the submittal process and Staff sought further clarification. The developer is VIP Homes and they also developed the subdivision to the north.

Question: David Cavenee said he noticed that north and east have block walls and to the west, it shows an existing chain link fence. He asked if there was a plan to do a perimeter wall that is consistent around the site.

Answer: Stephanie Bubenheim said there is an existing wall along the east and the north in chain link. She pointed out an area outlined in blue along the west side, where they will be installing a block wall.

Question: David Cavenee asked if they would be matching the heights and if it would look like a themed wall or if it would just be pure gray block.

Answer: Stephanie Bubenheim said the wall on the west is not a themed wall, but will just be a gray wall.

Question: David Cavenee asked if there would be any decel lanes on Mews.

Answer: Stephanie Bubenheim said it wasn't necessary due to low traffic in the area.

- 2. GP18-15 CADIZ: REQUEST FOR MINOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT TO CHANGE THE LAND USE CLASSIFICATION OF APPROX. 9.99 ACRES GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF S. GREENFIELD AND E. GERMANN ROADS FROM RESIDENTIAL >0-1 TO RESIDENTIAL > 3.5-5.**

Z18-29 CADIZ: REQUEST TO REZONE APPROXIMATELY 9.99 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF S. GREENFIELD AND E. GERMANN ROADS FROM TOWN OF GILBERT SINGLE FAMILY-43 (SF-43) TO SINGLE FAMILY-DETACHED (SF-D) WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY ZONING DISTRICT (PAD) TO MODIFY MINIMUM LOT AREA, MAXIMUM LOT COVERAGE, AND MINIMUM BUILDING SETBACKS.

S18-19 CADIZ: REQUEST FOR INPUT ON THE PRELIMINARY PLAT AND OPEN SPACE PLAN FOR NEW VILLAGE HOMES, FOR 50 HOME LOTS (LOTS 1-50) ON APPROX. 9.99 ACRES LOCATED SOUTH OF THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF S. GREENFIELD AND E. GERMANN ROADS.

Josh Rogers began his presentation on GP18-15, Z18-29 and S18-19, Cadiz. Planner Rogers gave an overview, noting that the Commission would be hearing a Minor General Plan Amendment, Rezoning and an overview of a Preliminary Plat and Open Space Plan. He said the proposal was from New Village Homes and involved just under 10 acres. He shared the location of the property south of the southeast corner of S. Greenfield and E. Germann Roads. He indicated that the Minor General Plan Amendment request was to change the land use classification from Residential > 0-1 DU/Acre to Residential > 3.5-5 DU/Acre. He said the Rezoning request was to rezone the Single Family – 43 (SF-43) to Single Family – Detached (SF-D) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay. He also requested input on the Preliminary Plat and Open Space Plan for 50 home lots. He shared the current General Plan Land Use Map, noting that he had highlighted the project in purple. He said that the area surrounding the property was fairly low density residential. He said the project is on the northern edge of the Santan Character Area. He said the current zoning surrounding the property was primarily SF-43 with some SF-35 and SF-6 to the north. He discussed the deviation requests (listed below):

Project Data Table (modifications are in Bold)

Site Development Regulations	Required per LDC (SF-D)	Proposed
Minimum Lot Area	3,000 sq.ft.	2,680 sq.ft.

(sq. ft. per DU)		
Maximum Height (ft.)/Stories	36/3	36/3
Minimum Building Setbacks (ft.)		
Front	10'	5'
Rear	10'	5'
Maximum Lot Coverage (%)		
One Story	60%	65%
Two/Three Story	50%	65%

Planner Rogers shared the Development Plan and stated that this project was very similar to a project that was before the Commission a few months ago. He said when that project was approved, they requested changes be allowed if a home buyer purchased a home with a bonus room. He said they are requesting the same allowance in this development. He said they have two product offerings: one is the 2,600 square foot product and one is a 4,500 square foot product. He said they are using this larger product to help buffer the surrounding lower density land uses. He said they are requesting a reduction in the 5' lot line, down to a zero lot line, when they build a home with a bonus room. The bonus room offering also would have an effect on the lot coverage if a homebuyer chooses that option. Planner Rogers said that the Series 100, are the smaller lot sizes and are 1- and 2-story units. The Series 200 offers three 1-story units and one 2-story plan. He said they are limiting the eleven large lots on the east side to 1-story to increase the buffer to the large lot residential that exists to the east. He said the average density per acre is 5 DU/Acre. He further discussed the bonus room option. He shared a typical lot layout. He stated that the roads would be made of cobblestone pavers. He shared an overview of the Plat layout. He shared a cross-section of the streets. He said they wouldn't be using typical sidewalks, but would be using 4' ribbon curb and 2' ribbon curb on the other side. He shared the Overall Landscape Plan. He said they have significant landscaping in the right-of-way along Greenfield Road. He shared the location of guest parking. He shared the Entrance and Amenity Plan, the Amenity Plan and the Wall Plan. He stated that it would not be a gated community. He said they aren't proposing any perimeter walls in an effort to make it as open as possible to fit into the Santan Character Area's theme. He shared an overview of the parking and trash plan. He said they have on-street trash receptacles. He shared a few of the concerns that Staff has with the Santan Character Area policies that they believe the development is not in line with. He finished his presentation and asked for input.

Comment: David Cavenee said they had seen this product in a couple of other locations, but in those locations, the projects were infill pieces and he feels this is a great project for an infill parcel. In this situation, it isn't an infill project and the property is surrounded by low density, high acreage residential housing. He said he doesn't believe this type of development fits in this area. He said this is the wrong application of the product, even though it fit perfectly in the other two that had been previously approved. He said he was very supportive of the previous project, but he doesn't believe this product fits in this location. Regarding the deviation requests, he said his view on this is that the developer has a rectangular parcel unencumbered by anything. He doesn't see a

rationale for any deviations. He said this project is a long way from where it needs to be. He said it needs to be a lower density product and this product is not the right one for this area. He said if they are going into this development, he would encourage the designer to follow the required design guidelines and make sure they meet those without seeking deviations, when there are no encumbrances to justify the deviations. He said he didn't feel it necessary to address the Design Review portion because he feels it is irrelevant.

Comment/Question: Brian Johns said that as much as he likes the product, he agrees with Commissioner Cavenee. He said he would be curious if there is anything in the area with this high density. He said the project is surrounded by acreage lots. He asked Planner Rogers what was located to the east of the site.

Answer: Josh Rogers said there are two occupied residential houses on acre lots to the east. He said there were also some undeveloped lots. He said that the site to the north is actually requesting to change to Single Family – Detached (SF-D).

Question: Brian Johns asked what they were looking to do. He asked if it was the same applicant to the north.

Answer: Josh Rogers said that it wasn't the same applicant. He said the density to the project to the north is approximately 4.1 acres and is a completely different product and builder.

Question: Les Smith asked if he understood that a portion of these homes would be 3-story homes.

Answer: Josh Rogers said that they would be able to build 3-story homes by right, but they are only planning on building predominately 1-story homes, with some 2-story homes. He said the larger lots have three 1-story plans and one 2-story plan.

Question: Vice Chair Carl Bloomfield said that he agreed with the Commission and has concerns on this case also, given that it is within the Santan Character Area, even though it is near the boundary. He asked what the boundary was.

Answer: Josh Rogers said the actual boundary is Superstition Drive.

Comment: Vice Chair Bloomfield said that the project doesn't fit the character of the area and doesn't fit the character of the Santan Character Area. He said he would be very hesitant to approve this, even though he liked the product the developer brought forward on the other projects. He said he felt like the product fit in those places, but he doesn't get the same feeling here. He said he wouldn't be in favor of approving this case.

Question: Greg Froehlich asked if there were any other products within the Santan Character Area that have this same density.

Answer: Josh Rogers said he had done a cursory analysis of the area. He said there is one SF-D product in the area, the Hamstra Dairy. He said he hasn't found anything this dense within the Santan Character Area.

Comment: Greg Froehlich said that the product is a good product, but the product is denser than anything in the area. He said it is kind of blocked in by some of the other buildings that are at that corner. He said they are also asking for a lot of deviations. He said when developers request

deviations, he likes to hear good reasons for those. He said he does understand the requests for changes based on the bonus room and is agreeable to that.

Comment: Chair Andersen said he didn't have anything new to add. He said his comments are pretty much in line with what the other Commissioners have said.

3. S18-18 ASPIRE HERITAGE DISTRICT: PRELIMINARY PLAT AND OPEN SPACE PLAN FOR ASPIRE HERITAGE DISTRICT, FOR THIRTY-TWO (32) RESIDENTIAL HOME LOTS (LOTS 1-32) ON APPROXIMATELY 2.47 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF VAUGHN AVENUE AND PALM STREET IN THE MULTI-FAMILY/LOW (MF/L) ZONING DISTRICT.

Sydney Bethel began her presentation on S18-18, Aspire Heritage District. She informed the Commission that this case was for a Preliminary Plat and Open Space Plan for the Aspire Heritage District for 32 residential lots on approximately 2.47 acres. She said this request is in conjunction with a Design Review that is also in process, but since this is within the Heritage District, the Planning Commission will not be seeing the Design Review portion of the case. She said she could show the Elevations for reference, but indicated to the Commission that they would be looking to approve the Preliminary Plat. She said it would then go back to the Redevelopment Commission for a formal recommendation. She said it went before the Redevelopment Commission for Study Session on November 21, 2018. She shared the location of the project at the corner of Vaughn Avenue and Palm Street and said it was zoned Multi Family / Low (MF/L). The project is for 32 lots with a minimum lot size of 21' x 51' with a maximum being 27' x 54'. She said there are three different types of proposed layouts, all of which are three bedroom units. Planner Bethel stated that the proposed density is 13.36 DU/Acre which is in compliance with the General Plan designation of 8-14 DU/Acre. She shared the gated entry point to the project at the corner of Vaughn and Palm Street. She also shared the location of the adjacent pedestrian gate, as well as a pedestrian gate that is located towards the back of the property and exits onto the canal. She shared the Landscape and Open Space Plan. She discussed the plant palette for the Heritage District, noting that this is an important component of what they like to see in the Heritage District. She said that the RDC was in favor of adding more of the plants from the plant palette. She shared the amenity area, which is located towards the center of the site. She shared the location of the guest parking. She said that parking was located on the first floor of all of the units. She said the development has a total of 72 parking spaces in total. She shared the Wall Plan, noting that the different sections have different elements of brick and steel incorporated into the wall variations. She shared that this development was similar to the District Lofts, which is located within the downtown area. She said that the RDC had commented that they would like to see more open fencing located at the vehicle gate entrance. She shared some additional concerns of the RDC, specifically about the amount of guest parking provided at the site. She indicated that the RDC was concerned because there is no HOA, so there won't be any restrictions on overflow and they are concerned with how this will affect the rest of the neighborhood. The RDC also has concerns about the plant palette. She finished her presentation and requested input from the Commission.

