

## MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
SAN LUIS COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
1090 E. UNION STREET  
OCTOBER 14, 2025  
6:00 p.m.

**1. CALL TO ORDER /ROLL CALL:** Commission Member Marco A. Pinzon called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

### PRESENT:

Commission Member George Amaya  
Commission Member Javier Barraza  
Commission Member Hugo Garcia  
Vice Chairman Angelica Ortiz  
Commission Member Marco A. Pinzon  
Chairman Ruben Walshe

### ABSENT:

Commission Member Veronica Zavala

### OTHERS PRESENT:

Jose A. Guzman, Director of Development Services  
Roman Pacheco, Planning Coordinator  
Eulogio Vera, Director of Public Works  
Israel Lara, I.T. Technician  
Jose Antonio Maldonado, Graphics and Media Specialist  
Manuel Hernandez, Assistant Director of Public Works  
Tomas Sanchez, City Engineer  
Christian Cuevas, Meeting Interpreter  
Griselda Franco, Resident  
Juan Javier Estrada, Resident  
Alma Lomeli, Resident

Guiomar Morales, Resident  
Elia Martinez, Resident  
Rene Morales, Resident  
Griselda Pelayo, Resident  
Jonathan Pizeno, Resident  
Vianey Vega, Vega and Vega Engineering

## **2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Commission Member Marco A. Pinzon led the Pledge of Allegiance.

## **3. CONSENT AGENDA**

### **3. A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

-Regular Planning and Zoning Commission meeting held on September 9, 2025.

**MOTION: Commission Member Marco A. Pinzon / Commission Hugo Garcia** approved the consent agenda as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

The vote was as follows:

Commission Member George Amaya	Aye
Commission Member Javier Barraza	Aye
Commission Member Hugo Garcia	Aye
Vice Chairman Angelica Ortiz	Aye
Commission Member Marco A. Pinzon	Aye
Chairman Ruben Walshe	Aye

## **4. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**4. Public hearing followed by discussion and possible action on any and all matters regarding Minor Amendment Case No. 2025-0273. A request by Vega & Vega Engineering on behalf of Comité de Bienestar to amend the City of San Luis 2040 General Plan changing the land use designation of 3.13 acres from Mixed-Use Activity Center (MU) to Medium Density Residential (MDR). Portion of**

**Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 775-56-001, located at the northwest corner of 6th Avenue and Urtuzuastegui Street, in San Luis, Arizona.**

### **A. Staff presentation**

**Mr. Jose A. Guzman, Director of Development Services,** summarized the staff report recommending approval of Minor Amendment Case No. 2025-0273.

### **B. Open public hearing**

Chairman Ruben Walshe opened the Public Hearing.

### **C. Call to the Public on this Item**

**Vianey Vega, Vega & Vega Engineering,** stated that he wanted to add a couple of comments to the staff. We have been working on this project with city staff and neighbors to address the concerns they have raised during their meetings. It was brought to our attention in the first neighborhood meeting that, in the first design we presented, all of our apartments were located on the northwest of the property, abutting the north line, with those lots on the north side. Their primary concern was raised and presented at that meeting, where they felt their privacy would be compromised by those three-story buildings abutting their property. Also, other items discussed at that meeting included density and additional traffic. We went back, and the staff called the developer and the engineer to a meeting to gather their thoughts and see what we can do to address those comments. We redesigned and moved our apartments to the southeast corner of the project, as shown on the site plan, and put townhomes on the northwest corner. We eliminated those three-story buildings abutting the north parcels, and now we have a larger buffer separating them from the neighbors on the east side. There is a 100-foot right-of-way on 6th Avenue, in addition to the 20-foot setback required for the buildings. We have also been working with the conditions mentioned in the rezoning, including a traffic impact study, and any other recommendations that come out of the survey will be implemented in the project. We are addressing all the concerns the neighbors have. This is a piece of undeveloped land that eventually needs to be developed.

