

## MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 23, 2019 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

- 8-b ZON17-00606 District 6.** Within the 3200 through 4000 blocks of South Hawes Road (west side), the 3200 through 3600 blocks of South 80th Street (east side), the 3600 through 4000 blocks of the South 80th Street alignment (east and west sides), the 7700 through 8400 blocks East Elliot Road (south side), the 8100 through 8400 blocks of East Elliot Road (north side), the 8400 through 8800 blocks of East Warner Road (north side), and the 8100 through 8600 blocks of East Warner Road (south side). (540± acres) Rezone from AG and LI to RS-6, RSL-4.0, RSL-2.5, RM-5, LC, GC, MX and LI with a PAD Overlay. This request will establish the 'Hawes Crossing' PAD to guide the future review of specific plans of development. Jordan Rose, Rose Law Group, applicant; Circle G Investments 402 LLC, Van Rijn Jody/Pieter, AG Land Investors LP/ETAL, Feenstra Charles L/Barbara M. TR, John & Brenda Van Otterloo Family Trust/ETAL, Maynard Billy W/Nora D, Maynard Dianne, Mesa-Casa Grande Land Co LLC, Rijlaarsdam Jacob/Mary TR, Stechnij H/Glenda TR/ETAL, Tuffly Frederick M., Owners. **(Companion case to ZON19-00754, associated with item 6-a).**

**Planner:** Tom Ellsworth

**Staff Recommendation:** Approval with conditions

**Summary:** This case was discussed in conjunction with cases ZON19-00754, ZON17-00607 and ZON19-00755 and not discussed individually.

Boardmember Villanueva-Saucedo motioned to approve case ZON17-00606 to include updated conditions of approval presented at the study session. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Sarkissian.

**That: The Board recommends the approval of case ZON17-00606 conditioned upon:** The following conditions of approval are in addition to and not intended to replace compliance with the zoning code. Any standard not identified through these conditions of approval the zoning code requirements shall apply.

### ZONING

1. Compliance with Exhibit F, 'Proposed Zoning' of the Hawes Crossing PAD.
2. Compliance with Exhibit 1 establishing the allowed land uses within the RS-6, RSL-4, RSL-2.5, and RM-5 zoning district within the Hawes Crossing PAD.
3. Compliance with Exhibit 2 establishing the allowed land uses within the Light Industrial (LI) zoning district within the Hawes Crossing Plan Area Development (PAD).
4. Compliance with Exhibit 3 establishing the allowed land uses within the General Commercial zoning district within the Hawes Crossing PAD.
5. Prior to approval of any development, a review and approval of Specific Plans shall be required as shown in the City's PAD review process. All Specific Plans shall be a minimum of 20 acres for single-residential development and 10 acres for non-residential, mixed use, and multi-residential development. An owner may request an adjustment subject to modification by the city per the terms of the development agreement.
6. Development standards for all zoning districts shall conform to the City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance in place as of October 23, 2019, except as modified by this PAD:

## MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 23, 2019 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

- a. Maximum height within the Mixed Use (MX), Light Industrial (LI), and General Commercial (GC) zoning districts shall be 75'.
- b. MX zoned properties shall include a minimum of 35% non-residential uses. The percentage for the non-residential use shall be calculated by the gross building square footage for vertical mixed-use buildings and per acreage area for horizontal mixed-use sites. This percentage is required to be shown with each proposed Specific Plan.
  - i. Within any MX zoned area, no more than a maximum of 50% of the residential area shall be allowed to be constructed prior to construction of the required 35% of the required non-residential uses.

