

CITY OF LITCHFIELD PARK

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting
Tuesday, July 13, 2021
7 p.m.

Virtual Meeting

Watch on You Tube via the following link:

<https://youtu.be/rSFR2pZjhec>

IN-PERSON ATTENDANCE AT PUBLIC MEETINGS HAS BEEN SUSPENDED UNTIL FURTHER NOTICE. NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN PURSUANT TO A.R.S. §38-431.02 THAT MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION WILL ATTEND BY AUDIO/VIDEO CONFERENCE CALL.

I. Call to Order

THIS MEETING WILL BE HELD BY REMOTE PARTICIPATION. CALL TO THE COMMUNITY WILL NOT BE HELD.

1. Zoom Conference

a. Computer: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83529145492> Meeting ID: 835 2914 5492

b. Telephone: 1 669 900 6833 or 1 253 215 8782 Meeting ID: 835 2914 5492

II. Business

A. City Center Development Update

Information

Woody Scoutten, City Engineer, will provide an update on the progress of the City Center development.

B. Zoning Code Update

Information

Review, discussion, and possible direction to Staff regarding the ongoing Zoning Code review and update, including Section 29, Parking and Loading Requirement.

C. Design Review Board/Board of Adjustment Update

Information

Update on the Design Review Board/Board of Adjustment meetings held on May 6, June 3, and July 1, 2021.

D. Topics for Referral to City Council

Action

Discussion of and possible referral of new topics to the City Council.

E. Minutes

Information
Action

Possible approval of the minutes of the May 11, 2021 Meeting.

III. Staff Report on Current Events

Information

This is the time Staff may present a brief summary on current events. The Commission may not propose, discuss, deliberate or take any legal action on the information presented, pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.02.

IV. Commissioners' Reports on Current Events

Information

This is the time Commissioners may present a brief summary on current events. The Commission may not propose, discuss, deliberate or take any legal action on the information presented, pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.02.

V. Adjournment

Action

David Ledyard, Chair

Persons with special accessibility needs should contact City Hall, 623 935-5033 at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD/BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT UPDATE

The following items were acted on at the May 6, June 3, and July 1, 2021 Design Review Board and Board of Adjustment Meetings:

Design Review Board

- ❖ **Taco Bell – Southeast Corner of Dysart and Camelback:** The Board had reviewed and provided comments at a previous study session for the site, architectural, landscape and lighting plans for a Taco Bell facility proposed for the center located at the southeast corner of Dysart and Camelback Roads. Revisions were made in response to the comments supplied and those plans were reviewed at the May 6 meeting. The plans were approved with the condition that the electrical transformer for the site is to be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer prior to the submittal of construction documents to ensure compliance with site visibility triangles for ingress/egress safety
- ❖ **750 Val Verde Circle:** An application the addition of a new two-car garage at this location was approved. It was noted that the owner is planning to do additional updates to the home in the future, but wanted to start with this addition. It was also noted that the owner will be keeping the existing two-car side-entry garage.
- ❖ **680 Fairway:** The applicant was seeking design approval for a bright orange exterior color, not included in the City's approved exterior color palette, that had already been applied to portions of the home. The applicant noted why they chose the color and that it went well with the Mid-Century design of the home. The Board noted that they were fine with using the color for accents, but not the carport wall siding. The applicant agreed to change the wall color. The Board approved the existing orange color on the front accent pieces with the condition that the carport wall siding is to be repainted a color to match the existing slump block.
- ❖ **104 Paseo:** The Board approved an application to add an extension to the existing garage at this home with the condition that the colors, materials, and finishes match the existing.
- ❖ **690 E. Fairway Drive:** The design plans for a roof mounted solar installation at this location were reviewed. It was noted that some of the arrays were not squared up and the panels were located both vertically and horizontally. The home is located on a corner lot and the panels would be visible from both streets. After discussing possible ways to rearrange the panels, the application was approved with the condition that two of the panels would be relocated and the conduit run as noted in the meeting and painted to match the house.
- ❖ **605 Bird Lane:** This applicant was seeking design approval of his plans to extend the home's garage by adding a third bay to the existing two-car garage. The application was approved with the condition that the colors, building materials, and finishes are to match the existing house.

