



**Planning and Zoning Commission**  
**Monday, October 11, 2021**  
**5:30 PM**  
**Library Auditorium**  
**7401 E. Skoog Blvd.**

----- Minutes -----

**I. Call to Order**

Chairperson Zurcher called the October 11, 2021, public meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission to order at 5:30 p.m.

**II. Invocation**

✚ Invocation given by Commissioner Gary Roberts.

**III. Pledge of Allegiance**

**IV. Attendance**

Chairperson Zurcher asked for roll call attendance to be taken. Members present: Chairperson Zurcher, Vice-Chairperson Renken, Commissioner Rutherford, Commissioner Roberts, Commissioner Laney, and Commissioner Griffis. Staff Present: Mark Trinidad, Planner, Wayne Balmer, Interim General Plan Consultant, Vikie Anderson, Administrative Supervisor and Kristi Jones, Administrative Support II.

**V. Approval of Minutes**

Chairperson Zurcher asked if the Commission had amendments to the minutes from the September 13, 2021, Work-Study Session. No revisions were submitted; thus, Chairperson Zurcher called for a motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner Griffis made the MOTION, seconded by Commissioner Rutherford to approve the minutes from the September 13, 2021, Planning Commission Work-Study Session.

MOTION carried unanimously by voice call vote as follows: Chairperson Zurcher YES, Vice-Chairperson Renken YES, Commissioner Roberts YES, Commissioner Rutherford YES, Commissioner Griffis YES and Commissioner Laney YES.

**MOTION carried with 6 ayes and 0 nays.**

Chairperson Zurcher asked if the Commission had amendments to the minutes from the September 13, 2021, regular meeting. No revisions were submitted; thus, Chairperson Zurcher called for a motion to approve the minutes. Vice-Chairperson Renken made the MOTION, seconded by Commissioner Roberts to approve the minutes from the September 13, 2021, Planning Commission regular meeting.

MOTION carried unanimously by voice call vote as follows: Chairperson Zurcher YES, Vice-Chairperson Renken YES, Commissioner Roberts YES, Commissioner Rutherford YES, Commissioner Griffis YES and Commissioner Laney YES.

**MOTION carried with 6 ayes and 0 nays.**

**VI. Announcements**

✚ There were no announcements.

**VII. Public Hearing Items**

✚ There were no public hearing items.

**VIII. Action Items**

- 1. PDP21-005.** Upon the application of Viewpoint 90 LLC, a Preliminary Development Plan for Antelope Park Parcel B. The project site is generally located between Viewpoint Drive and Pronghorn Ranch Parkway, southwest of Antelope Meadows Drive. The project is comprised of one hundred thirty-three (133) residential lots on approximately thirty-two (32) acres and currently zoned R1L-10 PAD.

Mark Trinidad, Planner, stated PDP21-005 Antelope Park Parcel B is a request for a Preliminary Development Plan (Plat) comprising one hundred thirty-three (133) total lots on approximately thirty-eight (38) acres. He displayed a vicinity map of the project site which is north of 89A between Viewpoint Drive and Pronghorn Ranch Parkway, southwest of Antelope Meadows Drive. Mr. Trinidad displayed a zoning map of the project site depicting the surrounding zoning to the north primarily R1 (RESIDENTIAL; SINGLE-FAMILY LIMITED) and the zoning to the south is currently commercial.

Mr. Trinidad reported that in December 2018 the Planning Commission had recommended approval of Zoning Map Change ZMC18-011 from RCU-70 to R1L-10 PAD along with the approval of Preliminary Development Plan PDP18-005 for Antelope Park. He noted that the Town Council approved Final Development Plans FDP19-006 (Antelope Park Parcel A for 82 lots) and FDP19-009 (Antelope Park Parcel B for 107 lots) in 2019. Mr. Trinidad explained that this request is essentially an extension of FDP19-009 Antelope Park Parcel B which adds six (6) acres and approximately twenty-six (26) additional single-family detached residential lots. He displayed a visual map depicting the original lots approved under FDP19-009 along with the additional twenty-six (26) new lots. Mr. Trinidad noted that the Preliminary Development Plan identifies street patterns, parks, open space, and the single-lot configuration. The streets were designed to allow for a more efficient utilization of the site and lot configurations.

