

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING OF THE TOWN OF CHINO VALLEY

**AUGUST 6, 2019
6:00 P.M.**

The Planning and Zoning Commission of the Town of Chino Valley met for a Regular Meeting in the Chino Valley Council Chambers, located at 202 N. State Route 89, Chino Valley, Arizona.

1) CALL TO ORDER

Chair Chuck Merritt called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2) PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Vice Chair Armstrong led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3) ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Chuck Merritt; Commissioner Gary Pasciak; Vice-Chair Tom Armstrong; Commissioner John McCafferty; Commissioner Teena Meadors; Commissioner William Welker; Alternate David Somerville

Absent: Commissioner Robert Switzer

Staff Development Services Director Joshua Cook; Planner Alex Lerma; Public Works

Present: Director/Town Engineer Frank Marbury; Administrative Technician Kathy Frohock (videographer); Deputy Town Clerk Vickie Nipper (recorder)

4) MINUTES

- a)** Consideration and possible action to approve July 2, 2019, meeting minutes.

MOVED by Vice-Chair Tom Armstrong, seconded by Commissioner Teena Meadors to approve the July 2, 2019 minutes.

AYE: Chair Chuck Merritt, Commissioner Gary Pasciak, Vice-Chair Tom Armstrong, Commissioner John McCafferty, Commissioner Teena Meadors, Commissioner William Welker, Alternate David Somerville

Vote: 7 - 0 PASSED - Unanimously

5) STAFF REPORTS

6) PUBLIC HEARING

- a) Consideration and possible action regarding a request for approval for Heritage Point preliminary plat to subdivide approximately 89.9 acres into 75 one (1) acre lot developed in four (4) phases. The property is located 0.25 mile west of the southwest corner of North Road 1 West and West Road 4 North and north of the Chino Lakes Unit 2 subdivision. Assessor Parcel No's. 306-13-004X, 306-13-120, and 306-13-004Z.

Mr. Lerma reported that:

- The applicant was seeking approval for a preliminary plat. The applicant was in the SR1 zoning district, was abiding by all the development standards, and was not asking for any deviations to the development standards.
- The property was surrounded by one-acre subdivisions.
- The subject property was made up of three separate properties with a combined total of 89.9 acres and was within the Single Family one-acre minimum zone.
- The General Plan identified the area as a medium family density and are of two-acres or less.
- The property was currently vacant.
- The preliminary plat split the property into 75 minimum one acre lots with a maximum of 1.19 acres.
- The project will be developed in four phases and will have four drainage tracts and one rights-of-way tract.
- The rights-of-way designation would be approximately ten acres and 3.31 acres of open space.
- There will be secondary access provided for emergency vehicles.
- Staff reviewed the four phases and locations.
- Through staff research, it was concluded that all the lots on the proposed preliminary plat met all the requirements for building setbacks, minimum lot area, minimum lot frontage, and maximum building height with the exception of Lot 1, 2, 13, 17, 18, 53, 58, 59 and 61, which did not meet a minimum lot frontage of 100 feet. The applicant was not requesting a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay. Staff was recommending the lots be adjusted to meet the development standards at the final plat stages.
- Utilities will be provided by private wells and septic.
- Staff was recommending approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission with conditions for approval that must be met before the item went before Council:
 1. The preliminary plat shall be modified to show Rights-of-way dedication of 50 feet from centerline on West Road 4 North per Section 4.28 and 5.3.2.1.
 2. In addition to the 50' Rights-of-Way dedication on Road 4 North and associated half-width street improvements, the property line corners need to be rounded with 35' radius on minor arterials and 25' on local streets. (UDO 5.3.2 & 5.3.2.D.8).
 3. Storm runoff data for the 10-year and 50-year storms needed to be added for tributary channels entering and exiting the site. In addition, storm runoff data for the 100-year storm needed to be added for channels exiting the site (UDO 5.2.3.B.3.f).
 4. Typical building setback detail shall be modified by adding the typical building setbacks of a corner lot.

Frank Marbury presented the following:

- Explained that for condition number two, the applicant needed to round the property corners at the straight intersection at Road 4 North to where the property corners had a 35-foot radius.
- The storm run-off was a technical issue. The plat showed the 100-year storm for all the

flows that flowed into the subdivision and were labeled but the code required that the ten and fifty year flows also be labeled. Also, any outside flows leaving the subdivision needed to be labeled.