- ❖ **115 Cercado Lane:** After discussion, it was noted that the plans submitted for an addition and exterior remodel for this home were not complete. The Board continued the application to provide time for the applicant to submit a more complete application.
- ❖ **1138 Oro Vista:** This application for a garage addition to create a four-car tandem garage was approved with the condition that all colors, materials, and finishes are to match the existing.
- ❖ **840 Villa Nueva:** This homeowner was seeking approval for an exterior wall color not within the City's approved color palette. It was noted that it is a darker than normal color, but it is offset and complemented by the stone retaining wall. The application was approved.
- ❖ **205 N. Neolin:** This application was also for an exterior wall color not included in the City's approved color palette. The applicant had proposed a dark blue exterior color, but was not present to provide information regarding whether they would be providing an accent trim color. The application was approved with the condition that the applicants must provide a trim color(s) of a lighter color to offset the dark blue with notations of where it would be applied to Planning Staff for possible approval.

Board of Adjustment

- ❖ **14044 W. Greentree South:** A public hearing was held at the June 3 meeting regarding an application for a variance to encroach into the setbacks required for the location of a detached accessory shade structure on the side of a home. Discussion was held, but the action on the item was continued in order to consult with the City Attorney. Subsequently, at the July 3 meeting, the Board did not approve the variance.
- ❖ **614 La Loma Avenue:** A public hearing was held for a request to encroach into the side yard setback required for the location of a detached accessory shade structure. Following the public hearing, the variance was not approved.

**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING
OF THE LITCHFIELD PARK PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
May 11, 2021**

I. Call to Order

The meeting was held online via Zoom and called to order at 7:03 p.m. by Chair Ledyard.

Members Present: Vice Chair Faith, and Commissioners Alvey, Darre, Lawrence, Ledyard; and O'Connor.

Members Absent: Commissioner Fraser.

Staff Present: Jason Sanks, Planning Consultant; Pamela Maslowski, Director of Planning Services; and Dawn Morocco, IT Assistant.

II. Business

A. Zoning Code Update

Mr. Sanks stated that a great majority of the Zoning Code update involves refining, reformatting, and restructuring the existing Code; however, there are a number of items that need review and discussion. At the April meeting, the Commission discussed the possibility of revising some of the accessory structure requirements. The City established standards that limit the size of accessory structures to 500 SF (square feet) due to concerns regarding overbuilding residential lots. Since that time, the City has received requests to allow larger guest houses, shade structures and garages. This has prompted discussion regarding whether some of the requirements/restrictions should be revised. He reviewed and discussed his Staff Report that was included in the agenda packet.

- The definition of an accessory structure includes any detached structure whether it is built within the building footprint or outside of it. Staff's proposal, based on the Commission's discussion and on discussions with the sub-committee that has been meeting with Staff, is to change the definition of an accessory structure to:

A subordinate structure located on the same lot as the principal building, located either partially or entirely outside of the required main building setbacks. Structures located within the main building setbacks shall not be considered accessory structures, shall be considered part of the primary structure whether attached or detached, and are subject to the development standards of the zoning district for which it is located. In all cases, building code requirements remain applicable to all structures.

He noted the language regarding the building code might seem redundant. However, while it might be fine to locate an accessory structure closer to an existing home from a design perspective, there could be restrictions under the building codes. This puts the applicants on notice that, in addition to the Zoning Code regulations, there might be specific building codes that require larger setbacks. He would like the Commission to consider this change.

- Mr. Sanks had technology difficulties and left the meeting for a short time. In response to questions, Ms. Maslowski supplied the requirements for accessory structures on lots bordering golf courses.
- Mr. Sanks returned to the meeting, and stated that Staff would like to know if the Commission had any concerns or direction regarding RV garages. RV garages have been a concern because of their size and the difficulty in architecturally integrating them with the home so they do not look like large storage boxes. The preference has been that RV garages be located within the main building envelope rather than as an accessory structure that would be allowed to be built closer to the property line. Mr. Sanks referred to the RV garage illustration in his Staff Report, noting that it gives an idea of the scale and height for an RV garage, although some RVs would require an even

larger sized structure. He did check other cities' requirements for accessory structures. The Town of Gilbert allows a 20' height, whereas Litchfield Park caps the height at 15'. An RV garage usually requires a height of at least 20'.