### DESIGN GUIDELINES

7. Commercial, office and all non-residential uses on the property shall comply with the design standards, architectural quality and standards in the non-residential design guidelines set forth in Exhibit 4, 'Design Guidelines'.
8. Compliance with the residential Building Form Standards outlined in Chapter 5 of the City's Zoning Ordinance as well as the City's Residential Development Guidelines, including the standards below:
  - a. RS-6 zoned properties shall conform to the following building form standards:
    - i. **Garages:** An attached or detached garage shall be allowed to be located in the rear of the lot with driveway access from the front lot line as an alternative to a traditional front facing garage at the front of the lot. As a front access or side-entry garage in the rear of the yard, the rear setback to a detached garage is 3 feet. In these cases, the garage may be shared between an accessory dwelling unit and the primary dwelling unit but must be one-story and no higher than 15 feet.
    - ii. **Façades:** Façades facing streets or open space, whether the front, side or rear elevation of the home, shall be finished to the same architectural articulation, detail, and trim level as the front of the home. The building façade articulation shall make use of multiple elements and design such as pop outs, varying roof lines, offsets, recesses, etc.
    - iii. **Staggered Setbacks:** Front setbacks should be staggered by at least 3 feet to provide a varied streetscape and visually interesting neighborhood. Where a staggered setback is not possible, a varied streetscape shall be provided through other building designs similar in concept. The alternative design shall be shown with the request for a specific plan review.
    - iv. **Accessory Dwelling Units:** Accessory dwelling units are permitted in the rear yard of all RS districts and shall meet the same setbacks and development standards of a garage. The height of any accessory structure shall not be more than one-story or 15 feet in height.
  - b. RSL-4.0 zoned properties shall conform to the following building form standards:
    - i. **Alley-loaded:** Alley-loaded product is permitted in the RSL-4.0 districts. For these lots, the garage setback is 3 feet or a minimum of 18'.
    - ii. **Shared and clustered driveways:** No home in the RSL-4.0 districts shall be permitted with more than one driveway. Where shared driveways are employed, such driveways shall not be more than 18 feet wide and the

## MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 23, 2019 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

centerline of the driveway shall be located on the property line between the two adjacent lots. Where units are clustered with common driveways, such driveways shall be constructed to be a minimum of 36 feet of uninterrupted curb between the driveways.

- iii. **Lot width:** Mixing lot widths along streets is required to further the variation of the streetscape. Different lot widths, building facades, or floor plans must be located adjacent and across from each other without a pattern. The variation of lot widths, building facades, or floor plans will be determined at the time of Specific Plan approval.
  - iv. **Covered entry:** Each home shall have a covered entry either by a roof specifically for the entry or integration into the roofline of the home.
  - v. Front porch coverings must be at least 50 percent of the width of the building with a depth of at least 6 feet, however, alternative designs for front porch or entries may be approved at the time of product approval with the specific plan.
- c. RSL 2.5 zoned properties shall conform to the following building form standards:
- i. **Alley-loaded:** Alley-loaded product is permitted in the RSL-4.0 districts. For these lots, the garage setback is 3 feet or a minimum of 18'.
  - ii. **Shared and clustered driveways:** No home in the RSL-4.0 districts shall be permitted with more than one driveway. Where shared driveways are employed, such driveways shall not be more than 18 feet wide and the centerline of the driveway shall be located on the property line between the two adjacent lots. Where units are clustered with common driveways, such driveways shall be constructed to be a minimum of 36 feet of uninterrupted curb between the driveways.
  - iii. **Lot width:** Mixing lot widths along streets is required to further the variation of the streetscape. Different lot widths, building facades, or floor plans must be located adjacent and across from each other without a pattern. The variation of lot widths, building facades, or floor plans will be determined at the time of Specific Plan approval.
  - iv. **Covered entry:** Each home shall have a covered entry either by a roof specifically for the entry or integration into the roofline of the home.
  - v. Front porch coverings must be at least 50 percent of the width of the building with a depth of at least 6 feet, however, alternative designs for front porch or entries may be approved at the time of product approval with the Specific Plan.

### LANDSCAPING

- 9. All development shall comply with the 'Approved Plant Palette' shown on Exhibit Q to achieve a unified landscaped environment that is appropriate and successful for the desert climate.
- 10. Landscaping areas shall consist of a blend of lush, and desert appropriate plant materials from the approved plant palette arranged in patterns along straight and meandering sidewalks, with emphasis on shade and color along the major streets and pedestrian corridors in the development.

## MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 23, 2019 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

11. Parcel entries shall be highlighted by unique urban plazas with portal elements framed by large shade trees. Community walls will be designed to complement both a traditional and modern aesthetic.
12. A landscape plan prepared by a landscape professional such as a registered landscape architect or a qualified arborist is required for all site plans and subdivision plats.
13. Park Landscaping: Landscaping in parks, open spaces and pedestrian trail areas shall include a diversity of desert appropriate plants materials and strategic use of trees to create nodes of shade. Turf should be used only where functionally appropriate for recreational fields, useable open spaces and as a complement to shaded nodes.

### OPEN SPACE

14. Compliance with Exhibit N 'Open Space Master Plan' and Exhibit O 'Trail Master Plan'.
15. Compliance with Exhibit 5 "Open Space Guidelines".
16. The public or common open space areas shall be a minimum of 15 percent of gross residential acreage in the RS-6, RSL-4, and RSL-2.5 areas. Open space in the RM-5 district and non-residential areas within the PAD shall conform to the open space requirements outlined in chapters 5 and 6 of the zoning code in place as of October 23, 2019.
17. Each single residential development in the RS-6, RSL-4 or RSL-2.5 zoning districts must provide a minimum of fifteen percent (15 %) of Open Space within the boundaries of the each specific plan of development; and a minimum of three percent (3%) of the Open Space areas shall be dedicated to parks. Further, a maximum of thirty percent (30%) of the single-family dwelling units within a specific plan may be built before the Owner is required to install the Open Space (or parks). The City will not issue any building permits for any single-family dwelling unit above 30% of the allowed residential uses in a Specific Plan until the required Open Space is constructed and approved by the City.
18. Specific Plan approvals shall include Neighborhood Parks, Pocket Parks, Urban Plazas, Open Space Trails, Theme Street Trails, and/or On-street Trails, per Exhibit N, Open Space Master Plan. The exact locations of the parks may vary and change during the Specific Plan review and approval process. However, general conformance, as determined by the Planning Director, to the Open Space Master Plan is required unless an area of 160 or more contiguous acres is submitted for Specific Plan review. In this instance, the Specific Plan may propose a new Open Space Master Plan for the area that provides the same or more parks, trails, and plazas and is compatible with adjacent areas of the current Open Space Master Plan. Any approved changes to the Open Space Master Plan must meet the intent, minimum requirements, and standards of the PAD.
19. No more than 30% of the single-family dwelling units within a Specific Plan shall receive a building permit prior to the construction of the required associated neighborhood park as shown on Exhibit N, Open Space Master Plan.

## **MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 23, 2019 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING**

### **OPEN SPACE BUFFER**

20. A 30' open space buffer is required along the western property lines of the overall PAD as shown on Exhibits L1, L2, L3.

### **LOT FRONTAGE**

21. All parcels within the development may be allowed to front on either a public or private street.

### **SIGNAGE**

22. Signage shall conform to the City of Mesa Sign Code, or as amended.
23. A comprehensive sign plan for developments in the non-residential areas shall be submitted during Specific Site plan approval, if required.
24. A comprehensive sign plan for the residential, parks, open space, and entry features shall be submitted with the Specific Plan, if required.

### **PHASING**

25. Development within each Village may be completed as a part of a single or multiple specific plans or site plans; however, the required infrastructure and open space must be constructed to support that development per Exhibit V, Conceptual Phasing and Exhibit N, Open Space Master Plan.

### **INFRASTRUCTURE**

26. Compliance with the final infrastructure master plans submitted (i.e. the Traffic Impact Analysis, Master Wastewater Report, Master Water Report, and Master Drainage Report) as may be amended, subject to the approval of the City, pursuant to the development agreement.

