



City of Apache Junction, Arizona

Meeting Minutes Planning and Zoning Commission

Meeting location:
City Council Chambers
at City Hall
300 E Superstition Blvd
Apache Junction, AZ
85119

apachejunctionaz.gov
P: (480) 474-5083

Tuesday, September 28, 2021

7:00 PM

City Council Chambers

1. Call to Order

Chair Heck called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Heck led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Roll Call

Present: 7 - Chairperson Heck
Vice Chair Hantzsche
Commissioner Gage
Commissioner Begeman
Commissioner Cross
Commissioner Cantwell
Commissioner Barker

Staff present:

Joel Stern, City Attorney
Larry Kirch, DS Director
Kelsey Schattnik, Planner
Nick Leftwich, Associate Planner

4. Consent Agenda

Vice Chair Hantzsche moved that the Planning and Zoning Commission accept the agenda as presented and approve the minutes from the August 10, 2021 and August 24, 2021 regular meetings. Commissioner Barker seconded the motion.

Yes: 7 - Chairperson Heck, Vice Chair Hantzsche, Commissioner Gage, Commissioner Begeman, Commissioner Cross, Commissioner Cantwell and Commissioner Barker

No: 0

Chair Heck called for a motion.

[21-509](#) Consideration of approval of agenda.

[21-510](#) Consideration of approval of the minutes of the August 10, 2021 and August 24, 2021 regular meetings.

5. Public Hearings

[21-486](#)

Presentation, discussion, public hearing and consideration of P-21-68-PZ, a proposed rezoning of approximately 22 acres, generally located near the southwest corner of Tomahawk Road and Broadway Avenue, from General Commercial (B-1) and High Density Multiple-Family Residential (RM-2) to High Density Multiple-Family Residential by Planned Development (RM-2/PD) to develop approximately 201 single-family rental units.

Commissioner Barker moved that the Planning and Zoning Commission recommend to the Apache Junction City Council the approval of planned development rezoning case P-21-68-PZ, a request by Sonoma Communities (developer), represented by Adam Baugh of Withey Morris, PLC (applicant), for an approximate 201 for-rent single family residential community to be named The Residences at Apache Trail, generally located near the Southwest corner of Broadway Avenue and Tomahawk Road, from General Commercial B-1 and RM-2 (High Density Multiple-Family Residential) to High Density Multiple-Family Residential by Planned Development ("RM 2/PD"), subject to the following conditions of approval: 1) All the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance are applicable to this case. 2) The development shall reflect substantial compliance and consistency with the Planned Development presented with case P-21-68-PZ, incorporated by reference herein, and as otherwise specified through these conditions of approval, to include general layout, elevations, lot sizes, setbacks, reduced rear setback of 10', public and private rights-of-ways, easements and tracts, amenities including proposed pool and clubhouse, perimeter and interior lot separation walls, model types, landscaping and other improvements. 3) All elevations shall include a uniform application of materials on all buildings. Different color palettes shall be used to differentiate and vary building elevations. Allocation of materials shall be consistent throughout the site. 4) Landscape, screening and irrigation improvements, planted within a minimum 10-foot deep strip inside the net property line but outside of required walls along the perimeters of the property, shall be provided in compliance with the city's landscape and screening requirements contained in Apache Junction City Code, Volume II, Land Development Code, Chapter 1, Zoning Ordinance, Article 1-8, Landscape Regulations. All required trees shall be 24" box and all required shrubs shall be 5-gallon in size and a decorative 6-foot-tall fence shall be constructed. 5) Street improvements include but not necessarily limited to, extension of pavement and the provision of sidewalk, curb, gutter, streetlights, underground utilities, fire hydrants, landscaping shall be required as part of this planned development project, and subject to review and approval by the City Engineer. 6) The developer shall meet the Traffic Impact Analysis, CLOMAR/LOMAR, drainage, and FEMA floodplain requirements, as outlined by the City Engineer in the previously provided pre-application and review comments. 7) The proposed development will not be age-restricted. 8) All applicable permits shall be applied for and plans shall be designed to current city codes prior to any lot grading or construction on the lots. Inclusive, all applicable development fees, including public art fees, shall be paid at the time of permit issuance. Development fees shall be paid on a per unit basis. 9) All common areas, amenity areas, and tracts within and immediately adjacent to the proposed development, including perimeter walls and fences, and interior and exterior common area landscaping, shall be owned and maintained in good condition at all times by the owners or homeowners association of the proposed subdivision. 10) The developer's engineer shall meet the civil engineering improvement plans and document requirements, as outlined in the previously provided pre-application and review comments and in accordance of the city's approved engineering standards that are in effect at the time of plan submittal. 11) A land division of the northern portion of the eastern parcel (102-02-001B), and subsequent lot combination of the newly created parcel and existing RM-2 zoned parcel (102-02-002B), shall be required. 12) Minor PD modifications or alterations of the approved architecture designs, floor plans, open space, unit mix, clubhouse location or development plan, shall be administratively reviewed and approved by the Director or designee. 13) Major deviations or proposed changes from the original plans associated with this case will require a Major PD Amendment. The Director or designee shall interpret the proposed modification to be significant/major if, in the Director or designee's opinion, the modified project density (i.e., units per acre) is proposed to be increased by more