- Staff is also proposing changing one of the requirements regarding lot coverage and size. The Code requires that no accessory structure or combination of structures shall occupy more than 25% of the area lying between the rear property line and the rear of the home. This metric is difficult to calculate due to the different types of properties in the City, and the calculations are rarely provided by the applicants. Staff would like to propose that this requirement be removed.
- The maximum size allowed for all accessory structures or combination of structures is 500 SF. This includes any attached shade structures. When lot coverage is calculated, it includes everything under roof and that is also used to determine the square footage of accessory structures. Staff is proposing that language be added clarifying that any attached shade structure is to be considered in calculating the total square footage.
- Based on recent discussions with the sub-committee and the Commission last month, Staff would like some direct input on increasing the maximum size (500 SF) allowed for accessory structures on larger lots within the City. He has proposed keeping the 500 SF maximum, except for lots within Residential Estate (RE) districts, where the maximum allowed would be 1,000 SF. It was first thought that the R-1 District lots should be included; however, upon further review, Staff found that many of these lots are already fairly densely packed. Staff feels that including only the RE Districts in the allowance for larger structures remains consistent with the City's goal to not over develop residential lots. Commissioner O'Connor noted that the sub-committee discussed increasing the allowable maximum size for the R-1 districts to 700 SF. Mr. Sanks responded that there was discussion regarding tiering the allowable height; however, he was not entirely clear after the if that was the case. He explained his reasoning for limiting the additional height to the RE districts and noted that, if the Commission wants to tier the allowable height, the requirement can be revised.

Commission discussion and comments included:

- A very large RV garage could be built as long as it is attached to the house; is within the required building footprint of the main house; does not cause the property to exceed the maximum lot coverage allowed; and the colors, materials, and finishes match the existing home. Also, the Design Review Board has a general policy that the ridge height of the RV garage may not exceed the ridge height of the existing home.
- There are about 24 lots with RE zoning, and there are very large lots of an acre or more that are not within an RE District. Mr. Sanks noted that a minimum lot size could be used as the threshold rather than the zoning district.
- A question was raised regarding a large house on Old Litchfield Road with a large RV garage and other structures. Mr. Sanks explained the history of the property and noted that the house is located on a very large lot with additional structures connected via trellises, making them a part of the home. The house, including the attached structures, are all located within the buildable area of the lot. The height is within what is allowed.
- It was suggested that the Commission could move forward with those changes the Commission agrees with at this point for the Code update. Additional changes to this section could be reviewed and discussed at a later date as a separate text amendment when there might be more public involvement.
- Mr. Sanks noted that Staff is bringing items to the Commission that have been brought to Staff's attention. The Commission could consider only the suggested changes to the definition at this time. That would probably take care of many issues where garages are being added within the building envelope and then being required to be attached to house with trellises and such. If the main building setbacks are met, whether the proposed addition is attached or detached, the size should not be restricted as long as it is approved by the Design Review Board. Allowing larger structures on larger lots could be a discussion for a future text amendment.

- Vice Chair Faith asked for clarification that, with the new definition, accessory structures would only apply to structures built within the setbacks. There would be no cap for a structure located within the building envelope. Mr. Sanks stated that was correct, except they would be limited by the maximum lot coverage.

Chair Ledyard noted that there appears to be interest in adjusting the definition for accessory structures. He asked if there were any Commissioners opposed to giving direction to Staff to change the definition. Commissioner Lawrence asked for clarification that the direction being given only regards the change to the definition and not the increase in size on certain sized lots. Mr. Sanks responded that was correct. The increase in size would not be a part of the current Zoning Code update, but could be part of a future text amendment. What would be included in this direction is changing the existing definition language as noted in the Staff Report. No Commissioner spoke in opposition.

B. Design Review Board/Board of Adjustment Update

Commissioner O'Connor noted the report was included in the agenda packet, and there were no comments.

C. Topics for Referral to City Council

There were no topics referred.

D. Minutes

Commissioner Lawrence **moved** to approve the minutes of the April 13, 2021 minutes; Commissioner O'Connor **seconded; unanimous approval.**

III. Staff Reports

Mr. Sanks reported on the progress of the Dysart and Camelback Center, the Sun Health La Loma Campus, and the proposed Major General Plan Amendment schedule.

IV. Commission Reports

There were no reports given.

V. Adjournment

Commissioner O'Connor **moved** to adjourn; Commissioner Lawrence **seconded; unanimous approval.** The meeting was **adjourned** at 7:56 p.m.

APPROVED:

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

David Ledyard, Chair

/pm