

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 19, 2015 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

- *4-a. Z15-025 District 2.** The 1600 through 1900 blocks of South Val Vista Drive (west side). Located north of Baseline Road on the west side of Val Vista Drive (60± acres). Site Plan Modification and Rezoning from LC-BIZ-PAD to LC-BIZ-PAD-CUP. This request will allow the addition of residential, retail, office, hotel and theater buildings to the existing commercial center. George Melara, Nelsen Partners, applicant; Whitestone Reit, owner. (PLN2015-00250)

Staff Planner: Kim Steadman

Staff Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

Summary: Item *4-a, case Z15-025 was removed from the consent agenda prior to the Planning and Zoning hearing. Staff member Kim Steadman presented case Z15-025 to the Board. Applicant Jeff Brand of Nelson Partners, 15210 N. Scottsdale Road, Suite 300, Scottsdale and Christine Mastandrea of Whitestone Reit, 2600 S. Gastone Road, Houston, Texas presented an overview of the proposed project.

Ms. Christine Mastandrea stated the center was purchased in 2011. Whitestone Reit has taken the opportunity to enhance the center with consideration to the needs of the surrounding neighborhoods. Mr. Brand presented an overview of the plans for pedestrian access which include shaded structures, the addition of parking structures, enclosure of the streets and addition of more buildings. Mr. Brand stated the center is focused on a place for people to live, play and shop in the area.

Jay Samuel, 3330 E. Impala Avenue, addressed the Board with his concerns for the addition of residential units and questioned of the height of the proposed apartment complex. Mr. Samuel stated the loss of visibility and the intrusion of people looking into the back yards was a concern for the current residents. He questioned the location of any overflow of parking from the apartment complex and if parking would occur on the side streets.

David Marchant, 1709 S. Citrus Cove, stated his house would back up to the site of the apartment complex and does not want to have a four- or five-story buildings looking into his property and may block his view. Mr. Marchant voiced his concern of his property value falling.

Chair Johnson requested the applicant address some of these concerns with the residents. Ms. Mastandrea addressed the issues of the residents and stated they reached out to the HOA. One of the changes made is the reduction in density. Mr. Brand addressed the question of parking. He stated there is ample parking for each level of the complex. The design of the building was modified to alleviate the view into the back yards.

Mr. Jay Samuel requested information of the drainage plan to ensure the water flow will not be directed into their neighborhood. Mr. Brand addressed those questions and stated the drainage plan is designed to move away from the neighborhood.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 19, 2015 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

Dan Copeland, 1717 S. Citrus Cove, expressed his opposition to the construction of the multi-story structure. Mr. Copeland stated when he purchased his home he received a booklet that displays ground floor parking. He stated that several years later there was another proposal which would construct a four-story parking garage backing up to the green belt.

Chair Johnson requested staff to summarize the neighborhood notification process. Staff member Kim Steadman reviewed the neighborhood notification procedure and reviewed the meetings that were held for the neighboring communities. Mr. Steadman stated the applicant scheduled two meetings with the surrounding neighbors. Concerns and questions raised by the residents were addressed in the Citizen Participation Report provided by the applicant.

Boardmember Ikeda questioned how emergency response would be handled. Mr. Brand responded that there is roadway access on the northern edge of the commercial property.

It was moved by Boardmember Allen to approve Item *4-a, Case Z15-025 and seconded by Boardmember Astle.

That: The Board recommends approval of zoning case Z15-025 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Project Narrative and revised Design Guidelines and as shown in The Village at Dana Park Master Site Plan document dated July 27, 2015, and the landscape plans dated July 27, 2015, and the Dana Park Master Plan Update dated June 2, 2015;
2. Design Review and approval of all development;
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations;
4. Compliance with all requirements of Design Review approval;
5. **Modification of the 1998 “Dana Ranch Village Square Design Guidelines” document as described in the project narrative and as herein modified, with final approval of the Planning Director prior to approval of any design review applications on the property;**
6. **The west face of the multi-residential building to be designed to minimize impact on existing residences to the west, with final approval by the Planning Director;**
7. **Replacement of pavers in the drive areas is to be with alternative pavement such as stamped, colored asphalt, as established in the revised Design Guidelines;**
8. **New or revised drive aisles are to be paved with alternative paving, as established in the revised Design Guidelines, with final approval of the Planning Director of the areas of standard pavement vs. alternative pavement;**
9. **New or revised pavement on sidewalks and other non-auto areas is to be alternative pavement such as colored, patterned concrete, etc. as established in the revised Design Guidelines;**
10. **The alley between the parking garage/residential and the back of the commercial center to be designed to provide interest as a high use pedestrian area;**
11. **The “Commercial/Amenity Building” to have a pedestrian-scaled street façade that**

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 19, 2015 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

provides interest at the street level and engages the sidewalks;

12. Approval of the Planning Director of a “Plan of Operation” and a “Good Neighbor Policy” for the multi-residential component, in conjunction with Design Review approval;
13. Any proposed modification to signage standards will require modification of the existing Comprehensive Sign Plan.

Vote: 5-0-2 (Boardmembers Hudson and Dahlke, absent)

* * * * *

Note: Audio recordings of the Planning & Zoning Board Meetings are available in the Planning Division Office for review. They are also “live broadcasted” through the City of Mesa’s website at www.mesaaz.go