The reason we are making the minor amendment is that R-2 has a lower density, and R-3 is a higher density allowed under the current General Plan. We want to bring a lower density, so we are doing this minor amendment. We could have done all this on R-3, which would have allowed us to develop all the apartments, since the plan allows that use. As the staff mentioned, there is a buffer between the single-family residential and industrial areas that exist on the south side. This could have been a total of three acres, with about 120 apartments. We only needed to do the rezoning because this property was state land, so it had to be rezoned, and that is a process that needs to be done as soon as the property needs to be developed. So, we reduced the portion for 54 apartments and the density to 23 townhomes. The developer is not just trying to put as many units as possible there, but to provide different housing opportunities. We are creating these opportunities for future homeowners who will have the chance to own a town home that is more affordable at this time than a regular house. If people cannot purchase a townhome, they will be able to rent apartments.

**Commission Member George Amaya** asked, "What is the proposed height of the townhomes?" **Mr. Vega** responded that it is a single-story building, and that we have already designed and built two models. They are located at Bienestar 10 on Avenue F, with County 24th Street at the southeast corner. It will be a similar model built over here. The ceiling height is 10 feet, the walls are 9 feet, and the roof peak is up to 20 feet; it is like a single-family home. **Amaya** then asked what the setback from the townhome was in relation to the subdivision to the north? **Mr. Vega** responded that the rear setback would be the same as a regular residence, 10 feet. The difference is that the side setbacks are zero. They are abutting one another, so that won't affect the neighbors on the north side. This is the design criteria for these townhomes: the sidewalls abut each other, but the rear yard has a 10-foot setback.

**Amaya** asked Mr. Guzman, "What is the current zoning for this parcel?" What are the permitted uses for the RA-10? **Mr. Guzman** responded that uses allowed on the RA-10 include residential houses on a minimum of 10 acres and farming. You can have farm animals on that property without going through a public hearing. Other permitted uses include public schools and public parks, and the primary focus of that district is agriculture and farming.

**Mr. Vega** further stated that the RA-10 zoning was established because the state land does not allow rezoning. They own the land as it is, and it was assigned RA-10 because it was part of the state's overall land, and they would not do any rezoning. It will remain RA-10 or RA-40, depending on the parcel's size.

**Vice Chairman Angelica Ortiz** asked whether there would be an additional block wall and, if so, how tall it would be. Mr. Vega responded that any subdivision must have a perimeter exterior wall on the project, and that an existing wall already exists on the north side. That wall was built by the developer of the subdivision on the north side, and it was his requirement. Now, we will be required to build anything that is above the Urtuzuastegui on the townhomes around the property and on the east side. But as far as an additional wall on the north side, the walls are six feet tall, and there is an existing wall on the north side that will remain, and the additional new walls will be six feet tall along the perimeter of the subdivision.

**Commission Member Hugo Garcia** asked how many units there would be. **Mr. Vega** responded, "There are 54 apartments and 23 townhomes? **Garcia** mentioned that the road looks small, and Urtuzuastegui and 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue are busy. Did you do a traffic study? **Vega** responded that, as he mentioned before, the traffic impact study is required by the rezoning and is a condition. We will address that, and it will be included as a condition in the following rezoning case.

**Juan Javier Estrada, 472 N. 6<sup>th</sup> Place**, stated that his concern is the number of people you guys plan to put on that small piece of land. We notice that schools are overcrowded, and the neighbors are not happy with this project. Currently, residents are invading our parking spaces, and with the agricultural season approaching, it will get worse. We are lacking police officers patrolling this area.

**Griselda Pelayo, 1121 E. San Luis Lane** stated that she has lived in that area for over 20 years and that, with this project, she feels invaded and that her privacy, as well as that of her neighbors, is being violated. We are currently dealing with issues with the existing apartment on the east side. As stated in previous meetings, some of the comments concerned neighbors throwing rocks into the pools and jumping the back fence on some properties. I believe there will not be any difference with the new neighbors from the proposed apartments.

**Commission Member George Amaya** asked staff whether the City of San Luis Building Department had ever specifically received any complaints related to construction damage for individual lot development. **Mr. Guzman** responded no.

**Elia Martinez, 1115 Washington Lane**, stated that, besides the concerns of safety, privacy, traffic, and property damage, there are additional concerns in the protest letter submitted by several property owners. We want the board not just to hear us but to put themselves in our shoes.

**Rene Morales, 1131 E. San Luis Lane** stated that his concern is that about three townhomes are going to be built, facing the back of one existing property in that area. The recreation area they are proposing is not sufficient to serve as a recreational amenity.