Question: Brian Johns asked to see the concerns raised by the RDC. Regarding parking, he asked to clarify that the parking met the requirements.

Answer: Sydney Bethel stated that the applicant is meeting their residential and guest parking requirements.

Comment/Question: Brian Johns said he didn't have an issue with parking if they are meeting the requirements. He also asked if they were meeting the plant requirements.

Answer: Sydney Bethel said that 7 out of the 15 proposed plants were not in compliance with the plant palette in the Design Guidelines for the Heritage District. She said that Staff has allowed for some deviation in the past for accent materials, but it needs to meet the intent of the Heritage District. She mentioned the date palms that were at the entrance on the Landscape Plan, noting that those are not on the plant palette.

Question: Brian Johns asked if the reason the applicant was desiring the date palms, was that they desired to get a certain look leading into their subdivision. He asked if Staff supported the landscape the applicant is showing now.

Answer: Sydney Bethel said that Staff is not supportive of the landscape they are showing now. She said they are supportive of an integration of more plants from the Heritage District plant palette.

Comment/Question: Brian Johns said he would be in support of the applicant working with Staff to integrate more of the plant palette into the area. He said he also agreed with the comment about view fencing. He said he wasn't seeing how the pedestrian walkway was connected to the main road. He asked if the proposed walkway was pretty consistent with the walkway that is coming from the areas next to it.

Answer: Sydney Bethel said that currently, where they are proposing the possibility of another pedestrian gate, they are proposing a sidewalk that comes down and ends, but wouldn't continue on. She said that part of adding that pedestrian gate would be the addition of a sidewalk that would connect to the existing public sidewalk.

Question: Brian Johns asked to clarify that they are asking for two pedestrian gates.

Answer: Sydney Bethel answered affirmatively. She said there is currently one proposed that connects to the pedestrian sidewalk. She said they also have sidewalks that connect within the site.

Comment: Brian Johns said he didn't see the point of having two connections going back into this entry. He said as long as they have a clear and defined crosswalk, he thought most of the traffic would be heading to the east anyway. He said as long as the one gate is to the north of the driveway or the turnaround loop at the fence, he thinks one is enough. He suggested it should be well marked, wider and have a little more landscape to give it more identity. He said the property to the south blocks it off, so he doesn't see any advantage to having another walkway over there. He suggested they stick to the gate they have and just make it a little more defined. He said he didn't have any other comments, but he was curious to see what the elevations would look like when they come out. He said he liked that they have sidewalks throughout the entire subdivision.

Question: David Cavenee asked how many species of plants Staff was concerned with. He asked if they were just concerned with the date palms or if they had additional concerns.

Answer: Sydney Bethel said that 7 of the proposed plants are not from the approved palette, so they would like to see further incorporation of approved plants. She said in the past they have allowed for some deviation with accent plants, but they don't like to see something that is applied to the majority of the plants, not being in line with the approved palette.

Comment/Question: David Cavenee said he would agree with that. He said he thinks the date palms are a nice iconic look and suggested maybe they could qualify as an accent because there are only three of them, but where there are other species that could be swapped with those that are from the approved palette, he would recommend they do so. He said he likes the layout and thinks it fits the character of the neighborhood. He said he thinks for the most part, the layout of the walls looks pretty good. He said it was difficult to determine how tall some of the walls are. He asked Planner Bethel for clarification. He said without seeing the elevations of the buildings, and knowing how the materials in the material board are going to translate to the buildings, it is difficult to give good feedback. He said initially he is concerned about the painted CMU feeling cheap and a little plain, unless it translates very well into the architecture of the buildings. He said he was agreeable with a single pathway. He said he thinks it is a good effort, but would like to see a little more detail in the buildings and how they relate.

Answer: Sydney Bethel said that dimensions were not provided specifically on these plans, but the walls are 6' or 8' in height and the lower walls are 3'.

Question: Chair Andersen asked to clarify that the Design Review portion of this project would not be coming back before the Commission because it would stay with the RDC.

Answer: Sydney Bethel answered affirmatively.

Comment: David Cavenee said that in that case, he would encourage Staff to pay attention to making sure that the materials correlate in a way that seems attractive.

Question: Greg Froehlich said that he is agreeable to the pathway being on one side, but he wanted to make sure that it is ADA accessible. He said at Lot 32, it appears that there might need to be a sidewalk ramp in there for crossing, so that people on the east side can cross over to that left side and utilize the pathway. He said that is the only minor comment he had and it seemed like everything else seemed like it was accessible. He said it appears in the drawing, that the west end of the project on the north side has an existing ADA ramp.

Answer: Sydney Bethel said it is difficult to see in the drawings, but they do have ADA ramps that have been commented on by Staff.

Comment/Question: Seth Banda said he is concerned with parking. He said he thinks it is a nice product, but he thinks products such as this one will have issues with a lack of parking due to the proximity to the Heritage District. He said they will probably have a lot of people that want to go downtown. He said he realizes they meet the requirements, but he would like to see a little more. In terms of the deviation from the plants, he agrees with the RDC that they should meet the plant palette. He said he likes the date palms and feels they are a good accent for an entry piece. He

asked if the other 7 plants that were not part of the approved plant palette, were within the gates of the community or if they were visible on the outside.

Answer: Sydney Bethel said that they were located within the gates and it was a very small section past the gates. She said it is possible that there are others, in addition to the date palms, that are outside the development, but she doesn't believe that there are many past the gates.

Comment: Seth Banda said that anything that would be apart from the non-approved palette, as long as it wasn't visible from the Heritage District and was within the community, wouldn't be too much of a problem for him. He said he thought the date palms were a good accent piece.

Comment: David Cavenee said that upon further review, he said it shows that there are 10 date palms at the entrance. He said if there are that many, and they aren't on the approved list, he thought 10 might be too many. He suggested they reduce that number. He said he agrees that they are a great accent.

Comment: Chair Andersen said that if the applicant is meeting the Code on the parking requirements, he doesn't think they can enforce the applicant to add more parking. He said he lives and works in the area and the area is already congested due to all the restaurants, but there will be a 600 car parking garage that is being built. He said he believes this will help get a lot of cars off the streets.

4. DR18-191, RESIDENCES AT SANTAN VILLAGE: SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPE, GRADING AND DRAINAGE, ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS, LIGHTING, COLORS AND MATERIALS FOR APPROXIMATELY 15.77 ACRES, GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH AND WEST OF THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SANTAN VILLAGE PARKWAY AND RAY ROAD AND ZONED MULTI-FAMILY/MEDIUM (MF/M) WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD) OVERLAY.

Stephanie Bubenheim began her presentation on DR18-191, Residences at Santan Village. She shared that this was a Design Review application for Residences at Santan Village. She said the Commission had previously heard the Minor General Plan Amendment and Rezoning case for this site in November. She said the site is 15.77 acres and located south and west of the southwest corner of Santan Village Parkway and Ray Road. She said that Town Council is hearing this case tomorrow night to vote for approval. The project is a response to the deviations requested in the rezoning to create a more dense, pedestrian oriented community. She shared the Site Plan, noting that the buildings are oriented towards the road and the main access point will be along Santan Village Parkway. She said there are two existing private drives, Ivanhoe to the south and Columbus to the west. She said along Columbus Drive, there will be angled on-street parking that matches the existing on-street parking to the west. She said that parking is internal to the site. She said the hard corner of Santan Village Parkway and Ray Road will still be zoned Regional Commercial for future commercial development. She said an access is provided on that private drive so that there is additional access once that site is developed. She said there are also many pedestrian access points throughout the site. She said there will be garage parking on each of the six buildings and there will be tandem parking, which will count towards parking counts as a

Condition of Approval in the Rezoning case. She shared the landscaping, indicating that Staff has requested a full Landscape Plan be provided. She pointed out that they will be requesting to amend the Santan Village Parkway right-of-way landscaping standards, because it was originally projected for Regional Commercial. They will also be requesting to amend the Santan Village Master Sign Program. She shared a slide which showed the Entry Experience and Promenade, as well as some Promenade details. She said there would be two exit only gates provided to get onto Columbus Drive for additional access outside of the facility. She shared some additional details regarding dog washes, fire pits, and pool amenities. Planner Bubenheim shared the Wall Plan. She said that Staff requested little to no walls, so the buildings themselves are used as the main walls for the site. She indicated that some units along Columbus Drive on the first floor would have access from their patios outside, so the residents can park on that street and enter into their homes. She said that there are a few walls provided, but Staff is requesting that they look into those walls a little more, because most of them tend to be 5' to 6' in height and they were expecting them to be a little lower and that they be more integrated into the project. She said they have also requested the view fence be a partial, opaque wall so that there wouldn't be any light glare into the site from the parking that is expected in the future. She shared the colors and materials board. She then shared the Elevations for Buildings 1 through 6. She said that Staff had commented that a few areas have large massing of one color and smaller windows, so they have asked for more articulation. She said they have also requested some perspectives be provided because the movement is not always evident on the 2-D renderings. She shared Floor Plans. She said each building would have elevators, as well as three sets of stairs, providing many points of access into the buildings. She finished her presentation and requested input on the architectural articulation on the building elevations, on the colors and materials and the height of the proposed walls and fences.

Comment: David Cavenee said he thought the site was laid out well for the density they are trying to achieve. He said he thinks it's a good layout and creates a nice interior space and presents itself well to the street. He said he wouldn't recommend any improvements to the layout. Regarding the elevations, he said he really liked them. He said he agrees with Staff that there are some large blank spaces and a few walls that are a little bare and would benefit from a little more articulation. He said that overall, he loves the material palette and thinks it will be quite attractive and will add warmth, despite the mass. He said they have moved the roofline up and down well to create articulation there. He said he is curious about one material that is being used to hold up the canopy. He said the canopy appears to be held up by a couple of columns and out of the stone columns, it appears that some kind of metal clad material is coming out.

Comment/Question: Vice Chair Bloomfield said he really likes the project. He said it is what they expected it would be. He asked Planner Bubenheim to clarify Staff's concerns with the height and if it was due to the fact that they had hoped the development would be a little more pedestrian friendly.

Answer: Stephanie Bubenheim said that they expected the walls to be a lower height. She said there are walls at the promenade area that are the connection to the development to the west. She said there are three walls and the comment was made that it isn't entirely inviting for people to know that they can pass through a 7' tall wall. She said Staff had expected that the walls would be lower. Regarding color, they were questioning if the gray color would be the best color to use.