Mr. Trinidad displayed a visual map depicting the new configuration of the one hundred thirty-three (133) lots. He noted that there are now two proposed points of access: one at Marble Canyon Way that connects to Viewpoint Drive and one at Bison Road which connects to Pronghorn Ranch Parkway. Mr. Trinidad emphasized that the previous approval for Antelope Park Parcel B only had one ingress/egress along Pronghorn Ranch Parkway.

Mr. Trinidad reported that PDP21-005 has been reviewed by Town Staff and finds it consistent with Town standards.

Mr. Trinidad indicated that a draft Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was submitted to Town Staff for preliminary review noting that a final TIA would be required as part of the Final Development Plan. He reported that the TIA generates approximately three hundred one (301) additional trips

with the additional lots. Mr. Trinidad explained that this is a net reduction from the previous Final Development Plans approved in 2019 which included the Point of View development.

In closing, Mr. Trinidad stated that Staff recommends the Commission approve the Preliminary Development Plan PDP21-005 for Antelope Park Parcel B as submitted with the following conditions:

1. The development shall occur in substantial conformance with the Preliminary Development Plan titled “Preliminary Development Plan Antelope Park Parcel B” attached hereto as “Exhibit A” and any applicable conditions of Ordinance No. 657 not superseded by the conditions of approval for previous Preliminary Development Plans.
2. Approval of a Final Development Plan per Code Section 13-19-060(G) and any applicable standards of design and construction procedures related to the Subdivision Code as set forth in Chapter 14 of the Town Code including engineered drainage and grading plans and all off site street and drainage improvements as recommended by the Town Engineer and Public Works Director.
3. In conjunction with a Final Development Plan approved by the Town Council, the Agent shall participate in roadway improvements including, but not limited, to travel lane widening commensurate with traffic generated by the Project as determined by the Public Works Director and as required for Phase I development described on the Antelope Park Traffic Impact Analysis dated July 31, 2018, updated October 29, 2018, and amended on June 29, 2021.
4. In conjunction with Final Development Approval, the Agent shall pay the Town for the stranded costs of the new 16-inch sewer plus actual or estimated costs to install water mains and water storage based on Northside Improvement Cost Estimate Spreadsheet dated August 22, 2016, and/or updated cost estimates.
5. The Agent may participate in any upsizing of capacities to serve the region; however, may seek to distribute or reimburse cost through creation of a Public Improvement Reimbursement Agreements per Section 14-04-070, a Development Agreement with the Town per ARS §9-500.05 or other voluntary process or arrangement with the Town or other parties.
6. Draft Covenants Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs) will be submitted for review with the Final Development Plan (Final Plat).
7. All Final Development Plans shall indicate a minimum setback of twenty (20) feet from any property line to front of garage except any portion of livable space may be within fifteen (15) feet of the front property line.
8. The revised Certificate of Assured Water Supply shall be approved by Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR) prior to Final Development Plan approval by Town Council.

Chairperson Zurcher opened the item to questions or comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Griffis asked why there is a requirement for a final TIA as the Commission hadn't received any information regarding a preliminary TIA.

Mr. Trinidad stated that the TIA was currently under Town Staff review and had not been included

in the Commission packets. He reiterated that a final TIA would be required as part of the Final Development Plan.

Vice-Chairperson Renken asked if the TIA includes the new access onto Viewpoint Drive.

Mr. Trinidad confirmed that the TIA will include the new access onto Viewpoint Drive.

Commissioner Laney asked for clarification that they are voting on an item without having all the pertinent information.

Mr. Trinidad noted that it is common to have a draft TIA submitted as part of the Preliminary Development Plan and that the final TIA is submitted as part of the Final Development Plan.