**Jonathan Piceno, 1335 Udall Lane**, stated that his concern is the number of parking spaces provided for the 76 units and 120-plus cars, on top of that, adding the traffic during the agriculture season. We have about 20 vehicles on the sand, anywhere between 20 and 40. As I heard from talking with the neighbors, they used to be on the road because they were asked at one point not to be there. So, it just flows through the parking spaces, like what we see closer to the border, where all the cars kind of mash into the neighborhood when people go to the Mexican side to run their errands.

**Alma Lomeli, 1133 E. San Luis Lane** thanked the board members for their attention and asked them to consider all the concerns mentioned before, as well as those in the protest letter regarding this project.

**Commission Member Marco A. Pinzon** asked, "Do we have enough water and sewer, enough water pressure to sustain that project? **Mr. Guzman** responded that, as part of the required impact fee study update, we must update the impact fees every five years. The impact fees include wastewater, water systems, streets, parks, and public safety services. So, whenever a house or housing unit is developed in the city, it pays its share of the impact on the city's infrastructure and services. The new impact fees were adopted in July, and they became effective on September 22, 2025. A regular house pays about \$9,000 in impact fees. Those fees

are generated for those services, and by state law, they can only be spent on those specific services.

Furthermore, **Pinzon** stated that, after going through the letter, one of their concerns was that building more apartments and townhomes around regular houses would decrease the value of the property. **Mr. Guzman** responded that this often comes up in rezoning cases, but unfortunately, the city cannot make or restrict zoning based on a speculative impact on value. So, we cannot really consider that on the recommendation.

**Pinzon** furthermore asked, do any of the board members have any knowledge of this? **Commission member Barraza** responded that the assessor's office assesses properties based on what is around them.

**Mr. Vega** commented that it is comparable to what is used to determine the value of the property —and that you currently have vacant land versus developed land. The costs from one another are the comparable costs used by the assessor's office.

**Commission Member Garcia** asked whether there is enough capacity to drain all the sewers for all the people who will be living in this area? **Mr. Eulogio Vera**, Director of Public Works, mentioned that impact fees cover future improvements and help maintain capacity for public services. But right now, we are expanding our wastewater treatment plant to handle additional growth in the city and the east part of town. Currently, we are diverting wastewater to the east plant. So, we have the capacity to handle this development. **Garcia** furthermore asked, "Do we have enough capacity?" **Mr. Vera** said we have enough capacity in our operations to handle this development.

**Betsy, 464 N. 6<sup>th</sup> Place**, stated that the point here is not about being against progress, but about demanding that the project be done responsibly. They need to plan new development more responsibly, thinking ahead about traffic jams and flow.

**Chairman Ruben Walshe** asked Mr. Vega if there is a timeframe for this project.

**Mr. Vega** responded, "Yes, there is." We are going to follow the first phase, which will be the townhomes. If we are allowed to proceed with the project, the subdivision will follow the traffic impact study. The timing is to break ground in the middle of next year and to start construction on the townhomes. The second phase will be apartments that are at least 1.5 to 2 years away.

This project is 6 acres, the total area. The density, parking, and zoning are dictated by the city ordinance, not what the developer or the engineer wants to put in there. There are requirements; as you may know, there are rules and regulations stipulated by the city's codes, and we follow them. That is the criterion for design; we are not going to cram so many units into an area that does not meet the requirements for city development. I want to reiterate that we are following all city rules and regulations. We are not asking for any exceptions. We are designing according to the code.

**Mr. Lomeli** furthermore asked whether the developer is following the city codes and regulations. **Mr. Guzman** responded that, as part of the rezoning process, they are required to follow all city codes and zoning regulations, and the developer will need to comply with all city regulations during the permitting process. **Lomi** stated, "How am I going to trust this developer when the offices of *Comite de Bienestar* do not comply with their parking requirements, and that street is currently obstructed with vehicles parked along the street due to social gatherings and weekend events?" **Mr. Guzman** mentioned that the *Comite de Bienestar* offices were built in accordance with previous regulations. The regulations that are used right now were adopted back in 2012. So, any new construction has to be built to those standards.

