



Planning and Zoning Board

Case Information

CASE NUMBER: Z15-035 (PLN2015-00308)
COMPANION CASE: GPMinor15-001
LOCATION/ADDRESS: The 1600 block of South Greenfield Road and the 1700 block of South Old Greenfield Road (east side).
GENERAL VICINITY: Located south of the Superstition Freeway and east of Greenfield Road
REQUEST: Rezone from AG, LC & LI-PAD to LC & RM-3-PAD and Pre-Plat
PURPOSE: This request will allow for the development of a multi-residential complex.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: Crisko LLC
APPLICANT: Earl, Curley & Lagarde – Stephen C. Earl
STAFF PLANNER: Kim Steadman

SITE DATA

PARCEL NUMBERS: 140-68-003T, 001D, 011E, 013, 014, 015A, 157, 158
PARCEL SIZE: 26.94± acres
EXISTING ZONING: AG, LC & LI-PAD
GENERAL PLAN Character area: Employment
CURRENT LAND USE: Agriculture & Residential

HISTORY/RELATED CASES

June 16, 1982: Annexed into the City. (Ord. #1599)
February 22, 1983: Establish City zoning from County Rural-43 to Agricultural (AG) (Z83-010)
February 18, 1986: Rezone from AG to Conceptual M-1 & approve conceptual pre-plat. Staff suggests developing area as a Development Master Plan (DMP) (Z86-008)
November 17, 1986: Rezone from AG (Conceptual M-1) to M-1 & approve pre-plat with conceptual site plan (Z86-099)
October 19, 1998: Site Plan Modification. Withdrawn (Z98-092)
July 12, 2006: Rezone to M-1 PAD & C-2 & pre-plat approval (Z06-047)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions
P&Z BOARD RECOMMENDATION: ☒ Approval with conditions. ☐ Denial
WAIVER SIGNED: ☒ Yes ☐ No

SITE CONTEXT

NORTH:	Superstition Freeway	– (US 60)
EAST:	Agricultural fields	–Zoned LI-PAD
SOUTH:	Agricultural fields	–Zoned AG
WEST:	(Across Eastern Canal) Existing commercial	– Zoned LC
	(Across Greenfield Rd) ADOT Right of Way	– (US 60)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION/REQUEST

This site is located at the southeast corner of Greenfield Rd. and the Superstition Freeway (US 60). The applicant proposes a 346 unit multi-residential development, and an additional lot for a future hotel.

The request is for a Minor General Plan Amendment (through companion case GMMinor15-001), rezoning from AG, LC & LI-PAD to LC & RM-3-PAD, a two-lot Preliminary Plat, and Site Plan Review of the multi-residential project.

NEIGHBORHOOD PARTICIPATION

The applicant has enacted a Citizen Participation Plan for this project in conjunction with minor General Plan amendment case GPMinor15-001 that included holding a neighborhood meeting on August 13th and mailing letters to property owners, HOA's and Registered Neighborhoods within the area. Per the Citizen Participation Report provided by the applicant their efforts resulted in two property owners in attendance at the neighborhood meeting, and no other requests for information. Staff has not been contacted by the Public in regard to this project.

CONFORMANCE WITH THE MESA 2040 GENERAL PLAN

The companion case, GPMinor15-001, proposes a Minor General Plan Amendment from "Employment Districts" to "Mixed Use Activity District". Staff is in support of this amendment. Please see the staff report for the companion case for a full General Plan analysis. Approval of this request is dependent upon approval of the companion General Plan amendment.

To be consistent with the intent of allowing residential uses as part of a Mixed Use Activity District, the design and development of the property should have buildings and parking fields "located on the property to establish a connection to the street and promote walkability between buildings." In this case it is important that the site design include connections to the employment uses to the east and south and the commercial uses to the west.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Rezoning:

Most of this site was rezoned in 2006, when two zoning districts, LC & LI-PAD, were established. The LC was located in the northwest corner of the site (on a proposed "Lot 1") and was intended for a commercial use fronting Greenfield Rd. The LI-PAD on the rest of the site was designed, principally, to meet the needs of a proposed RV dealership. The 2006 rezoning covered an area much larger than the current case, and its site plan proposed additional lots for other unspecified LI uses. That plan was never built, and the proposed lots were not created.

The current request leaves the LC zoning at the northwest corner for a future hotel development. As before, the LC zoning will follow the boundaries of "Lot 1". The proposed layout of Lot 1, however, is slightly revised now and will include some fragments of the LI-PAD zoning. These fragments will be rezoned to LC in order to avoid any ambiguity over the development standards of Lot 1.

The remainder of the current proposal will be rezoned RM-3-PAD. This zoning will facilitate a 346 unit, multi-residential development. Please note that the southern boundary of this request includes lands, zoned AG, that were not a part of the 2006 case.