She said that while it is matching the architecture, there is also the Santan Village area where signage is incorporated into the walls a lot of the time, so they were looking at whether it might be a good idea to use a second color or if they could use a different type of decorative block to break up the design of the walls.

Comment/Question: Vice Chair Bloomfield said he could see Planner Bubenheim's point at the Promenade and at the entrance. He said it looks like two walls coming together and then a wall behind it, so they could go around it. He asked if he was correct.

Answer: Stephanie Bubenheim answered affirmatively.

Comment: Vice Chair Bloomfield said it seemed that Staff's perception was that they should take that down to 3' or 4' high walls so that people could see through there and have it be a promenade and not just a blank wall that they are looking at. He said he would agree with that. He said the lower walls would contribute to a pedestrian-oriented design. He said this area would be very pedestrian-oriented with Top Golf and other family entertainment and the Santan Mall nearby. He said this should be a support to all of the amenities that are around the development. He said he is really looking forward to this project.

Comment: Brian Johns said that he understands that Staff is wanting to make the walls shorter along the promenade, but he pointed out that they are using a ground face wall, which is not an inexpensive material. He said they are using the most expensive block that the block manufacturer has to offer and he said the ground face ties in well to the Santan materials. He said the applicant did something very unique. He said to be able to experience that as you are coming through it will allow a connection from what's behind it. He said to take that and shorten it will reduce the texture. He said he personally feels that the larger walls will provide security from the traffic going by and will also create an experience as you're entering through those areas. He said he thinks they did a wonderful job on the buildings themselves. He said they used a lot of rich materials at a pedestrian level, which is important because the sidewalks are next to the buildings. He said there are some blank walls, but noted that these are big buildings. He said he isn't too concerned with the massing and having a blank wall now and again because there is so much going on. He said he did feel that Building 2 did have a pretty blank canopy and pointed out the area in the upper left corner on the elevation. He said they might be able to do something a little more in that area, but overall he was pleased with the plan and the amount of movement in the plan itself. He said there is some uniqueness and variety in the different windows and in the staircases. He said he supports the project.

Comment/Question: Greg Froehlich said he actually likes the color and thinks it matches well with the buildings. He said he thinks they did a great job with the pedestrian connectivity throughout the project. He asked about the two exits to the west that are operated by a gate that allows them to exit only. He asked if there were pedestrian gates next to those gates.

Answer: Stephanie Bubenheim pointed out the location of the pedestrian gates.

Chair Andersen told the audience that they were going to continue the Study Session and try to hear the remainder of the cases before starting the Regular Meeting.

- 5. GP18-16: VILLAS AT SOMERSET - MINOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT TO CHANGE THE LAND USE CLASSIFICATION OF APPROX. 20.77 ACRES GENERALLY LOCATED EAST OF THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF GREENFIELD ROAD AND PECOS ROAD FROM RESIDENTIAL > 5 - 8 DU/ACRE LAND USE CLASSIFICATION AND RESIDENTIAL > 3.5 - 5 DU/ACRE LAND USE CLASSIFICATION TO RESIDENTIAL > 2 - 3.5 DU/ACRE LAND USE CLASSIFICATION, AND;**

S18-17: VILLAS AT SOMERSET - PRELIMINARY PLAT AND OPEN SPACE PLAN FOR 68 HOME LOTS ON APPROXIMATELY 20.77 ACRES LOCATED EAST OF THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF GREENFIELD ROAD AND PECOS ROAD.

Keith Newman began his presentation on GP18-16 and S18-17, Villas at Somerset. He said this was for a Minor General Plan Amendment and a Preliminary Plat. He said the subject site was located east of the southeast corner of Greenfield Road and Pecos Road, just east of the Gilbert, Arizona Temple. He said the property was made up of two separate parcels. He discussed the surrounding area. He said the site is 20.77 acres. He said the request is for a Minor General Plan Amendment to change the land use classification from Residential > 5-8 DU/Acre to Residential > 2-3.5 DU/Acre on one of the parcels and from Residential > 3.5-5 DU/Acre to Residential > 2-3.5 DU/Acre on the other parcel. He said that this change will accommodate the development that the applicant is proposing. He said the project is for 68 lots. He said the applicant is also proposing a Preliminary Plat for the 68 lots concurrently. He said the zoning of the property is Single Family – Attached (SF-A) and will remain unchanged. He shared the Proposed Development Plan, noting that the lot sizes will be 5,300 to 7,600 square feet. He said most of the units will be attached, but they will have a few detached units. He said the units are all accessed by private streets and they have 20' long driveways. He said the community will be gated. He said the streets are 50' in width and they will allow parking on either side of each local street. He shared the Amenity Plan, noting that there are two proposed amenity areas. He said the community has no fencing or walls around the individual property boundaries, so all the residents will have easy access to all of the amenities. He shared some of the development features. He shared the Wall Plan, noting that the primary walls along Pecos and the walls along the right-of-ways will be view walls. He said they were working with the applicant on the design of the wall that separates the commercial development to the northwest corner. He said they have requested that they provide that a portion of the wall be solid. He shared the Entry Monument along Pecos Road, as well as the Entry Monument along Somerset. He shared the Parking Plan. He finished his presentation and asked for input.

Comment/Question: Vice Chair Bloomfield said he has been on the Commission long enough to remember this case coming before them previously. He said at that time, they had a layout associated with the zoning that was requested. He noted that this design was a little different than when it was previously seen. He asked if there were any concerns from Staff with the changes.

Answer: Keith Newman said that Staff wasn't concerned. He said the unit count is about the same. They were previously proposing about 72 units, so this is slightly less. He said the home designs will be compatible with what is around the area. He said this density is more compatible

than what the proposed densities were before. He said the proposed density of 3.27 DU/Acre is more in line with the subdivisions around this one. He said this product is unique and the applicant is calling it a “lock and leave” product. He said most of the units are attached and they don’t maintain any of the spaces outside of their common walls, as it is all HOA maintained. He said the homeowner only owns and maintain inside the walls of their unit and the HOA takes care of everything else. He said that Staff is highly supportive of what the applicant is proposing and have no major concerns.

Comment: Vice Chair Bloomfield said he likes the idea that they are going with a little lower density and thinks that is a plus in this area.

Comment: David Cavenee said he is on board with the project. He asked to see the Wall Plan. He said he would like to understand how the Wall Plan would engage with the commercial corner. He said given the fact that it would be a commercial use, it would probably need to be a solid wall. He said he wasn’t sure he understood some of the theme walls. He wondered what was intended for the walls to the south. He said it may just be a drafting error, but it appears that the walls are protruding into the development to the south. He would suggest that the renderings either be cleaned up or explained. He said he loves the layout and thinks it will be a great product for this area. He thinks they have done a great job and thinks the materials are fantastic. He also thinks the amenities are well done and richly designed.

6. DR18-186, VAL VISTA AND QUEEN CREEK RETAIL: SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPING, GRADING AND DRAINAGE, ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS, LIGHTING, AND COLORS AND MATERIALS FOR APPROXIMATELY 2.12 ACRES, GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF QUEEN CREEK ROAD AND KEY BISCAVNE DRIVE, AND ZONED SHOPPING CENTER (SC) WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD) OVERLAY.

Sydney Bethel began her presentation on DR18-186, Val Vista and Queen Creek Retail. She stated that this presentation and the next one (DR18-192) are related. She said this case was for one pad site located to the north and the other would be for two commercial shops located on the corner. She said that Super Star Car Wash has also been submitted, but that case is lagging behind these two. She shared that this is part of a larger Master Site Plan: The Enclave at Gilbert Senior Living. She said a Master Site Plan was approved with the site, so these are elements that are filling in. She said it was a unique master plan in that there were no filled-in layouts, only connectivity and streets. She said this site is one pad that will be split into three separate suites for retail and restaurant sites. She said there are also patios located on either the west or the east side. She said the parking is internal. She said it also has a drive-thru going all the way around facing Queen Creek Road. She said that Staff’s biggest concern with the Site Plan layout is the lack of connectivity to the greater site area. She said the site was intended to be a mixed-use community with the congregate care facility, The Enclave at Gilbert Senior Living, being the main core of it. She said that even though the zoning was all Shopping Center (SC) with a PAD overlay for the entire district, should be treated as residential in regards to pedestrian connectivity because the core of this is housing residents. She shared the Landscape Plan, as well as the colors and materials. She indicated that the site has its own specific site design guidelines for the entire site.

She said the site is out of compliance with four of the proposed colors and materials. She said the colors and materials are very similar to what is approved in the design guidelines, but because they are so similar, Staff would like them to utilize the materials that have been previously approved, because that will be enforced on the other sites as well. She pointed out that the red roof tile is not part of the design guidelines that was included in the Staff Report, but it is included on the congregate care facility and they like seeing that tied in to all of the new developments, because it is a unique feature. She shared the east and west elevations, noting the location of the drive-thru and pointing out that they would like to see a little more articulation along the roofline. She said they would also like to see some additional elements to add visual interest since the side that is facing the street should be held to a higher architectural standard. She shared the north and south elevations. She shared some reference photos of The Enclave at Gilbert, which is almost completely built-out. She finished her presentation and requested input.

Question: David Cavenee said as he looks at the elevations, on the upper elevation on the right side, he sees a white trim around the stone entry that he is concerned about. He said the white paint color seems to be such a departure from the other warm and natural colors that are coming out of the roof tile and the stone finishes. He said the white is jumping out at him as not a good fit.

Answer: Sydney Bethel asked to clarify the trim that Commissioner Cavenee was referring to. He indicated the location of the thin white trim above the arch and sides of the doorway. She said that those were metal accents.

Comment: David Cavenee said he was just wondering if white was the correct finish for something on this warm of a building.

Comment/Question: Brian Johns said he was okay with the building and elevations and color. He said he thinks it fits the standards in the area. He asked about the parking to the west. He said it appears to be dead-end parking. He asked if something special was going on at the end of it and asked why they didn't connect it to the drive-thru.

Answer: Sydney Bethel said that they wanted to keep the drive-thru isolated to make sure that it doesn't cause conflicts with parking. She said this was a request by the Town Traffic Engineer to reconfigure this from the pre-application meeting. She said that currently the drive-thru comes out and exits on the private drive. In order not to cause backup with the queueing, because they were concerned with it only having a two car queueing lane, they have requested that the area be closed off and for the drive-thru to come down through the opening that Commissioner Johns is discussing.

Comment: Brian Johns said that would make a lot more sense. He said that if someone pulls in there where it dead-ends, they would have to back all the way out to get out. He said he knows it isn't usually Town standard to have a dead-end parking that large, but he didn't think it made sense to have such a long driveway for the drive-thru.