#### **D. Close Public Hearing**

**MOTION: Commission Member Javier Barraza / Commission Marco A. Pinzon** to close public hearing. The motion passed unanimously.

The vote was as follows:

Commission Member George Amaya	Aye
Commission Member Javier Barraza	Aye
Commission Member Hugo Garcia	Aye
Vice Chairman Angelica Ortiz	Aye
Commission Member Marco A. Pinzon	Aye
Chairman Ruben Walshe	Aye

**E. Action on Minor Amendment Case No. 2025-0273**

**MOTION: Commission Member George Amaya / Commission Member Javier Barraza** to forward Minor General Plan Amendment Case No. 2025-0273 to the city council with the recommendation of approval. The motion failed with three (3) Ayes and three (3) Nays by Commission Member Hugo Garcia, Vice Chairman Angelica Ortiz, and Commission Member Marco A. Pinzon.

The vote was as follows:

Commission Member George Amaya	Aye
Commission Member Javier Barraza	Aye
Commission Member Hugo Garcia	Nay
Vice Chairman Angelica Ortiz	Nay
Commission Member Marco A. Pinzon	Nay
Chairman Ruben Walshe	Aye

There were comments among the commission members and Mr. Guzman.

**MOTION: Commission Member Hugo Garcia / Vice Chairman Angelica Ortiz** to continue this item to the next available Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting.

The vote was as follows:

Commission Member George Amaya	Nay
Commission Member Javier Barraza	Aye
Commission Member Hugo Garcia	Aye
Vice Chairman Angelica Ortiz	Aye
Commission Member Marco A. Pinzon	Aye
Chairman Ruben Walshe	Aye

**5. B. Public hearing followed by discussion and possible action on any and all matters regarding Rezoning Case No. 2025-0274. A request by Vega & Vega Engineering on behalf of Comité de Bienestar, to rezone approximately 3.13 acres from Rural Area (RA-10) to Medium-High Density Residential (R-2) and approximately 2.80 acres from Rural Area (RA-10) to High Density Residential (R-3), Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 775-56-001, located at the northwest corner of 6th Avenue and Urtuzuastegui Street, San Luis, Arizona. (Item continued from meeting of September 9, 2025)**

**A. Staff presentation**

**Jose A. Guzman, Director of Development Services,** stated that this case is related to the previous case and the conditions we added to address some of the residents' concerns. The first condition is that they must comply with all city zoning, building, subdivision, and other applicable regulations. They have to submit a traffic study and implement any improvements required by it. The third condition is that the adjacent townhomes on the north side will be limited to one story, and the development must substantially conform to the conceptual plan presented today. They also need to comply with all local and federal construction standards regarding grading, vibration, and dust control. Based on those conditions, the staff recommends approval of the rezoning and forwarding it to the city council.

**B. Open the public hearing**

Chairman Ruben Walshe opened the Public Hearing.

**C. Call to the Public on this Item**

There was no public comment on this item

**MOTION: Commission Member Hugo Garcia / Commission Member George Amaya** to continue Rezoning Case No. 2025-0274 to the next available Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting.

The vote was as follows:

Commission Member George Amaya	Nay
Commission Member Javier Barraza	Aye
Commission Member Hugo Garcia	Aye
Vice Chairman Angelica Ortiz	Aye
Commission Member Marco A. Pinzon	Aye
Chairman Ruben Walshe	Aye

**6. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION: Commission Member Marco A. Pinzon / Commission Member Hugo Garcia** to adjourn the regular meeting at approximately 7:19 p.m. The motion passed unanimously.

The vote was as follows:

Commission Member George Amaya	Aye
Commission Member Javier Barraza	Aye
Commission Member Hugo Garcia	Aye
Vice Chairman Angelica Ortiz	Aye
Commission Member Marco A. Pinzon	Aye
Chairman Ruben Walshe	Aye

APPROVED:

---

Ruben Walshe, Chairman

ATTEST:

---

Roman Pacheco, Planning Coordinator

CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING MINUTES ARE A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION, SAN LUIS, ARIZONA, HELD ON OCTOBER 14, 2025. I FURTHER CERTIFY THE MEETING WAS DULY CALLED AND HELD, AND A QUORUM WAS PRESENT.

---

Roman Pacheco, Planning Coordinator