Commissioners and staff discussed the following:

- The lots that did not meet the development standards will be corrected before the final review and did not need to be one of the conditions of approval.
- The street radius', drainages, retention, etc. requirements will be addressed during the final technical review. The radius' in the conditions were ensuring property corners were developed properly for traffic to see around on the street corner.
- The drainage plan will require that any runoff generated by the development on the site would be released at historic runoff rates. A study of current runoff rates will determine the water runoff for the development rate.
- There was a depth of flow rate for any drainage water on municipal streets. If the flow rate exceeded the maximum flow rate, storm drain systems would be required. Water flow rates on Municipal roads and the code requirement was discussed. The intent of the drainage studies and plans was to help ensure the water flow from the new development did not impact surrounding properties.
- The zoning in SR1 allowed certain entitlements, such as animals, and the applicant was not requesting any deviations from the zoning code. Private CC&R's could restrict the development, but the Town gave the same entitlements as any other property with the same zoning. The CC&R's could not hinder any surrounding property that allowed animals through Town code.

Commissioners, staff and Craig Helsing, property owner, discussed the following:

- It was the property owner's intent to only allow domesticated animals. The property owner would be disclosing to home buyers that farm animals were allowed in the neighboring areas.
- There will most likely be a white split rail fencing around the perimeter of the property.

Open to the Public – Public Comments:

Tom Barkley, Architectural Chairman of Appaloosa Meadows II, asked for clarification about whether the homes will be one or two story homes, and what is the planned size of the homes. The property owner said the homes will be single story homes with RV garages attached and the size had not yet been determined, but they were in the range of 1,700 to 2,800 square feet. Staff explained that if in the future the owner decided to put two story homes in the development, he was allowed a certain height per code and no one could restrict a two-story home. The owner also explained that Talia Way would be a secondary access point with the main entrance off of Road 4 North on Heritage Point Blvd.

Ken Burkett, Appaloosa Meadows resident, asked if there would be any further public meetings on the development. The Commission explained that the plat will go to Council with recommendations and if approved, then would go through a technical review process with the Town staff and it would again go before the Commission with more public input. Staff explained that the preliminary plat had a different notification process than zoning had and no neighborhood meeting was required. Staff confirmed and elaborated on the review process and explained that the final plat will go before both the Commission and the Council for final

approvals. Staff explained that the technical review was not open to the public as it was staff reviewing the plans and once it was signed off, it would return to the Commission and the Council. The Commission explained the technical review was based on building codes, engineering requirements, and other rules. Staff explained technical review involved the public improvements and the engineering side of the plans. It was basically a compliance review to ensure that the applicant was complying with Town codes and associated standards. It was not a qualitative review. Mr. Burkett wanted to know if this was the same plan from 15-years ago and wondered if any changes had been made that related to current day requirements. Mr. Burkett said that he had drainage problems from the property and had spent a great deal to mitigate the problem and did not want a future issue. He had concerns about animals and other issues. The Commission stated the Town staff could address some of his concerns and that they would be dealing with many of the issues during the technical review.

MOVED by Vice-Chair Tom Armstrong, seconded by Commissioner William Welker to forward to the Town Council a recommendation of approval for Heritage Point preliminary plat, subdividing approximately 89.9 acres into 75 one (1) acre lots developed in four (4) phases with the following conditions to be completed before item goes before Town Council for approval of the preliminary plat:

1. The preliminary plat shall be modified to show rights-of-way dedication of 50 feet from centerline on West Road 4 North per Section 4.28 and 5.3.2.1
2. In addition to the 50' rights-of-way dedication on Road 4 North and associated half-width street improvements, the property line corners need to be rounded with 35' radius on minor arterials and 25' on local streets. (UDO 5.3.2 & 5.3.2.D.8)
3. Storm runoff data for the 10-year and 50-year storms needed to be added for tributary channels entering and exiting the site. In addition, storm runoff data for the 100-year storm needed to be added for channels exiting the site (UDO 5.2.3.B.3.f)
4. Typical building setback detail shall be modified by adding the typical building setbacks of a corner lot.

AYE: Chair Chuck Merritt, Commissioner Gary Pasciak, Vice-Chair Tom Armstrong, Commissioner John McCafferty, Commissioner Teena Meadors, Commissioner William Welker, Alternate David Somerville

Vote: 7 - 0 PASSED - Unanimously

7) NON-PUBLIC HEARING ACTION ITEMS

8) DISCUSSION ITEMS

9) PUBLIC COMMENTS


Call to the Public is an opportunity for the public to address the Commission on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Commission that is not on the agenda. Public comment is encouraged. Individuals are limited to speak for three (3) minutes. The total time for Call to the Public may be up to 30 minutes per meeting. Commission action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter, scheduling the matter for further consideration and decision at a later date, or responding to criticism.

10) ADJOURN

MOVED by Commissioner William Welker, seconded by Commissioner John McCafferty to adjourn the meeting at 6:40 p.m.

AYE: Chair Chuck Merritt, Commissioner Gary Pasciak, Vice-Chair Tom Armstrong, Commissioner John McCafferty, Commissioner Teena Meadors, Commissioner William Welker, Alternate David Somerville

Vote: 7 - 0 PASSED - Unanimously



Chair Charles Merritt



Date