Response: Sydney Bethel said it originally went into a dead-end parking spot and that is why it was reconfigured to this and now it is again being reconfigured to a different design.

Comment: Brian Johns said it makes sense to pull that drive-thru lane through the parking lot.

Comment: David Cavenee said that Planner Bethel had mentioned that the color palette was slightly off. He said if the color palette is close, they should get in line with the actual palette.

7. DR18-192, VAL VISTA & QUEEN CREEK, LOT 3: SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPING, GRADING AND DRAINAGE, ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS, LIGHTING, AND COLORS AND MATERIALS FOR APPROXIMATELY 2.12 ACRES, GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF VAL VISTA DRIVE AND QUEEN CREEK ROAD, AND ZONED SHOPPING CENTER (SC) WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD) OVERLAY.

Sydney Bethel continued her presentation on DR18-192, Val Vista and Queen Creek, Lot 3. She said Lot 3 was located on the same master site. She said that this site would have two different pads on it: Shops A and Pad A. She said that Shops A would be split into three separate tenants and Pad A is one tenant and is proposed to be a drive-thru restaurant. She said currently they are proposing a coffee shop. She shared the location of the main facility of The Enclave at Gilbert Senior Living, as well as the location of the casitas to the south, which are individual independent living units. She said this is a commercial zoning district, but there will be residents that are living near the site. She shared the Landscape Plan. She said there is a site wall to screen the drive-thru, but Staff is requesting something bigger and asking them to add more landscaping to create more buffering. She said Staff is concerned about the drive-thru being adjacent to the residential area without a decent amount of buffering. She said they have not provided landscaping on the north side near the other drive-thru, but they are not as concerned with that, because to the north of that drive-thru will be the Super Star Car Wash. She shared the colors and materials, which are very similar to the ones shown in the previous case. She said that these colors and materials follow all of the design guidelines. She said Staff has suggested that the applicant integrate the red roof tile that the previous case (DR18-186) is integrating and that the congregate care facility is using. She shared the elevations for Pad A which is located to the north and currently proposed to be a coffee shop. She said the applicant is proposing lighting that is above 14' and is against Code, unless there is approval from the Planning Commission. She said the lower segment is 19' in height and the other segment is 24' in height. She said it is to illuminate the proposed signage, so it would be an architectural feature and as long as the Commission is agreeable with the change, they can move forward. She said that Staff had suggested that because this project is more of a modern clean look, adding some of the warmer colors to the proposed metal accent features to draw it into the congregate care facility would be a good idea. She shared the Elevations for Shops A, noting the west elevation facing Val Vista would be the location of the drive-thru. She said there is greater massing and articulation along that elevation because it is facing a major street. She shared additional reference photos of The Enclave at Gilbert Senior Living. She also requested input on whether they should add warmer colors and textures to link the project to the existing building on site and whether they could consider allowing the lighting fixtures to be above the 14' maximum height requirement for Pad A.

Question: David Cavenee asked if they were requiring a singular landscape palette around the perimeter of this to make it feel like a singular development.

Answer: Sydney Bethel said there is a landscape palette that is within the design guidelines specifically for this site. She said the wording in the guidelines is “incorporation” and it doesn’t specifically call out for them to have the same landscape palette, like it does for the colors and materials. She said the only place where they have to have the certain materials is in some specified entryways.

Question: David Cavenee asked to clarify that they weren’t getting a similarly themed tree along the front edge that would ring the property and makes it feel like it’s a monolithic type development.

Answer: Sydney Bethel said they did do all of the exterior landscaping in the first phase with the Enclave project, as well as the internal streets. She said she would have to double check to see what that landscape palette was from that original approval. She said it should be the same landscape palette.

Comment: David Cavenee said he agrees with Staff’s thoughts about adding a landscape buffer between the residents and Shops A. He said that might mean they have to shorten the building or shift the building to achieve that. He said even though there is a screen wall, he thinks you would want to soften that edge. As far as bringing in some of the warmer colors, he said he likes how this color palette makes a connection, but still has a difference. He said he agreed with bringing in a little bit of warmth from the residences. He said that if it can be done by the metal accents that would be great, but if not, he suggested finding some other way to do that.

Comment: Vice Chair Bloomfield said in Shops A where it faces Val Vista, they have a healthy landscape buffer that will probably shield the building from the street elevation and from passing cars and motorists. However, he is concerned with Shops A and the very long drive-thru they’ve got coming around the back of the building, because all of the shops have back doors there. He asked if that was where the businesses would get deliveries. He said if so, the delivery trucks would be going through the drive-thru and it won’t work. He said if they want to have a drive-thru, it should be on the other side (the north side) of Shops A and then flip back around into that adjacent parking lot. He said this would eliminate the conflict with the residences to the south.

Question: Greg Froehlich asked about the deviation on the lighting height. He asked what kind of lighting it would be and if Staff has any concerns about the maximum height.

Answer: Sydney Bethel said that it is specified in the Code, that if it is an architectural feature that is meant to illuminate or articulate signage, it is permitted with the Planning Commission’s approval. She said that Staff is in support of it. She said it is integrated well into the existing elevations and if the Commission is agreeable to it, then Staff is very supportive of it.

Question: Greg Froehlich asked where the lighting was in comparison to the residents.

Answer: Sydney Bethel said the lights were facing the Super Star Car Wash and the street, and the residences are farther away from the lights. She said they are not in close proximity to any of the residences.

Comment: Greg Froehlich said he would be in favor of the increased lighting height and thinks it is a nice feature.

Comment/Question: Brian Johns said he was okay with the elevations in terms of colors and materials. He said that some of the rear elevations doesn't show what's happening in the front. He said he is curious how they did their transition of the small towers they are showing. He asked if they were just flat or if they were coming back into the building. He said he would ask that Staff get a little bit more definition from the applicant to see if they are returning and actually looks like a tower and isn't just a base. He said it doesn't really show it on the opposite elevation. He said he hates to see it just be a face and not a mass. Regarding the Site Plan, he said he has a concern about the drive-thru in the corner where they are turning the corner. He said if they have a 12' drive, as they turn the corners, there isn't enough space for people in big trucks. He said it even looks like the driveway is reduced where it turns the corner to 8'.

Answer: Sydney Bethel said it actually is 12' although it does look a little smaller.

Comment: Brian Johns said he thought it needed to bump out to about 14' to 20' so that a larger vehicle could get around. He suggested talking to traffic to see if they would back him on his position, but he said in his experience larger vehicles would be riding the curb all the way around. He said he is also concerned about where the dumpster is for the coffee shop. He said it looks like it's on the main spine coming through. He suggested that Staff take a look at that because the garbage truck is going to be running back where the main drive is coming back in. He said he didn't know if they would have any kind of shops that would require the extra wide dumpster, but if they are, they may need to look at it because they have the dumpster in there pretty tight. He said that would be something to look out for because it might be a concern later on if it ends up being a restaurant. He said if it ends up being mostly retail, it shouldn't be an issue. He mentioned the drive-thru in the back. He said they have seen a lot of shops like this, where they have put the drive-thru all the way across the backside and then actually put the drive-thru at the very top. He said it works well as long as they have the distance back behind and in this case, it looks like they do. He said usually deliveries are through the front door in shops like the ones proposed and so they wouldn't go through the drive-thru.

8. UP18-25: GILBERT RECYCLING CENTER - A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR APPROXIMATELY 3.27 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED SOUTH OF THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF BASELINE ROAD AND MCQUEEN ROAD TO ALLOW A SALVAGE YARD IN THE GENERAL INDUSTRIAL (GI) ZONING DISTRICT.

DR18-163: GILBERT RECYCLING CENTER - SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPE, GRADING AND DRAINAGE, ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS, LIGHTING, COLORS AND MATERIALS FOR APPROXIMATELY 3.27 ACRES, GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF BASELINE ROAD AND MCQUEEN ROAD AND ZONED GENERAL INDUSTRIAL (GI).

Keith Newman began his presentation on UP18-25 and DR18-163, Gilbert Recycling Center. He said the project is a Conditional Use Permit and a Design Review for a salvage yard. He said the existing General Plan Land Use designation and General Industrial zoning on the site are intact

and are not going to be changed. He said this use complies with those designations. He said the operating hours for the facility would be 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Monday through Thursday and the peak hours will be from 12:00 to 1:00 p.m. and 3:00 to 4:00 p.m. He said the site is located just south of Baseline Road along McQueen on the west side of the road in the General Industrial area and north of the railroad tracks. He shared the two access points to the site. He said there is an 8' solid wall along McQueen that is proposed and a 6' tall chain link fencing that has mesh screening along the north boundary. He said a portion of the south boundary will also have an 8' CMU wall. He said they are trying to work with the applicant to make sure it goes all the way to the midpoint to screen the view of the yard from McQueen as much as possible. He said they will have 10 parking spaces in their parking lot near the office. He said the surrounding properties are all General Industrial. He said the applicant is proposing two buildings on the site: a 3,300 square foot office/scale building which will be set far back off the road and a 2,000 square foot processing building that's right up against McQueen. He shared the Landscape Plan, noting that the majority of the landscaping is along McQueen in the 25' landscape setback. He said the interior yard area will not have any landscaping. However, Planner Newman said that Staff had requested that the applicant provide landscaping in the parking area in the parking island and foundation landscaping around the office/scale building. He shared the Elevation of the Office/Scale Building. He said Staff's major concern was that the elevations needed more massing and more articulation on them as these buildings are comprised of metal siding and have a fairly flat design all the way around. He said both buildings are designed similarly. He requested input on the massing and materials on the building elevations. He said Staff is concerned with the shipping container they are proposing to the west of the building. He said that Town Design Standards does not allow shipping containers to be used as office space, but it needs to be an integral part of the design and complement the design of the rest of the structure. He said they are working with the applicant on that. He shared the Elevation of the Processing Building and noted the lack of vertical massing and the flat lines. He asked for input on the articulation of this building, noting that this building would face McQueen Road, so they have asked the applicant to dress up this building quite a bit. He said this elevation doesn't match the floor plan and they are working with the applicant to provide a floor plan or an elevation that match each other. He finished his presentation and asked for input from the Commission.

Comment: Les Smith said this is a great use of a difficult property. He said he didn't have any concerns with the design of the buildings.

Comment: Seth Banda said he would like to see a bit of an elevation change, especially on the elevation facing McQueen. He said they still have Kokopelli around the corner and he realizes this is an industrial area, and it's a difficult area, but because it is off McQueen, he thinks they should do something to that elevation. He said he supports Staff's recommendation on that. He said he agrees with Staff on the landscaping and suggested that they do some landscaping in the parking area.