than 10%, the quality of project design is diminished, the types of proposed land uses are significantly altered and/or the overall character of the project is contrary to the intent and spirit of the original City Council PD ordinance approval. 14) The developer will meet with the city to dedicate pieces of the land for trails for trail use. Vice Chair Hantzsche seconded the motion.

Yes: 7 - Chairperson Heck, Vice Chair Hantzsche, Commissioner Gage, Commissioner Begeman, Commissioner Cross, Commissioner Cantwell and Commissioner Barker

No: 0

Planner Schattnik gave a presentation on Case P-21-68-PZ: "The Residences at Apache Trail" to develop approximately 201 single-family rental units, located at the southwest corner of Broadway and Tomahawk.

Recommend approval subject to conditions of approval in staff report. A public hearing with the city council is scheduled on October 19th at 7:00 pm.

Applicant Sonoma Communities, represented by Adam Baugh Withey Morris, gave a presentation on the project and discussed challenges on the property, including a large wash which was addressed in the plan. Most rental residences are single story and include updated fixtures and amenities which will attract better tenants. The wash, layout of the units, mailboxes, electric vehicle parking stations, horse trail system, sewer system, traffic studies and parking was discussed with the applicant and the commissioners.

Chair Heck opened the public hearing portion of the meeting.

George Schroeder, residing at 2444 W. Virginia, Apache Junction, stated he was opposed to apartments, especially two or three stories, and expressed concern over garbage, noise, and increasing traffic on Old West Hwy. Mr. Schroeder stated he doesn't want Apache Junction to be like Mesa.

Scott Oldenkirk, residing on Sixshooter Road, Apache Junction, had questions about the approval process of the development. Mr. Oldenkirk stated that he likes the rural nature of Apache Junction, and doesn't want the development here.

Jeff Bartlett, residing at 108 N. Meridian Drive, Apt. 220, Apache Junction, expressed he likes the fact that Apache Junction is developing more like Mesa, or even Phoenix. Mr. Bartlett stated that he likes the design of the project and stated he is against too many regulations and feels that there are ways to make it work and lower the cost of living.

Ken Bradley, residing at 635 N. Royal Palm, Apache Junction stated he's lived in Arizona for a long time and expressed concern over Apache Junction losing the rural nature of the city, and he is against having the apartments.

Jim Bower, 1950 E. 12th Ave., Apache Junction had a question about the main entrance of the development and where it was located; it was stated that it's on Broadway. He further stated that he is not against development in Apache Junction.

Chair Heck closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

The commission discussed several concerns including the horse trail, the wash, traffic and rezoning commercial property to residential property along with future commercial development along Old West Hwy. The commission agreed to recommend for approval, as long as another

condition was met regarding the trail.

Chair Heck called for a review of the findings of fact which were read, and all commissioners agreed, no objections.

Chair Heck called for a motion.

[21-528](#) Presentation, discussion, public hearing and consideration of case P-21-73-PZ, a proposed rezoning by planned development requested by Chris Hundelt of Keystone Homes, of 14.77 acres located at the southwest corner of Superstition Boulevard and Royal Palm Road from from RS-GR (“General Rural Low Density Single-Family Detached Residential”) to RM-2/PD (“High Density Multiple-Family Residential by Planned Development”) for the purpose of developing a 166-unit rental residential community.