### **AIRPORT COMPATIBILITY:**

27. Owner granting an Avigation Easement and Release to the City, pertaining to Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport which will be prepared and recorded by the City (concurrently with the recordation of the final subdivision map or prior to the issuance of a building permit).
28. Written notice be provided to future property owners, and acknowledgment received that the project is within 1-2 mile(s) of Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport.
29. Due to the proximity to Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport, any proposed permanent, or temporary structure, as required by the FAA, is subject to an FAA filing, for review in conformance with CFR Title 14 Part 77 (Form 7460) to determine any effect to navigable airspace and air navigation facilities. If required, an FAA determination notice of no hazard to air navigation shall be provided prior to building permit issuance.
30. Provide a 4-foot x 4-foot sign at the entrance to all sales and leasing offices for this PAD, with notice to all prospective buyers that the project is within an Overflight Area for Phoenix-Mesa Gateway as specified in Section 11-19-5 of the Zoning Ordinance.
31. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, provide documentation by a registered Professional Engineer or registered Professional Architect has certified that Noise attenuation measures have been incorporated into the design and construction of the

## MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 23, 2019 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

- 8-a ZON19-00754 District 6.** The 7700 through 8400 blocks of East Elliot Road (south side), the 3700 through 4000 blocks of the South 80th Street alignment (both sides), the 3700 through 4000 blocks of South Hawes Road (west side), the 8400 through 8600 blocks of East Warner Road (north side), the 4200 through 4400 blocks of the South Hawes Road alignment (east side), and the 8100 through 8400 blocks of East Warner Road (south side). (280± acres). Minor General Plan Amendment. This request will change the General Plan character designation for the area from Mixed Use Activity/Employment to Neighborhood. Jordan Rose, Rose Law Group, applicant; Circle G Investments 402 LLC, Van Rijn Jody/Pieter, AG Land Investors LP/ETAL, Feenstra Charles L/Barbara M. TR, John & Brenda Van Otterloo Family Trust/ETAL, Maynard Billy W/Nora D, Maynard Dianne, Mesa-Casa Grande Land Co LLC, Rijlaarsdam Jacob/Mary TR, Stechnij H/Glenda TR/ETAL, Tuffly Frederick M., Owners. (**Companion case to ZON17-00606, associated with item 6-b).**)

**Planner:** Tom Ellsworth

**Staff Recommendation:** Adoption

**Summary:** Principal Planner Tom Ellsworth presented case ZON19-00754, ZON17-00606, ZON19-00755 and ZON17-00607 to the Board. Mr. Ellsworth explained the four cases include rezoning and General Plan Amendments. There are two separate requests; one includes a request by private property owners and the other is a request by the State Land Department. The separate requests are due to certain requirements regarding property (s) owned by the State Land Department. And that is the reason behind consideration of the State Land Department property as a separate request. Overall, the four cases together make up the request for the Hawes Crossing Planned Area Development (PAD). Mr. Ellsworth described the location of the requested development.

Mr. Ellsworth presented an explanation of each of the General Plan character designations within the requested area and the goals of each. The property is also located within the Gateway Strategic Plan, one of the goals of this plan is to bring 100,000 jobs for the entire area of the strategic plan. A map of the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan was presented indicating that the Hawes Crossing area lies within the Airport Overflight Area (AOA) 3 and within half a mile of the AOA 2 overflight area. The land use request for this area is appropriate and compatible with the General Plan (with the proposed amendments), the Gateway Strategic Development Plan, and the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Mr. Ellsworth explained these requests were referred to the airport to review to ensure proposed conditions of approval conform to the Mesa Gateway Airport standards.

Over the past several years, the city has received requests for development in the Inner Loop District of the Gateway Strategic Plan. The general request has typically included employment, retail and residential uses. As staff reviewed the General Plan and guiding documents for the Gateway Strategic Plan, it became evident that a further land use analysis was needed to determine the appropriate land use mixture and allocation for the area. As a result, the city hired a consultant to conduct the Inner Loop Land Use Study. The goals of the study were to determine the appropriate land use distribution, variety of uses and the compatibility with increased over-flight activities.

## MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 23, 2019 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

There was a significant amount of outreach for the study which began with the kick-off meeting in February 2018. The meeting was attended by property owners within the Inner Loop District, surrounding residents and stake holders. The study also included separate stake holder focus groups that included property owners, economic development entities, and various City Departments. There were several other community meetings and the study was finalized in the summer of 2018.

The result of the study included the land use plan which determined the City should maintain the AOA 1 and AOA 2 areas for employment related uses and with non-residential uses along the freeway corridor. Some of the other recommendations that came out of the study was to create a higher-intensity mixed use corridor along Elliot Road, limit residential uses along Power Road and create connectivity to the neighborhoods to the north, specifically to the north of Elliot road and south of the powerlines. The study also showed jobs to housing ratio of 4-1 with potential for an additional 55,120 jobs in the Inner Loop area with the proposed land uses.

Mr. Ellsworth stated that the overall goal of the request is to create an orderly structured form of development that creates a vibrant community and sets design standards and guidelines to promote high quality development. The Planned Area Development (PAD) is the mechanism in the zoning code that accomplishes this.

Jordan Rose, 7144 E. Stetson Drive, Scottsdale, AZ, representing the applicant presented the request to the Board. Ms. Rose provided a background of how the 6 dairy farmers and the state land department came together to discuss the development of the land. She explained the dairy farmers are at a crossroads where their current equipment is 20-30 years old and needs to be replaced. In order to continue their operation, the dairy farmers will either need to reinvest millions of dollars or move to redevelop in a more rural location.

Ms. Rose stated the applicants have worked closely to redesign and reconfigure the proposed development, working with both the Airport and City staff. She explained the development complies with the 2008 Gateway Strategic Plan and follows the recommendations of the Inner Loop Study and the Gateway Strategic Development Plan. She informed the Board that they have received 27 letters of support, 627 signatures of support and 13 letters of opposition.

Nick Labadie, 7144 E. Stetson, Scottsdale, AZ presented details of the Development Master Plan. Mr. Labadie explained there was a lot of planning that went into the project. He stated the development overlay and plan includes Land Uses, Open Space and the Circulation elements to guide the development, and the plan bases itself on a transition of uses, from lower density to higher density and then moves into non-residential uses. Mr. Labadie stated it is a true Mixed-Use development.

Gerald Wilson, Hilgart-Wilson, Managing Principal based in Phoenix spoke about the infrastructure for the project. He stated they have worked with City Engineering and Planning Departments to ensure the water, wastewater and drainage follow the guidelines of the City and the 2019 Design Guidelines. They have tested against the maximum density and feels the infrastructure proposed with this project will be compliant with the City's requirements and goals of the Master Plan Community.

## MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 23, 2019 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

Dawn Cartier, President of CivTech, spoke about the traffic impact in the area. Ms. Cartier stated they conducted a comprehensive survey of the land uses and predicted how much traffic will be generated with the land use changes. The traffic study was a comprehensive framework of the Hawes Crossing development and how the City will implement projects as the parcels become developed. They have been in contact with ADOT and City Transportation staff and will be widening 9.5 miles of roadway as well as installing 13 new signals in the area.

Brian O'Neill, Executive Director of the Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport stated the airport does not oppose the project. Mr. O'Neill confirmed they have worked closely with the landowners and with their legal representatives to ensure the development complies with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. However, he is taking this opportunity to discuss residential encroachment and as airports continue to grow, and neighborhoods continue to encroach upon airports there is a lot of opportunity for negative impacts. Mr. O'Neill explained that although this project is within the AOA 3 area, they are continuing to work with the City of Mesa to ensure that every time homes in the AOA are sold, there is a disclosure signifying the proximity to the airport. As those homes resell and the airport continues to grow, the possibility of those homeowners becoming displeased with living near a growing airport can put operational restrictions on the airport and could hamper the airport operations. One way to protect against these types of developments is to not allow residential as he is concerned with the long term, negative impact. Again, Mr. O'Neill stated they are not opposed to the development.

