



# City of Apache Junction

## Development Services Department



### CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION STAFF MEMO

**Date:** May 6, 2024

**To:** Honorable Mayor and City Council Members

**Through:** Bryant Powell, City Manager  
Rudy Esquivias, Development Services Director  
Sidney Urias, Planning Manager

**From:** Kelsey Schattnik, Senior Planner

**Case Numbers:** P-23-63-PZ & P-23-64-GPA

**Subject:** P-23-63-PZ: Proposed Rezoning of approximately 18 acres from General Commercial by Planned Development ("B-1/PD") (Ordinance No. 1144) and B-1/PD (Ordinance No. 1146) to High Density Multiple-Family Residential by Planned Development ("RM-2/PD")

P-23-64-GPA: Proposed Major General Plan Amendment to redesignate approximately 18 acres from Commercial to High Density Residential

#### Summary

**P-23-63-PZ** Is a Planned Development (PD) Rezoning request by Greg Davis with Iplan Consulting, representing the property owner, Jason Barney with Olsen Recker/Guadalupe Properties LLC, to rezone approximately 18 acres from General Commercial by Planned Development ("B-1/PD") (Ordinance No. 1144) and B-1/PD (Ordinance No. 1146) to High Density Multiple-Family Residential by Planned Development ("RM-2/PD") near the southeast corner of the US-60 and Goldfield Road. The subject site is proposed to be developed with approximately 271 rental units to be known as Silveray on Goldfield.

**P-23-64-GPA** Is a proposed Major General Plan Amendment of APNs 103-01-0110, 103-01-0130, 103-01-0140, 103-01-0150, 103-01-0160, 103-01-0170 and 103-01-0180, located near the southeast corner of Goldfield Rd. and US-60, from Commercial to High Density Residential (40 du/ac).

## **Planning & Zoning Commission Hearing and Recommendation**

Due to the requirements for a Major General Plan Amendment, the Planning and Zoning Commission held two (2) public hearings for these cases. The General Plan requires that these meetings be held in two (2) different locations.

The Planning and Zoning Commission held the first public hearing for P-23-63-PZ & P-23-64-GPA on March 26, 2024 in the Superstition Fire and Medical District's Board Room located at 565 N. Idaho Road. Please see the attached staff report and exhibits presented to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

At this meeting, Staff made a presentation and introduced the preliminary recommended conditions of approval for the Planned Development Rezoning and Major General Plan Amendment. The applicant also made a presentation and answered questions asked by the Commission.

Eight (8) residents of Golden Vista Resort spoke during the meeting. Their primary concerns included:

1. The two-story height of the development
2. Water pressure concerns
3. Increased density
4. Property value concerns
5. Maintaining commercial land
6. Increased traffic

The Planning and Zoning Commission held a second public hearing for P-23-63-PZ & P-23-64-GPA on April 23, 2024. Both Staff and the applicant gave a presentation. Please see the attached staff report and exhibits presented to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Five (5) residents spoke during the meeting. Their primary concerns included:

1. The two-story height of the development
2. The desire for commercial development at this site.
3. Increased density.

Ultimately, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 4-3 to recommend approval of P-23-63-PZ & P-23-64-GPA, subject to the conditions of approval that were recommended in the Staff Report, dated April 23, 2024, with the elimination of Project Specific Condition Numbers 1 & 2.

Project Specific Condition No. 1 would have required the developer to reserve 5 acres on the north side of Resort Boulevard to remain commercial. Project Specific Condition No. 2 provided a list of General Commercial Uses that would not be permitted.

*The commissioners who voted in favor of the proposed development discussed the following:*

1. The benefit of developing a historically vacant property.
2. The benefit of adding additional rooftops.
3. Whether this site is viable for commercial use and noted that the approved development plan has been in existence for 20+ years and has yet to be developed.
4. Recent trends of commercial development.
5. Not wanting to keep commercial property that may never develop.

*The commission members who voted against the proposal discussed:*

1. The desire of an ownership product at this site as opposed to a rental product.
2. The lack of desire to continue changing the voter approved General Plan.
3. The concern of changing commercial to residential.
4. Concerns regarding the lack of affordability with market rate housing.

Attached:

- Planning and Zoning Commission Staff Reports and attachments (March 23, 2024 & April 23, 2024)