Comment/Question: David Cavenee said his primary concern is the perimeter fencing. He said he sees the labels that call for 8' block fencing, but he isn't sure that he sees that it continues all the way around. He wanted to clarify that it was their intent to continue it all the way around. He asked what the property to the north was.

Answer: Keith Newman said that it was a storage facility that had individual storage yards.

Comment: David Cavenee said he understands that it is industrial and isn't sure he would force them to make it too pretty. He said it might need a little bit on the McQueen side, but he said it is industrial and a reuse of a difficult piece of property. He said the railroad tracks provide a good separation between the golf course. He said he isn't sure it merits a lot of expense on articulation. He is worried about the walls more than anything.

Question: Brian Johns asked if the walls have a design.

Answer: Keith Newman said they are still working with the applicant on the wall design. He said the wall along McQueen is just a plain block wall, but they are working with the applicant to add some additional color and material variations. He said they would be seeing more detailed designs at the next hearing.

Question: Brian Johns asked if the facility was open to the public or if it was all internal business use. He said he didn't see any connection between the parking and the processing area.

Answer: Keith Newman said it is open to the public. He said they will come in the south entrance and circulate around the site clockwise, so they will pass the office/scale building and proceed to the scale to weigh the materials. Next, they will offload the materials and store them in the yard area and then the vehicles will circulate around on the paved drive and pull in or park in the parking lot to finish their transaction with the business. He said they would then exit out the same entrance they came in.

Question: Brian Johns asked to clarify that they don't really get out of the vehicle.

Answer: Keith Newman said they wouldn't get out of the vehicle very often, but just if they had to finish their transaction with the office.

Greg Froehlich indicated he had a Conflict of Interest with Item 10, ST18-11, Hamstra Dairy.

10. ST18-11, HAMSTRA DAIRY: FOUR (4) NEW STANDARD PLANS (50-1, 50-2, 50-3 AND 50-4) BY MARACAY HOMES, FOR 58 LOTS WITHIN THE PHASE 1 DEVELOPMENT OF THE HAMSTRA DAIRY PAD, GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF VAL VISTA DRIVE AND CHANDLER HEIGHTS ROAD AND ZONED SINGLE FAMILY 7 (SF-7) WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD) OVERLAY.

Nathan Williams began his presentation on ST18-11, Hamstra Dairy. He said this case was for four Standard Plans in the Single Family – 7 (SF-7) portion of the Hamstra Dairy project. He reminded the Commission that Hamstra Dairy was 160 acres at the northwest corner of Chandler Heights and Val Vista. He said the area was master planned last year. He said there are three different zoning districts (SF-7, SF-8, and SF-10) and each zoning district has a separate application. He said this is the smallest zoning district within Hamstra Dairy. He said this is the only Standard Plan application that has four applications. He said they have told the applicant that they will need a minimum of four sets of Standard Plans for each of those applications. He said this is only for Phase 1 of Hamstra Dairy. He said when they looked at the Plat and Open Space

Plan, there were five phases of development of Hamstra Dairy. Tonight, they are approving Standard Plans for Phase 1, but theoretically what will happen for the remainder of SF-7 and SF-8 and SF-10 is that they will be transferred to the remainder of these parcels. He said the SF-7 would be primarily in the southeast corner, SF-8 would be in the northeast corner and SF-10 would be along the western half of the development. He said there are 332 total lots throughout the development. He said they are only approving these for Phase 1, because that is what is being platted at this time and they don't approve Standard Plans on things that aren't platted. He said he believes this phase will consist of 58-60 lots. He said there are four sets of plans. These are called their 50 Series and are their smallest plans ranging from 2,600 to 4,600 square feet. He said two of the plans are 1-story in height and two of the plans are 2-story in height. He said the architectural themes for this portion are Modern Hacienda, Modern Farmhouse and Modern Desert. He said the Modern Ranch is a fourth architectural theme to add diversity, but it will only be offered in the other applications. He said Staff only had minor comments at 1st Review. He said they like the elevations overall, but they suggested a few items to help provide 4-sided architecture. He said they suggested bringing architecturally-themed windows and accents on windows on the front and to the rear. They also suggested hardy board or veneer to the rear and sides to help create more 4-sided architecture. He requested input on the amount of diversity. He said there are four different architectural themes with four different color schemes per theme. He said that adds up to potentially 16 different colors and materials themes throughout the 332 units. He asked the Commission for input as to whether they felt that number of variations was enough. He shared the elevations for the 1-story plans. He noted that the front elevations have a lot of roofline movement and massing changes. He then shared the elevations for the 2-story plans. He showed the four different color schemes on the Modern Hacienda, the Modern Farmhouse and the Modern Desert. He finished his presentation.

Question: Seth Banda asked to clarify that there are four different plans.

Answer: Nathan Williams said in the SF-7 district, there are four different plans (50-1, 50-2, 50-3, and 50-4). He said when they add in the different colors and material themes, there are also four of each of those variations. He said this means that among these offerings, there are three different architectural styles: Modern Hacienda, Modern Farmhouse and the Modern Desert.

Question: Seth Banda asked to clarify that there were 1-story plans and 2-story plans.

Answer: Nathan Williams said there were two 1-story plans and two 2-story plans.

Comment: Seth Banda said he was trying to figure out the number of different variations and he said it seems like they have a lot of variations given the different color schemes. He said he feels that this is a good amount of diversity. He said this is very representative of what some of the neighbors around the dairy would like to see. He said they are beautifully designed and planned. He said he agrees with Staff that they should see if they could do a little more from the side and rear of the houses, either something with the windows or some color schemes or different materials being used to give a good 360 view from around the neighborhood.

Chair Andersen said at this time, they would go back to Agenda Item 1.

1. Oath of Office:

Town of Gilbert Planning Commission
Study Session December 5, 2018

Planning Commissioner Alternate Philip Alibrandi
Planning Commissioner James Torgeson

Vice Mayor Brigitte Peterson administered the Oath of Office to incoming Alternate Commissioner's Philip Alibrandi and James Torgeson. Vice Mayor Peterson then gave Alternate Commissioner Alibrandi and Alternate Commissioner Torgeson an opportunity to introduce themselves to the audience. Chair Andersen welcomed the Alternate Commissioners to the Planning Commission.

11. Discussion of Regular Meeting Agenda

Chair Andersen said that at this time, they had no changes to the Regular Meeting agenda.

ADJOURN STUDY SESSION

With no other business before the Commission, Chair Andersen adjourned the Study Session at 7:02 p.m. He announced that they would begin the Regular Meeting at 7:10 p.m.

Brian Andersen, Chairman

ATTEST:

Debbie Frazey, Recording Secretary

**TOWN OF GILBERT
 PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
 COUNCIL CHAMBERS
 50 E. CIVIC CENTER DRIVE
 GILBERT, AZ
 DECEMBER 5, 2018**

COMMISSION PRESENT:

Chairman Brian Andersen
 Vice Chair Carl Bloomfield
 Commissioner Seth Banda
 Commissioner David Cavenee
 Commissioner Greg Froehlich
 Commissioner Brian Johns
 Commissioner Les Smith
 Alternate Commissioner Philip Alibrandi
 Alternate Commissioner James Torgeson

COMMISSION ABSENT:

None

STAFF PRESENT:

Sydney Bethel, Planner II
 Stephanie Bubenheim, Planner II
 Keith Newman, Planner II
 Josh Rogers, Planner II
 Nathan Williams, Senior Planner
 Amy Temes, Interim Principal Planner
 Catherine Lorbeer, Interim Planning Manager

ALSO PRESENT:

Attorney Nancy Davidson
 Council Liaison Brigitte Peterson
 Recorder Debbie Frazey

PLANNER	CASE	PAGE	VOTE
Nathan Williams	DR18-130	3	Approved
Sydney Bethel	DR18-151	3	Approved
Nathan Williams	DR18-168	3	Approved
Josh Rogers	GP18-12	16	Approved
Josh Rogers	Z18-26	16	Approved

Town of Gilbert Planning Commission
 Regular Meeting December 5, 2018

Stephanie Bubenheim	GP18-10	5	Approved
Stephanie Bubenheim	Z18-20	5	Approved

CALL TO ORDER REGULAR MEETING

Chair Brian Andersen called the December 5, 2018 Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:12 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Recording Secretary Debbie Frazey called roll and a quorum was determined to be present.

12. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair Andersen told the audience that it had been suggested that the Commission move Items 20 and 21 from the Public Hearing (Non-Consent) Agenda to the Public Hearing (Consent) Agenda. Vice Chair Carl Bloomfield made a **MOTION** to approve the agenda and move Items 20 and 21 to the Public Hearing (Consent) Agenda; seconded by David Cavenee; motion passed unanimously.

Motion passed 7-0

13. COMMUNICATION FROM CITIZENS.

At this time, members of the public may comment on matters within the jurisdiction of the Town, but not on the agenda. The Commission/Board response is limited to responding to criticism, asking staff to review a matter commented upon, or asking that a matter be put on a future agenda.

Chair Andersen asked if there were any members of the public who wished to speak on something that was not on the agenda. Seeing no members of the public who wished to speak, he moved on to the next item on the agenda.

14. Deleted

PUBLIC HEARING (CONSENT)

All items listed below are considered consent calendar items and may be approved by a single motion unless removed at the request of the Commission/Board for further discussion/action. Other items on the agenda may be added to the consent calendar and approved under a single motion.

Chair Andersen then read the Consent Agenda which consisted of Item 15, DR18-130, Gilbert Public Safety Training Facility; Item 16, DR18-151, Aldi Grocery Store; Item 17, DR18-168, Gilbert Crossroads Light Industrial; Item 20, GP18-10, Verde at Cooley Station; and Item 21,

Z18-20, Verde at Cooley Station. He then asked if any member of the Commission had a Conflict of Interest with any item on the Consent Agenda.

Commissioner Greg Froehlich declared a Conflict of Interest with Item 20, GP18-10 and Item 21, Z18-20.

Chair Andersen stated that they would need to make two separate motions. The first motion would be on Items 15, 16 and 17. Vice Chair Bloomfield made a **MOTION** to approve Item 15, DR18-130, Gilbert Public Safety Training Facility; Item 16, DR18-151, Aldi Grocery Store, and Item 17, DR18-168, Gilbert Crossroads Light Industrial (listed below with Staff Recommendations); seconded by David Cavenee; motion passed unanimously.