Boardmember Crockett stated he shares some of Mr. O'Neill's concerns about residential encroachment. Mr. Crockett asked if Mr. O'Neill would agree that even with disclosure it would not stop residents advocating for restrictions of the airport operation. Mr. O'Neill responded providing disclosure would not stop residents from coming together and pushing for restrictions. He stated they would never want to stifle the opinions of any resident or business around the airport and feels it is important to have an open dialogue to provide information, so they have better understanding of the airport operation.

Boardmember Sarkissian inquired if potential number of residential units noted in the inner loop study was derived from maximum densities or average densities. Staffmember Tom Ellsworth confirmed that number of residential units from the land use study was based on average density.

Boardmember Boyle asked Mr. O'Neill to clarify his statement that the airport is not-opposed to the development and if there are times when the airport is in support of a project. Mr. O'Neill stated the airport takes a position of non-opposition or opposition on land use requests. He stated if this project included residential development in an AOA2 district, they would be opposed. Mr. Boyle clarified if there will be larger, louder aircraft when the SkyBridge project is complete. Mr. O'Neill responded there is a possibility they will bring in a larger cargo aircraft when SkyBridge is complete and this consideration was included in the projected development of the AOA planning contours. Mr. Boyle confirmed the process for disclosures and Mr. O'Neill stated they have a robust community outreach program and work with residential communities to meet the process.



## MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 23, 2019 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

Mr. Boyle stated they received letters of opposition from Economic Development and the Chamber of Commerce and asked if these concerns were considered in the Land Use Study. Planning Director Nana Appiah responded that it is his understanding that various stakeholders were involved in the land use study and the results of the study is what is guiding staff recommendation. In addition, he had not had a discussion with any of the groups to dispute results of the study.

Mr. Boyle asked if the writer of the study could explain if the two groups were asked about their opinion as a part of the information gathering. Rick Merritt, a consultant on the Land Use Study stated that Economic Development was in attendance throughout the process. Mr. Boyle inquired if Economic Development discussed their opposition during this time. Mr. Merritt responded he had heard on and off opposition from Economic Development staff but never had any direct discussion about the study. Mr. Ellsworth stated that throughout the Land Use Study there were specific focus groups and as with any Land Use Plan there are multiple stakeholders and competing interest. And as staff met with those stakeholders there were points of friction and disagreements in the allocation of some of the land uses.

Ralph Pew, 1744 S. Val Vista, spoke in favor of the project. Mr. Pew stated he is speaking on behalf of Jim Stewart who owns approximately 40 acres of land on the east side of Elliott and is very interested in the decision of the project. Mr. Pew feels the project is important and will bring in needed jobs to the area.

Mr. Wayne Balmer, 1456 Leisure World, spoke to the Board. Mr. Balmer complimented the staff and applicant in their analysis of the report and said they have done a good job developing a cohesive project. He stated there is an area that he wants to point out to the Board to look at, specifically the northeast and southwest corners of Hawes and Ellsworth Road. He said Hawes road is the only interchange between Elliott and Power Road and feels allowing residential to go in the corner will underutilize the property in the future. A better use would be a commercial development.

Rusty Luellan, 11909 S. 202<sup>nd</sup> Street, spoke in support of the project. This project fits in with what he would like to see in the area.

Bonnie Klassen, 2927 S. Piedra, spoke for herself and husband, Grant Klasson are in support of the project. Ms. Klassen stated she is in support of the Hawes Crossing project but not supportive of data centers built in close proximity of the schools.

Otto Shill, 2514 N. Mesa Drive, is a member of Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors and member of the Aircraft Owners Association, Falcon Field. Mr. Shill stated the Chamber was not consulted on the project and has several members that have raised concerns. He stated the Board has no serious criticism of the plan itself but have concerns about the impact on the airport. He explained they cannot predict the long-term impact on the future of the airport and could be in danger.

## MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 23, 2019 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

Billy Maynard, 8357 E. Warner, spoke in favor of the project.