Planned Area Development (PAD) Overlay:

The applicant's request for a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay will allow for deviation from development standards in these specific areas:

- Parking: the Zoning Ordinance requires multi-residential developments to provide 2.1 parking spaces per dwelling unit. This is intended to meet the needs of residents and visitors. 727 parking spaces are required for this 346-unit development. The applicant proposes 683 spaces, or 1.97 spaces per unit, a reduction of 44 parking spaces. The applicant states that in its years of experience with the apartment market, a parking ratio of 1.8 to 1.9 spaces per unit has repeatedly proven to be ideal. Also, the proximity of this development to employment centers helps justify the reduction, as residents who work near-by could walk to work.
- Entrances facing the Street: §11-5-5(D)3b of the Zoning Ordinance requires that "All units located along public rights-of-way must have the primary building entrance or individual unit entrances facing this right-of-way." The intent is to provide neighborhoods that engage the street, encouraging pedestrian activity. The design of the applicant's product does not lend itself easily to this standard. In exchange, a pedestrian gate within a covered portico has been added at the east end of the development providing pedestrian access there, as well as at the west end, through the main entry portico. The building design has also been enhanced to provide more interest along the sidewalk, at the pedestrian level.
- Setback from street: The required setback from the street front property line is 20'. The applicant proposes 8' tall perimeter walls (spanning between two-story residential buildings) that encroach into that setback. Staff supports this encroachment, along with allowing the buildings to encroach up to 10 feet into the setback. The wall design combines solid and view fencing, and integrates with the architecture of the buildings. The reduced setback creates a street wall with windows, etc., improving the pedestrian experience
- Fence Height: The applicant proposes 8' tall perimeter fencing. Code limits residential fences to 6'. This setting, however, is surrounded by properties that should develop as commercial or employment uses which are allowed the 8' height. The requested exception will be in keeping with surrounding uses.
- Parking plan: The parking area design does not meet code for location of landscape islands. It also does not show parking canopies for the 290 covered spaces. This will affect the location of landscape islands throughout. In working to provide a corrected parking plan the applicant has identified areas where they cannot meet the requirement for 24'-wide landscape islands between canopies. They have proposed a solution where smaller bays of covered parking would be separated by narrower landscape islands, to be approved by staff. The resulting design will meet the intent of the code.

The allowance for these deviations is being addressed through quality building design as required by the PAD overlay. The design documents presented reflect that level of quality. The applicant has also enhanced the sidewalk and landscape area along Old Greenfield Road and Banner Gateway Drive. The project will also need Design Review approval, assuring the quality of the project. Staff also recommends participation in the Tri-Star Program, through Mesa Police. It is a "cooperative effort to foster a safer community in rental properties."

Site plan:

Auto and pedestrian access to the multi-residential development is from the west, through a shared entry court located on the future hotel site. This access area is shown on the site plan as part of the hotel site which is "Not a Part" of this site plan. It does, however, need to be included in the first phase of the development in order to have the access needed to the apartment complex. The site plan needs to be amended to reflect this. In addition, in order to meet the requirements of the General Plan Character type, there needs to be a strong pedestrian connection to the commercial uses along Greenfield. To do this, the enhanced sidewalk and landscaping as shown along Banner Gateway Drive needs to be extended out to Greenfield Road in this first phase of development.

The east end of the site also has a covered pedestrian access, and an exit-only auto gate. The site is organized around two main amenity cores, each one surrounded by three-story residential buildings. Those central blocks are surrounded by parking and drive aisles. Garages and parking line the north and east property lines. Garage/living unit buildings line the street frontage to the south.

Staff has some concern for the location of the Solid Waste dumpsters and the access to those locations. For some of the units, the only way residents have to access the dumpsters is by walking a long distance through the drive aisles. Staff also has some concern for the "G3" buildings in the parking area between the two main clusters of buildings. The drawing provided to date do not show enough detail as to the ground level on the pedestrian entry sides of these buildings. Staff has some concern for how these units connect to the larger pedestrian system; additional detail is needed.

Conclusion:

The applicant has added enhanced pedestrian components that should provide options for walking and biking, in addition to driving. This will help tie the development to its neighborhood. Buildings are well designed, and there is over 4 acres of usable open space within the development. In the final design, the applicant is encouraged to consider moving the perimeter wall and building closer to the street. Staff recommends approval with the following conditions.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, and building elevations except as otherwise conditioned;
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations;
3. Recordation of cross-access easements between both lots in the subdivision;
4. All street improvements to be installed with the first phase of development;
5. **Providing a phasing plan with the first phase of development that identifies the limits of the phase, the auto and pedestrian connections, sidewalk and landscape improvements along Old Greenfield Road out to Greenfield Road, and temporary landscaping at the edge of the phase. Sidewalk design in front of Lot 1 to be consistent with sidewalk in front of Lot 2;**
6. **Provide a revised site plan with details for pedestrian access to building type G3 and to show sidewalk connections from the G2 buildings to the dumpster locations;**

- 7. Install temporary right-of-way landscaping along Lot 1's Old Greenfield Rd frontage with the first phase of this development which landscaping shall be supplemented and made permanent in conjunction with the future development of the balance of Lot 1;**
- 8. Provide a parking plan that meets the intent of Code for landscape islands and for landscape islands between parking canopies;**
- 9. This site plan approval includes an area of improvements on Lot 1 associated with this development, as depicted on the site plan. Future development of the balance of Lot 1 will require both Site Plan Review and Design Review;**
- 10. Design Review approval of the current proposal;**
11. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations;
12. Compliance with all requirements of Design Review approval.