Commissioner Laney asked where the second access is on Viewpoint Drive.

Mr. Trinidad stated it is at Marble Canyon Way and apologized that the street name was partially obstructed on the visual map.

Chairperson Zurcher asked about improvements to Viewpoint Drive.

Mr. Trinidad reported that the applicant will improve curbs, sidewalks, and gutters as well as deceleration lanes and deferred to the applicant for more in-depth details.

Commissioner Griffis had a question regarding the widening of Viewpoint Drive as the language in the Staff brief used the word “recommended.”

Mr. Trinidad stated that the improvements along Viewpoint Drive will be subject to the future development north of this parcel; thus, recommended upon the future buildout north of the subject parcel. He noted that the comment was carried forward from the previous applications in 2019.

Vice-Chairperson Renken questioned whether the road improvements would be contingent on the buildout of the commercial area to the south as opposed to the north.

Mr. Trinidad confirmed it is the area to the south.

Chairperson Zurcher asked for clarification that Viewpoint Drive from Pronghorn Ranch Parkway north to Parkview will eventually be widened with the buildout of Viewpoint.

Mr. Trinidad replied “correct.”

Vice-Chairperson Renken asked if improvements to Pronghorn Ranch Parkway will be done along with this project.

Mr. Trinidad stated that improvements to Pronghorn Ranch Parkway will not be done as part of this project. The subsequent phases of Antelope Park will trigger the widening of Pronghorn Ranch Parkway.

Chairperson Zurcher asked which phase will trigger the widening of Pronghorn Ranch Parkway.

Mr. Trinidad stated that there will be three more phases: Parcels C, D and E noting that it will likely be Parcel C that triggers improvements including the widening of Pronghorn Ranch Parkway.

Commissioner Rutherford asked if there was an approximate timeline for the future phases.

Mr. Trinidad reported that the Town hasn't received any applications for Parcels C, D or E.

There were no further questions of Staff; therefore, Chairperson Zurcher invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Rick Radavich, Agent, Prescor Builders, addressed the Commission. Mr. Radavich stated that his company worked on Antelope Park Parcel A and while they were working on Parcel A, the owners of Parcel B asked if they would be interested in that as well (Parcel B had already been approved.) Upon review, they found a few things on the plans that didn't balance so they were going to have to rework some aspects. He noted that Point of View came up as an option as well and it was determined that the better plan would be to combine that into Parcel B. Mr. Radavich explained that both original sites were engineered and planned by two different people; therefore, there were some drainage and other issues that needed to be addressed. He noted that although they have decreased the total number of units, it is a better plan.

Mr. Radavich stated that a TIA was originally done for Antelope Park Parcels A, B, C and D noting that the original plan didn't have access to Viewpoint Drive – only Pronghorn Ranch Parkway. He noted that upon their first submittal, it was requested to update the TIA to see if it made an impact; it did not. Mr. Radavich indicated that Planning requested a second access onto Viewpoint Drive. He emphasized that the original TIA and the updated TIA which included the one hundred thirty-four (134) lots all accessed onto Pronghorn Ranch Parkway and didn't affect the TIA. Mr. Radavich noted that they don't have access to the Point of View TIA; however, the overall number of lots has decreased from one hundred seventy-one (171) to one hundred thirty-three (133).

Continuing, Mr. Radavich stated that they will be widening Viewpoint Drive along the frontage with another twelve-foot (12') lane of travel, five-foot (5') bike lane, curb, gutter and ten-foot (10') multi-use path as well as tying in a water line. He reported that there will be a left-turn lane/deceleration into the project on Pronghorn Ranch Parkway and a right-turn lane into the project like Antelope Park Parcel A.

Chairperson Zurcher asked for confirmation that they are widening Viewpoint Drive and adding a right-turn lane.

Mr. Radavich replied "yes" noting that this project started several months ago and has been through various Town Staff changes and had received the Viewpoint street section a few weeks ago.