Motion passed 7-0

15. DR18-130, GILBERT PUBLIC SAFETY TRAINING FACILITY: SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPING, GRADING AND DRAINAGE, ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS, LIGHTING, COLORS AND MATERIALS FOR APPROXIMATELY 52.5 ACRES, GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF POWER ROAD AND PECOS ROAD, AND ZONED PUBLIC FACILITY/ INSTITUTIONAL (PF/I).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Approve the Findings of Fact and approve DR18-130, Gilbert Public Safety Training Facility: Site plan, landscaping, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, and colors and materials for approximately 52.5 acres, generally located at the northwest corner of Power Road and Pecos Road, and zoned Public Facility/ Institutional (PF/I), subject to conditions:

1. Construction of the project shall conform to the exhibits approved by the Planning Commission/ Design Review Board at the December 5, 2018 public hearing.
2. The construction site plan documents shall incorporate the Standard Commercial and Industrial Site Plan Notes adopted by the Design Review Board on March 11, 2004.
3. Signage is not included in this approval. Administrative Design Review approval is required prior to submitting for sign permits.

16. DR18-151, ALDI GROCERY STORE: SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPE, GRADING AND DRAINAGE, ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS, LIGHTING, COLORS AND MATERIALS FOR APPROXIMATELY 5.54 ACRES, GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF PECOS ROAD AND MARKET STREET AND ZONED REGIONAL COMMERCIAL (RC) WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD) OVERLAY.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Approve the Finding of Fact and approve DR18-151, ALDI Grocery Store: Site plan, landscape, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, colors and materials for approximately 5.54 acres, generally located at the southwest corner of Pecos Road and Market Street and zoned Regional Commercial (RC) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay, subject to conditions:

1. Construction of the project shall conform to the exhibits approved by the Planning Commission/Design Review Board at the December 5, 2018 public hearing.
2. Administrative Design Review approval is required for all signage prior to submitting for sign permits.
3. Shared parking and cross access agreements, as well as construction easements, shall be provided to the Town during construction document review.
4. Cart corrals are not permitted within the parking lot area. Cart corrals must be built as shown on the approved exhibits along the perimeter of the building.

17. DR18-168, GILBERT CROSSROADS LIGHT INDUSTRIAL: SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPING, GRADING AND DRAINAGE, ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS, LIGHTING, PHASING, COLORS AND MATERIALS FOR APPROXIMATELY 27.6 ACRES, GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF MUSTANG DRIVE AND GERMAN ROAD, AND ZONED LIGHT INDUSTRIAL (LI) WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD) OVERLAY.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Approve the Findings of Fact and approve DR18-168, Gilbert Crossroads Light Industrial: Site plan, landscaping, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, phasing, colors and materials for approximately 27.6 acres, generally located at the southeast corner of Mustang Drive and Germann Road, and zoned Light Industrial (LI) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay, subject to conditions:

1. Construction of the project shall conform to the exhibits approved by the Planning Commission/ Design Review Board at the December 5, 2018 public hearing.
2. The construction site plan documents shall incorporate the Standard Commercial and Industrial Site Plan Notes adopted by the Design Review Board on March 11, 2004.
3. Signage is not included in this approval. A future Master Sign Plan for the overall 45+ acre Gilbert Crossroads site will be necessary to provide shared monument signage for

Town of Gilbert Planning Commission
Regular Meeting December 5, 2018

the overall campus. Administrative Design Review approval is required prior to submitting for sign permits for any signage.

4. All building drainage visible from public view shall be internalized; all roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened and there shall be no exposed roof ladders on any of the exterior building elevations.

Chair Andersen announced that Items 15, 16 and 17 had been approved. He then called for a vote on Items 20 and 21. Vice Chair Bloomfield made a **MOTION** to approve Item 20, GP18-10, Verde at Cooley Station and Item 21, Z18-20, Verde at Cooley Station (subject to Staff recommendations as listed below); seconded by David Cavenee; motion carried.

Motion carried 6-0 with Commissioner Greg Froehlich abstaining.

20. GP18-10, VERDE AT COOLEY STATION: REQUEST FOR MINOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT TO CHANGE THE LAND USE CLASSIFICATION OF APPROX. 22.92 ACRES GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF RECKER AND WILLIAMS FIELD ROADS FROM 0.97 ACRES OF VILLAGE CENTER, 9.75 ACRES OF BUSINESS PARK AND 12.20 ACRES OF RESIDENTIAL > 14-25 DU/ACRE LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS TO 11.2 ACRES OF VILLAGE CENTER, 10.66 ACRES OF BUSINESS PARK AND 1.06 ACRES OF RESIDENTIAL > 14-25 DU/ACRE LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS.

21. Z18-20, VERDE AT COOLEY STATION: REQUEST TO AMEND ORDINANCE NOS. 1900 and 2179 PERTAINING TO THE COOLEY STATION RESIDENTIAL, OFFICE, AND SHOPPING CENTER PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD-ROS), AND ORDINANCE NO. 1995 PERTAINING TO THE COOLEY STATION VILLAGE AND BUSINESS CENTER PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT BY REMOVING APPROXIMATELY 57.16 ACRES, GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF RECKER AND WILLIAMS FIELD ROADS; APPROVING THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE VERDE AT COOLEY STATION PAD; AND CHANGING THE ZONING CLASSIFICATION OF SAID REAL PROPERTY FROM 15.00 ACRES OF GATEWAY VILLAGE CENTER (GVC), 17.13 ACRES OF GATEWAY BUSINESS CENTER (GBC), AND 25.03 ACRES OF MULTI-FAMILY/MEDIUM (MF/M) ZONING DISTRICTS, ALL WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY TO 25.23 ACRES OF GATEWAY VILLAGE CENTER, 18.04 ACRES OF GATEWAY BUSINESS CENTER AND 13.89 ACRES OF MULTI-FAMILY/MEDIUM (MF/M) ZONING DISTRICT, ALL WITH A PAD OVERLAY.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- A. Recommend to the Town Council approval of GP18-10, to change the land use classification of approx. 22.92 acres, generally located at the southwest corner of Recker and Williams Field Roads from 0.97 acre of Village Center, 9.75 acres of Business Park, and 12.20 acres of Residential > 14-25 DU/Acre land use classifications to 11.20 acres of Village Center, 10.66 acres of Business Park, and 1.06 acres of Residential > 14-25 DU/Acre land use classifications; and
- B. For the following reasons: the development proposal conforms to the intent of the General Plan and can be appropriately coordinated with existing and planned development of the surrounding areas, and all required public notice and meetings have been held, the Planning Commission moves to recommend approval of Z18-20 rezoning approximately 57.16 acres within Verde at Cooley Station Planned Area Development (PAD) and generally located at the southwest corner of Recker and Williams Field Roads from approximately 15.00 acres of Gateway Village Center (GVC), 17.13 acres of Gateway Business Center (GBC), and 25.03 acres of Multi-Family/Medium (MF/M) zoning districts all with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay to approximately 25.23 acres of Gateway Village Center (GVC), 18.04 acres of Gateway Business Center (GBC), and 13.89 acres of Multi-Family/Medium zoning district, all with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay, subject to the following conditions:
- a. Dedication to Gilbert for the Collector Roads (A-A) and (B-B) shown on Exhibits: Development Plan, Street Sections, Street Section Keysheet, shall be completed at the time of final plat recordation or sooner as required by the Town Engineer. Dedication of the Collector Streets (A-A) and (B-B) shall each extend 50 feet adjacent to the Project.
 - b. Developer shall designate and shall set forth on any final plat, landscape, sidewalk and parking tracts and/or roadway easements abutting (A-A), (B-B), Williams Field Road and Recker Road, all as shown on Exhibits: Development Plan, Street Sections, and Street Sections Keysheet.
 - c. Construction of off-site improvements to Williams Field Road, Recker Road, Collector Roads (A-A) and Collector Road (B-B) adjacent to the Property shall be completed prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy or final approval of any unit or building constructed on the Property or at the time requested by Gilbert, whichever is earlier.
 - d. At the written request of Gilbert, Developer shall dedicate all necessary easements for the roadway improvements, including easements for drainage and retention and temporary construction easements. Failure to dedicate said easements within thirty (30) days after the date of Gilbert's written request may result in the reversion of the zoning of the Property to the prior zoning classification.
 - e. Developer shall create a Homeowner's Association (HOA) or Property Owner's Association (POA) for the ownership, maintenance, landscaping, improvements and preservation of all common areas and open space areas, and landscaping within the

rights-of-way. Maintenance responsibilities for common areas and open space areas shall be specified on the approved site plan or final plat.

- f. Developer shall record easements to be owned by the HOA or POA for pedestrian, bicycle, multi-use or trail system purposes as determined by the final plat, at the time of final plat recordation, or earlier if required by the Town Engineer. In recognition of the modifications to the underlying zoning regulations set forth herein, such easements shall be open to public access and use.
- g. The Developer shall disclose to the public on the final plat, including new owners, the daytime and nighttime noise levels naturally occurring with Union Pacific's long-standing freight rail services, as well as the pre-existing and predictably-occurring vibrations.
- h. Any proposed permanent or temporary structure is subject to an FAA filing for review in conformance with CFR Title 14 part 77 (form 7460) to determine any effect to navigable airspace and air navigation facilities.
- i. A fair disclosure agreement and covenant, which would include the following disclosure, should be recorded as a condition of development approval: "This property, due to its proximity to Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport, will experience aircraft overflights, which are expected to generate noise levels that may be of concern to some individuals. The mix of aviation activities and types of aircraft expected to be located and operate at the Airport now and in the future include: scheduled and unscheduled commercial charters, commercial air carriers, and commercial air cargo operations, all of which are expected to use large commercial aircraft; general aviation activity using corporate and executive jets helicopters and propeller aircraft; aviation flight training schools using training aircraft; and military activity using high performance military jets. The size of aircraft and frequency of use of such aircraft may change over time depending on market and technology changes.
- j. All subdivision plats and public reports filed with the Arizona department of real estate should include the notice described in condition (i) above.
- k. Sales and leasing offices established for new subdivisions and residential development projects should provide notice on a sign of the aircraft overflight area.
- l. Recorded documentation of cross access agreements will be required at the time of final plat application submittal.

- m. The Project shall be developed in conformance with Gilbert’s zoning requirements for the zoning districts and all development shall comply with the Town of Gilbert Land Development Code, except as modified by the following:

<i>GVC LDC Development Standards</i>	<i>GVC Verde at Cooley Station</i>
Storefronts and Access (LDC Table 2.804)	Decreased percentage for residential unit window, window displays, and door coverage to 40% on ground floor.
Building Transparency (LDC Table 2.804)	Ground-floor view windows, window displays, or doors may be provided between 0 and 8 feet above grade adjacent to the principle building frontage.
Driveway Restrictions (LDC Table 2.804)	Arterial access is permitted at existing curb-cuts.
Parking Setback (LDC Table 2.804)	Parking is permitted within the build-to-lines along Recker Road and (A-A).
Minimum height of separation wall to Nonresidential Zoning District or Uses (LDC – 4.109.A.2(b))	No minimum height requirement.