Commissioner Barker moved that the Planning and Zoning Commission recommend to the city council that we continue this item until the Planning and Zoning meeting of November 23, 2021. Commissioner Cross seconded the motion.

Yes: 7 - Chairperson Heck, Vice Chair Hantsche, Commissioner Gage, Commissioner Begeman, Commissioner Cross, Commissioner Cantwell and Commissioner Barker

No: 0

Associate Planner Nick Leftwich gave a presentation on case P-21-73-PZ, a proposed rezoning of 14.77 acres at the southwest corner of Superstition Boulevard and Royal Palm Road, for the purpose of developing a 166-unit rental residential community.

Brennan Ray of Burch & Cracchiolo, representing Applicant Chris Hundelt of Keystone Homes gave a presentation on case P-21-73-PZ.

The commissioners discussed traffic concerns, walls, fire protection, and landscaping plants.

Chair Heck opened the public hearing portion of the item.

George Schroeder residing at 2444 W. Virginia, Apache Junction stated the development was the worst representation of Apache Junction and was not in favor of the development.

Jeff Bartlett residing at 108 N. Meridian Dr., Apt. 220, Apache Junction stated he liked the design and the property and felt the high density development was a good thing for creating a place for people to live. He stated the demographics will change over time.

Kacey Bradley residing at 635 N. Royal Palm, Apache Junction stated she was directly affected by this development and doesn't understand why there's so many people crammed into the parcel. She discussed traffic concerns and accidents and feels like the development isn't a good fit for the area.

Beth Williamson residing at 971 E. Ranch Rd., Apache Junction, stated she's the boarding stable owner. She discussed her concerns with horse riders and the dangers with traffic.

Ken Bradley residing at 635 N. Royal Palm, Apache Junction stated he's concerned about wildlife and mentioned a wildlife study. He also mentioned concern with traffic.

Tim Sheehan residing at 357 S. Winchester Rd., Apache Junction stated he owns AJ Apartments and stated he receives calls weekly from people looking for a place to live. He stated that we definitely need this development in the area due to all the people moving to the area.

Lucy Ortiz residing at 591 E. Superstition Blvd., Apache Junction stated she just purchased her home in this rural area and wasn't expecting high density housing in front of her home, and she feels like the development would be killing the habitat and the 2-story would block her view. She stated she is not in favor of the development.

Julie Fritz residing at 575 N. Royal Palm Rd., Apache Junction she is opposed to the development and will be directly affected by it. She stated the parcel is too small for that many people.

Chair Heck closed the public hearing portion of the item.

The commissioners discussed several concerns with the development, including fire access, the development location and the fit as a whole, the amount of high density housing currently approved in the city, the neighbors, horses, the sewer board and city staff transparency, a disconnect between zoning map and master plan map and the resulting issues, and traffic flow concerns.

Director Kirch stated the general plan was approved by the voters and passed by the city council in August 2020. He stated that a traffic study is warranted in the project area. He stated that staff recommended approval of the development and was correct to do so. He further stated that the city inherited a lot of zoning from the county.

Chair Heck again discussed the traffic concerns and requested a continuance pending a traffic study.

City Attorney Stern suggested a continuance in two months due to time involved for a traffic study.

Chair Heck called for a motion.

6. Old Business

None.

7. New Business

None.

8. Information and Reports

None.

9. Director's Report

None.

10. Selection of Meeting Dates, Times, Location and Purpose

Vice Chair Hantzsche moved that the Planning and Zoning Commission hold a regular meeting on October 12, 2021 at 7:00 pm in the city council chambers located at 300 E. Superstition Boulevard. In the event there are no items to be brought forward to the commission, this meeting may be canceled. Notification of cancellation properly posted and the commission notified by staff. Commissioner Barker seconded the motion.

Yes: 7 - Chairperson Heck, Vice Chair Hantzsche, Commissioner Gage, Commissioner Begeman, Commissioner Cross, Commissioner Cantwell and Commissioner Barker

No: 0

Chair Heck called for a motion.

11. **Adjournment**

Chair Heck adjourned the meeting at 9:58 pm.

Chair Peter Heck