Vice-Chairperson Renken commented that his concern is the morning traffic turning south on Viewpoint Drive. He wasn't clear if the second TIA included the access onto Viewpoint Drive.

Mr. Radavich stated that the second TIA doesn't include access onto Viewpoint Drive. He noted that he requested the TIA for the original Point of View, which was for sixty-four (64) lots; however, he hasn't received it. Mr. Radavich explained that he hadn't been asked about a TIA including the access onto Viewpoint Drive until recently.

Commissioner Rutherford commented that her concern is that there isn't a street plan depicting the turning lanes and stacking distance for the turning lanes and noted there is significant congestion in that area.

Chairperson Zurcher asked if they could table the matter until they have more detailed information.

Mr. Radavich deferred the question to his client.

Dave Everson, Mandalay Homes, addressed the Commission. Mr. Everson stated that there is confusion on his part as well as the original TIA was favorable with no access to Viewpoint Drive. He noted that the access onto Viewpoint Drive was requested after they had completed the design. Mr. Everson explained that there were initially two separate projects: one loading entirely onto Viewpoint and the other entirely onto Pronghorn Ranch Parkway. Utilizing only Pronghorn Ranch Parkway seemed logical as they had reduced the overall number of units. He indicated that they could leave it as two separate projects or combine them into one project and determine the best place to put the traffic. Mr. Everson commented that he has gotten mixed signals as to what is wanted.

Chairperson Zurcher stated that they don't have a complete picture as to the newest part of this project. He noted that they need better drawings regarding the access onto Viewpoint Drive and they need to see the TIA.

Mr. Everson indicated that he would like to table the matter at this time.

Commissioner Rutherford commented that she was not unsympathetic to the problem as he has made a better overall project and is ready to move ahead.

Mr. Everson asked the Commission if they wanted an access onto Viewpoint Drive. The Commission collectively would like to see an access onto Viewpoint Drive.

Mr. Everson stated that they were recently given a street section by Staff to build into their design and are in the process of engineering and incorporating that into the design and wondered if the TIA would change the street section/design. As the Commission didn't think it would affect it, Mr. Everson reported that he could get that information to the Commission right away.

Commissioner Griffis questioned whether the Commission should approve the project with specific stipulations so nothing gets overlooked or should they table the item for a future meeting. She expressed her concern that the project should continue moving forward as time is money and there has already been delays throughout the process thus far.

Chairperson Zurcher stated that he would like to see it tabled as the information provided in the packet was incomplete.

As there were no further questions for the applicant, Chairperson Zurcher opened the item to questions or comments from the public.

There was no public comment; therefore, Chairperson Zurcher closed public comment and brought the item back to the Commission for comments or motion.

**Action PDP21-005**

**Vice-Chairperson Renken moved to defer PDP21-005 to a date unspecified. Commissioner Roberts seconded the motion.**

MOTION carried 6:0 by roll call vote as follows: Chairperson Zurcher YES, Vice-Chairperson Renken YES, Commissioner Roberts YES, Commissioner Rutherford YES, Commissioner Griffis and Commissioner Laney YES.

**MOTION carried with 6 ayes and 0 nays.**

**IX. Call to the Public**

Chairperson Zurcher called for further public comment. He stated that those wishing to address the Planning and Zoning Commission need not request permission in advance. Action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter or rescheduling the matter for further consideration and decision at a later date.

**X. Adjournment**

There was no further public comment related to any item presented during this meeting; therefore, Chairperson Zurcher called for a motion for adjournment.

Commissioner Roberts made the MOTION, seconded by Commissioner Laney to adjourn by voice call vote.

Commission members voted as follows: Chairperson Zurcher YES, Vice-Chairperson Renken YES, Commissioner Roberts YES, Commissioner Rutherford YES, Commissioner Griffis YES and Commissioner Laney YES.

**MOTION carried with 6 ayes and 0 nays.**

The October 11, 2021, meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Short break before work-study session convened.

  
Acting Chairperson Griffis