<i>Multi Family Medium (MF/M) LDC Development Standards</i>	<i>Parcels 5, 21b, 22b Verde at Cooley Station</i>
Minimum Net Land Area per Unit	1,700 sq. ft. (*=25 d.u.'s/ac.)
Minimum Perimeter Building Setbacks (ft.)	
Front	8 feet adjacent to arterials and collectors
Side	10 feet adjacent to arterials and collectors
Rear	10 feet adjacent to collectors
Minimum Perimeter Landscape Area (Depth in Ft.)	
Front	5 feet adjacent to arterials and collectors
Side (Street)	5 feet adjacent to arterials and collectors
Rear (Residential)	8 feet adjacent to collectors
Rear (Non-Residential)	8 feet adjacent to collectors
Minimum height of separation wall to	No minimum height requirement.

Town of Gilbert Planning Commission
Regular Meeting December 5, 2018

nonresidential zoning district or uses (LDC – 4.109.A.2(b))	
--	--

- n. The maximum number of dwelling units shall be limited to the maximum allowed under the Gilbert General Plan.
- o. An extensive storm drain system was constructed by the Town to serve the Project area. If this storm drain system is not being utilized for any portion of the project adjoining Recker or Williams Field Roads, then the Developer shall install alternate storm drain facilities to convey the runoff from the adjoining roadways, and shall then retain 100% of the runoff that would have otherwise been collected in this storm drain system. This requirement is in addition to the on-site retention required for the Project. The Developer shall also decommission any portion of the existing storm drain system that is no longer necessary as a result of the Project. On-site and off-site retention calculations and the method of decommissioning shall be described in the Drainage Report for the Project and must be approved by the Town.
- p. A Pedestrian Corridor with Pedestrian Access Easement shall be required as shown on the Development Plan with a minimum width of 35 feet with a minimum sidewalk of 8-10 feet. This corridor will create a gateway to the future commuter rail.
- q. The applicant shall prepare for review and approval by the Town’s Design Review Board, design guidelines addressing a landscaping palette and intensity, architectural design theme, hardscape, building materials, signage, and entry monumentation for the Verde at Cooley Station development to coordinate and conform to the Gateway Area Streetscape Design Guidelines and to implement the Gateway Character Area policies contained in the General Plan.

PUBLIC HEARING (NON-CONSENT)

Non-Consent Public Hearing items will be heard at an individual public hearing and will be acted upon by the Commission/Board by a separate motion. During the Public Hearings, anyone wishing to comment in support of or in opposition to a Public Hearing item may do so. If you wish to comment on a Public Hearing Item, you must fill out a public comment form, indicating the item number on which you wish to be heard. Once the hearing is closed, there will be no further public comment unless requested by a member of the Commission/Board.

18. GP18-12 BELLAMY - REQUEST FOR MINOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT TO CHANGE THE LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS OF APPROX. 40.04 ACRES GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SOUTH GREENFIELD AND EAST GERMANN ROADS FROM 16.08 ACRES OF COMMUNITY COMMERCIAL AND 23.96 ACRES OF RESIDENTIAL > 5-8 DU/ACRE TO 40.04 ACRES OF RESIDENTIAL > 3.5-5 DU/ACRE.

19. Z18-26 BELLAMY - REQUEST TO REZONE APPROX. 40.04 ACRES GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SOUTH GREENFIELD AND EAST GERMANN ROADS FROM 16.08 ACRES OF COMMUNITY COMMERCIAL (CC) AND 23.96 ACRES OF SINGLE FAMILY-6 (SF-6) TO 40.04 ACRES OF SINGLE FAMILY-DETACHED (SF-D) WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD) OVERLAY.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- A. Move to recommend to Town Council approval of GP18-12, a Minor General Plan Amendment; and
- B. For the following reasons: the development proposal conforms to the intent of the General Plan and can be appropriately coordinated with existing and planned development of the surrounding areas, and all required public notice and meetings have been held, the Planning Commission moves to recommend approval of Z18-26 rezoning approx. 40.04 acres generally located at the southeast corner of Greenfield and Germann Roads from approx. 16.08 acres of Community Commercial (CC) and 23.96 acres of Single Family- 6 (SF-6) to 40.04 acres of Single Family-Detached (SF-D) with a planned area development (PAD) overlay. Subject to the following conditions.
- a. Dedication to Gilbert for the Superstition Drive right-of-way that is adjacent to the Property shall be completed prior to or at the time of recordation of the final plat or sooner as required by the Town Engineer. Dedication of Superstition Drive shall extend 25 feet from the center line and from the property line on Greenfield Road 620 feet to the east. **Failure to complete dedication prior to or concurrent with recordation of the Final Plat may result in reversion of the zoning to the prior zoning classification.**
 - b. Dedication to Gilbert for the Superstition Drive roadway easement that is adjacent to the Property shall be completed prior to or at the time of recordation of the final plat or sooner as required by the Town Engineer. Dedication of the Superstition Drive roadway easement shall extend 25 feet from the center line and from 620 feet east of the property line on Greenfield Road to 955 feet east of the property line on Greenfield Road. **Failure to complete dedication prior to or concurrent with recordation of the Final Plat may result in reversion of the zoning to the prior zoning classification.**
 - c. Construction of off-site improvements to Superstition Drive adjacent to the Property shall be completed prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy or final approval of any building

Town of Gilbert Planning Commission
Regular Meeting December 5, 2018

constructed on the Property or at the time requested by Gilbert, whichever is earlier.

- d. At the written request of Gilbert, Developer shall dedicate all necessary easements for the roadway improvements, including easements for drainage and retention and temporary construction easements. Failure to dedicate said easements within thirty (30) days after the date of Gilbert’s written request may result in the reversion of the zoning of the Property to the prior zoning classification.
- e. Developer shall create a Homeowner’s Association (HOA) for the ownership, maintenance, landscaping, improvements and preservation of all common areas and open space areas and landscaping within the rights-of-way.
- f. Developer shall record easements to be owned by the HOA for pedestrian, bicycle, multi-use or trail system purposes as determined by the final plat, at the time of final plat recordation, or earlier if required by the Town Engineer. In recognition of the modifications to the underlying zoning regulations set forth herein, such easements shall be open to public access and use.
- g. The Project shall be developed in conformance with Gilbert’s zoning requirements for the zoning districts and all development shall comply with the Town of Gilbert Land Development Code, except as modified by the following:

Site Development Regulations	Required per LDC	Bellamy SF-D (PAD)
Maximum separation fence height (ft.)	8’	9’-10’ – solely applicable to the “Entry Theme Wall” as indicated in Attachment 4 – Exhibit 4: Wall Plan
Minimum Separation Fence Height adjacent to arterials (ft.)	8’	6’-8”
Arterial / Arterial Intersection Landscape	50’ x 250’ (11,250 sq.ft. adjacent to each arterial)	Modified, adjacent to the S. Greenfield Rd. arterial, to measure no less than 210’ in length and no less than 11,250 sq.ft. in area.

Before hearing Item 18, GP18-12, Bellamy and Item 19, Z18-26, Bellamy, Chair Andersen recused himself due to Conflict of Interest and turned the meeting over to Vice Chair Bloomfield.

Vice Chair Bloomfield invited Planner Josh Rogers to begin his presentation.

Josh Rogers began his presentation on Item 18, GP18-12, Bellamy and Item 19, Z18-26, Bellamy. He shared the location of the site on the southeast corner of Greenfield and Germann Roads. He said the site is approximately 40.04 acres. He shared a Vicinity Map. He said this request was for a Minor General Plan Amendment to change the land use classification of 16.08 acres of Community Commercial and 23.96 acres of Residential > 5-8 DU/Acre to 40.04 acres of Residential > 3.5-5 DU/Acre. The zoning portion of the case is to rezone 16.08 acres of Community Commercial and 23.96 acres of Single Family – 6 (SF-6) to 40.04 acres of Single Family – Detached (SF-D) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay. He shared a current General Plan Land Use Map, noting the current General Plan land use designation on the left, and what is proposed on the right. He shared the Rezoning Map, noting that it mirrors the Minor General Plan Amendment. He discussed the deviation requests (as listed below):

Project Data Table

Site Development Regulations	Required per LDC (SF-D)	Lot Type 1 - Proposed	Lot Type 2 - Proposed
Minimum Lot Area (sq. ft. per DU)	3,000 sq.ft.	3,772 sq.ft.	6,600 sq.ft.
Minimum Lot Dimensions (ft.)			
Width	N/A	46'	55'
Depth	N/A	82'	120'
Maximum Height (ft.)/Stories	36/3	N/A	N/A
Minimum Building Setbacks (ft.)			
Front	10'	10'	10'
Side	0' or 5'	5' and 5'	5' and 5'
Rear	10'	10'	10'
Maximum Lot Coverage (%)			
One Story	60%	60%	60%
Two/Three Story	50%	50%	50%
Maximum separation fence height (ft.)	8'	9'10" Solely applicable to the "Entry Theme Wall" as indicated in Exhibit 10: Wall Plan	
Minimum Perimeter Wall Height adjacent to	8'	6'8"	

arterials (ft.)		
Arterial / Arterial Intersection Landscape	50' x 250' landscape (11,250 sq. ft. adjacent to each arterial, 22,500 sq.ft. total)	Modified, adjacent to the S. Greenfield Rd. arterial, to measure no less than 210' in length and no less than 11,250 sq.ft. in area.