James Boyle, 19645 E. Elliot Road is in favor of the project and spoke as a representative of the following property owners:

Alex Boyle, 19645 E. Elliot  
Jim Boyle, 19645 E. Elliot  
James Boyle, Jr., 19645 E. Elliott

Mr. Boyle stated the dairies are old facilities and are having a tough time finding feed for their cows and disposal of the animal waste and it has become an expensive process. He explained this has been a long process and they have made several changes requested by the Planning Division and Economic Development staff. And He is surprised by the response from the Economic Development Advisory Board and felt they have been working together with them during this process. Mr. Boyle explained their goal is to leave behind a nice development.

Jason Barney, 4915 E. Baseline, spoke in support of the project and feels it will be the crown jewel for Mesa.

Shital Patel, 3344 E. Inglewood Circle is in support and did not speak.  
Vikus Patel, 3344 E. Inglewood Circle is in support and did not speak.  
Charles Bohler, 258 S. 75<sup>th</sup> Way, is in support and did not speak.  
Gene DeRadd, 4550 E. Apricot is in support and did not speak.  
Pieter Van Rijn, 20102 E. Warner Road, is in support and did not speak.  
Charles Feenstrat, 19711 E. Elliot, is in support and did not speak.

Courtney Everhart, 1334 E. 1<sup>st</sup> Place, spoke in support and feels the owners are requesting the right thing for this project.

Atrina Rosband-Clarke, 3129 S. 83<sup>rd</sup> Circle spoke in support. Ms. Rasband-Clarke stated she appreciates all the work the owners have done to prepare for the changes.

Nicole Vierra, 3143 S. Channing spoke in support. Ms. Vierra stated her home backs up to the farm and appreciates the dairy farms and the work they have put in to bring this project forward. As a mother, she feels this would allow a safer place for her family.

Bob Lemberge, 10418 E. Jacob is in support and did not speak.

Jim Rang, 3133 E. Fargo, is in support and did not speak.

Cassandra Wood, 3133 E. Fargo, is in support and did not speak.

Brenda Hunsaker, P.O. Box 490 is in support and did not speak.

Mary Oertte, 2938 S. Hillridge spoke in favor. Ms. Oertte feels the development will improve the area and provide tax dollars to the City.

## MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 23, 2019 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

Kim Robinson, 4360 E. Taurus Place, is in support and did not speak.

John Gosney, Jr., 7950 E. Onza, spoke in support. Mr. Gosney has resided in Boulder Creek for many years and stated there was no disclosure when he moved in there are dairy farms next to his home. He feels the development will afford a lot more work for smaller contractors in the area.

Kevin Vanhooose, 3232 S. Hawes, spoke in support. Mr. Vanhooose stated he supports the redevelopment.

Daryl Fultz, 7904 E. Obispo, spoke in support. Mr. Fultz stated he received misinformation that the land would be developed as industrial but after attending this meeting and heard it would be residential near his home, he is in favor of the project. He inquired if the Arizona Dairy is a part of this development. Mr. Ellsworth responded the Arizona Dairy is located closer to Power Road and there are no current plans for development for this property.

Jacob Rijlaarsdam, 3232 S. Hawes, is in support and did not speak.

Ken Sanders, 3215 S. Sossaman, is in support and did not speak.

Ava Savve, 3143 S. Channing, is in support and did not speak.

Jody Van Rijn, 20102 E. Warner Road, is in support and did not speak.

Les Hendrickson, 7839 E. Portabello, is in support and did not speak.

Andrea Hendrickson, 7839 E. Portobello, spoke in support. Ms. Hendrickson and her husband are proud to be a part of this community and the efforts the dairy owners have put forward to bring this project to the City.

Molly Pierce, 25906 S. 198<sup>th</sup> Way, spoke in support. Ms. Pierce feels this project will make Mesa a place where they can live and play.

Other citizens that completed a comment card but did not speak are:

Cheryl Harper, 40064 N. Prince is in support and did not speak.

Sarah Robinson, 20268 E. Sunset, is in support and did not speak.

Lora Gennari, Mesa, is in support and did not speak.