Planner Rogers said that the deviation requests were mainly aesthetic in purpose. He said the first one was a request to increase the maximum wall height at the pedestrian entry portal off of both main entries. He said they are also requesting to reduce the minimum wall height of walls adjacent to arterials from 8' down to 6' 8". He said that their last deviation was a request to modify the required 50' x 250' landscape setback. He then shared the Development Plan. He said the applicant is proposing 165 total units broken up into two different lot sizes. He said the first type of lots are smaller in size and located on the inside towards the corner of the arterial. The applicant plans 91 of these units with 3,772 square foot lots. He said they are adhering to all of the other requirements for the SF-D. He said on the outside, towards the south and towards the east, they want to provide a buffer and establish 6,600 square foot lots to reflect what is currently zoned there (SF-6), so they can buffer Whitewing to the east and the residential to the south. He shared their Open Space Plan. He said the design has significant Open Space throughout the development. He indicated a little red square in Lot 8 that is encroaching into the 50' x 250' landscape area. He said they are asking to modify the 50' x 250' requirement so they can accommodate that lot at that location. He said they are adding an additional 10,000 square foot area of landscaping at that arterial corner and they are also adding a nice feature on the corner. He shared a visual representation of the corner feature. He shared the Wall Plan, noting the two green indicators at the entryway pushed back approximately 100' from the right-of-way. He said these are the entry theme walls and the applicant is requesting that they be allowed to raise the height of the walls to 9' 10". He said they are also asking to decrease all of the perimeter walls along the arterials down to 6' 8". He shared the Greenfield Road entryway feature, a roundabout, the entry wall and the feature they are requesting to increase. He also shared the Germann Road entrance and noted that they would also like to raise the entryway feature on the Germann entrance to approximately 7'. He shared some concerns that were brought up at the neighborhood meeting about changes in traffic patterns for this area. He shared a slide about traffic generation, noting that the number of daily trips is significantly less for the proposed use than for the potential commercial use. He said the only area in which the volume is higher is in the AM peak exit hours. He addressed some of the concerns raised by the Commission at the previous Study Session. One of the concerns raised was about changing this from commercial to residential. He said the applicant has stated that due to access issues and the commercial being so close to the corner, there isn't enough room to put a cut in the center median, so it eliminates traffic coming from the east to access the site coming down Germann. Additionally, the applicant asserts that the surrounding residential density isn't dense enough to support commercial on this site and attributes the lack of development on the site to that. He also noted that the proximity of other retail options nearby was another reason commercial wasn't as viable in the area. The Planning Commission had also asked about underutilized or vacant existing Community Commercial land in the area. He shared an exhibit created by Staff to illustrate that there is approximately 86 acres of land designated Community Commercial

within 3 miles of the subject site that is undeveloped. He pointed out that demand is not strong in this area. He also noted that there is a significant amount of underutilized Community Commercial in the area. He also addressed a question raised by the Commission about proximity of grocery stores in the area, pointing out that there are a significant number of grocery stores in the area. Planner Rogers then discussed General Plan Land Use Policies. He finished his presentation by saying that Staff recommends approval of this project with the conditions listed in the Staff Report.

Vice Chair Bloomfield thanked Planner Rogers for his presentation and called for questions or comments for Staff. Seeing none, he invited the applicant forward to make a presentation.

Brennan Ray introduced himself and said he was there on behalf of the applicant, Lennar Homes. He said he appreciated the opportunity to bring this case before the Commission tonight. He said it wasn't necessary to make a presentation as Staff had done a thorough job and they agreed with Staff's recommendation for approval. He said they were in agreement with the stipulations requested. He asked if he could reserve the opportunity to speak until after he had heard the comments from the neighboring residents that had requested to speak.

Vice Chair Bloomfield said he had two public comment cards. He then called Mike Janfrancisco to the podium. Mr. Jan Francisco was opposed to the item and wished to speak.

Mike Janfrancisco, of Gilbert, introduced himself. He said the reason he was in opposition to this change was that he believes the entire project is in violation of the Land Development Code. He said this project doesn't ensure compatibility among land uses. He said with SF-43 and SF-35 and low density housing with custom homes, semi-custom homes and horse properties in the entire area, he doesn't understand why this would be approved. He said this whole project is totally incompatible with the neighborhood. He said to exacerbate this further, putting as many homes as possible on an acre of ground is not planned management. He said that it is indiscriminate land use. He said the community used to be such a nice rural community and now Greenfield has a lake, the waste treatment plant expanding, a church, a school, and soccer fields. He said Greenfield has almost become gridlocked. He said all the traffic from San Tan Valley is streaming north to get on the 202. He said he is retired and can't go out at certain times of the day because the 202 is backed up half a mile. He said it has become a safety hazard. He also addressed the impact to the area's resources, noting that we are in a drought. He said adding 162 homes in a drought doesn't seem like responsible planning. He said they lived in a beautiful rural community and now they are going to inundate it with as many homes as can be squeezed onto a piece of property. He said he is concerned about the environmental impact, the safety issues, the impact to their lifestyle, and the fact that their quality of life has been degraded. He said he bought this home when he retired from Motorola and he thought it would be a nice community, but he said now they are inundated with traffic. He said it was a beautiful community, but now developers have overrun the area and are degrading their quality of life. He asked the Commission to deny this request.

Vice Chair Bloomfield invited Brennan Ray back to the podium.

Brennan Ray addressed the concern about traffic. He said that if you look at what the site is entitled to develop today, the number of daily trips with the proposed use is significantly lower than what is possible. He said the infrastructure is in place along Greenfield and Germann to accommodate this project. In terms of compatibility, he said they are consistent with the current zoning along the south and partially along their eastern edge. He said currently there is 16.08 acres of Community Commercial and the SF-6 wraps it. He indicated the area in blue, noting that they were including SF-6 sized lots of 6,600 square feet. He said in that way, they are trying to be consistent with the surrounding area. In terms of being consistent with good planning principles, he pointed out that they are locating the smaller lots in the development along arterials. He said you want to place your higher, more intense uses out along the arterial streets and they have done this. In terms of the quality of the development, he said this is as good of an example as any. He said he has had the opportunity to work with Lennar on a number of developments and they are a reputable builder that does a good job. He said a significant amount of detail has gone into this development, noting the increased amount of landscaping, the corner enhancement feature, the quality of the walls, the design, the entry features and the sense of arrival that is being created. He said they believe that this will be a good development that is consistent and compatible with the area. He again said he would recommend the Commission's approval.

Vice Chair Bloomfield read the name of Nancy Janfrancisco and said she was opposed to the item, but did not wish to speak. He then called for questions or comments for the applicant.

Question: David Cavenee asked about the Wall Plan. He asked what the height of the existing wall was between the eastern property and the subject property.

Answer: Brennan Ray said that he believes it is 6' or 6'6" in height. He said it serves as the border for the Whitewing development.

Question: David Cavenee asked about the request to go from 8" to 6'8". He asked if that was for the theme walls.

Answer: Brennan Ray answered affirmatively that they are requesting that the red walls out along Germann Road and south along Greenfield Road be 6' 8" which he believes is consistent with a lot of residential developments.

Question: David Cavenee asked to clarify that the request was mostly for aesthetics.

Answer: Brennan Ray answered affirmatively.

Question: David Cavenee asked if they would be solid walls.

Answer: Brennan Ray answered affirmatively that the perimeter wall would be solid.

Comment: David Cavenee said he wasn't able to attend last month's meeting to see this in Study Session and weigh in on this case, but he said he appreciates the transition from dense to less dense as they move into some of the other adjacent properties. He said it still feels a bit dense to

him. He said he appreciates that Mr. Ray addressed the traffic impact and pointed out that this will have a less intense traffic impact than the current zoning.

Vice Chair Bloomfield closed the Public Hearing and brought the discussion back to the dais.

Comment: David Cavenee said he feels the project is a little dense, but he understands that it could be worse. He thanked the Janfrancisco's for coming out. He said he is sensitive to their situation, but also moved by the comments about the less traffic intensive opportunity here. He said given the project they had reviewed earlier and the fact that density was a concern in that case, he is a bit bothered by the density here, but noted that the previous project was even denser. He said he likes the layout and all the green at the entry. He said it looks like the perimeter landscape is going to be nice. He said he thinks the wall is fine at 6' 8". He said the 50' x 250' in the corner is well offset by the offering of more landscape and that is a very fair give back for that corner. He said he is agreeable to the deviations requested and the layout and will be in favor of the project.

Comment: Greg Froehlich said he thinks they did a pretty good job of diminishing the effect to the existing residences by having a less dense product in those areas. He said he sees the issues with this site being commercial. He said he thinks it's a good project overall and is okay with the deviations on the walls and the corner.

Vice Chair Bloomfield pointed out that they needed to make separate motions on the two cases. Les Smith made a **MOTION** to recommend approval of GP18-12, Bellamy; seconded by David Cavenee; motion passed.

Motion passed 6-0 with Chair Andersen abstaining due to Conflict of Interest.

David Cavenee made a **MOTION** to recommend approval of Z18-26, Bellamy, subject to conditions listed in the Staff Report; seconded by Seth Banda; motion passed.

Motion passed 6-0 with Chair Andersen abstaining due to Conflict of Interest.

Chairman Andersen returned to his position on the dais and called the next item on the agenda.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Administrative items are for the Commission/Board discussion and action. It is to the discretion of the majority of the Commission/Board regarding public input requests on any Administrative Item. Persons wishing to speak on an Administrative Item should complete a public comment form indicating the Item Number on which they wish to address. The Commission/Board may or may not accept public comment.

22. **Minutes** – Consider approval of the minutes of the Study Session and Regular Meeting of November 5, 2018.

Chair Andersen called for a motion to approve the minutes of the November 5, 2018 Planning Commission Study Session and Regular Meeting. A **MOTION** was made by Vice Chair Bloomfield; seconded by Seth Banda; motion passed.

Motion passed 6-0 with one abstention by David Cavenee because he wasn't in attendance.

COMMUNICATIONS

23. Report from Chairman and Members of the Commission on current events.

Chair Andersen said he had a question for Staff regarding the scooters he had seen around the Town. Council Liaison Peterson pointed out that they could not discuss that because it wasn't on the agenda, but she told the Commission it would be on the December 20 Council Agenda. No other members of the Commission had anything to report.

24. Report from Council Liaison on current events.

Brigette Peterson thanked the Commissioners for attending the joint meeting they had with the Town Council and the Planning Commission. She said she thought it was very beneficial for them to sit down together and get an idea of where everyone stands. She said they will be implementing some of the ideas that were brought up in the meeting during the new year such as adding the Pledge of Allegiance at the beginning of the meeting and moving her presentation to the beginning of the meeting. She said they had a second meeting for the General Plan Update and the process is going extremely well. She said she is very pleased with the consultant they chose. She said for updates, you can visit the General Plan website off of the Town of Gilbert website. She said there is a special tab under Planning. She said the Town Council inauguration will be Tuesday, January 8 at 6:00 p.m. She said they have a regularly scheduled Town Council meeting immediately following. She wished the Commission a Merry Christmas and said she would see them in 2019.

25. Report from Planning Services Manager on current events.

Interim Planning Services Manager Catherine Lorbeer shared a few statistics from November. She said there were 34 new planning cases submitted in November, adding to their total of 141 active planning cases. She said on the building permit side, that 97% of their residential and commercial plan reviews are meeting the turnaround times. She said 100% of their sign permit reviews are meeting the turnaround time. She said they had 74 single family permits issued and a total of 490 permits issued overall. She also wished the Commission a wonderful holiday season and a Merry Christmas. She said the Commission's first meeting in January would take place on January 9, 2018.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business before the Planning Commission, Chair Andersen adjourned the Regular Meeting at 7:50 p.m.

Brian Andersen, Chairman

ATTEST:

Debbie Frazey, Recording Secretary

DRAFT