Jordan Rose, responded to the comments and stated they appreciate the neighbors and the support they have received. The last few years have been intense, and they have worked so well together, and the proposal complies with staff and the Inner Loop Study.

Boardmember Boyle asked Ms. Rose to discuss the power line that goes down Hawes and inquired what it means. Jordan Rose responded the power line runs on the north side of the property and it separates their property from the existing residential development to the north. They have given an easement down Hawes Road so that the power can extend to the mixed-use development and should not inhibit any other development.

## MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 23, 2019 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

Boardmember Sarkissian stated the presentations and the plan are very well done. Ms. Sarkissian appreciates how many neighbors came out. She likes how it is a cohesive plan and well thought out. This brings more certainty to the area and feels there will be more interest in the area with the nearby freeway. Ms. Sarkissian feels the project transitions well into the Elliot Corridor to the east and enables great mixed-use development and is well thought out project.

Boardmember Crockett expressed his concern about the future of the airport and while it is true there is a certain inevitability to hear complaints about any airport, he feels we can head off some of those concerns with this project. He reminded the Board this request is for a General Plan amendment. The airport is a great resource for the City and feels the letter from the airport states they will be subject to future restrictions. Mr. Crockett spoke about the power lines and the need to supply power to the new data center and feels there is no benefit of supporting residential in an opportunity zone.

Boardmember Villanueva-Saucedo stated she drove through the area recently and feels there is a need for something to develop there. Ms. Villanueva-Saucedo stated she is typically the first to vote against anything residential near the airport, she does appreciate the fact that there has been a well thought plan to ensure a cohesive development and the plans match with the plan designed for the area. She stated the fact that the airport is not opposed to the project, that the residential is within the AOA3 area, and 56% of the development will be non-residential and non-residential will be built prior to the residential development, she is in favor of the project.

Boardmember Boyle feels what happens in Mesa is that we jump too fast to approve projects and stated he has concerns with this plan. Mr. Boyle stated he feels they were given the first option that has been presented and not thinking through the impact on the airport. He likes that the project could bring a 66% increase in jobs but questions if it could be increased to a higher level with an even greater version. He appreciates that there are restrictions to regulated over development of residential in the MX district. he also stated that the airport is going to be an important part of the city and needs to be better protected.

Chair Dahlke stated she would like to acknowledge and recognize concerns from EDAB and feels they play a big role in the development of the City. Ms. Dahlke stated staff provided an insightful analysis. She stated the citizen support as well as the non-opposition from the airport, and that the plan following the Inner Loop Study plays an important part in the analysis and recommendation of staff. For these reasons, she is in support of the project.

Boardmember Sarkissian clarified that this project began in 2016 and feels it is hard to get everyone on board and feels this is a very good plan. Ms. Sarkissian stated she feels we are getting a cohesive plan and not fragmented pieces. She feels the development plan goes together well and brings more certainty to future development and businesses in the area.

Boardmember Villanueva-Saucedo motioned to adopt the Minor General Plan Amendment, case ZON19-00754. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Sarkissian.

## MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 23, 2019 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

**That: The Board recommends the adoption of the Minor General Plan Amendment, ZON19-00754.**

Vote: 3-2 Adoption (Vice Chair Astle and Boardmember Allen, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Dahlke, Sarkissian and Villanueva-Saucedo

NAYS – Boyle, Crockett

\* \* \* \* \*

**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.gov](http://www.mesaaz.gov)**

## MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 23, 2019 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

buildings to achieve a noise level reduction to 45 db as specified in Section 11-19-5 of the Zoning Ordinance.

32. All final subdivision plats shall include the following notice: "This property, due to its proximity to Phoenix- Mesa Gateway Airport, will experience aircraft overflights, which are expected to generate noise levels that may be of concern to some individuals."
33. A disclosure of airport activity and proximity thereto shall be included within the Codes Covenants and Restrictions for all HOAs within Hawes Crossing.

### STANDARD CONDITIONS

34. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations, except as modified through this PAD.
35. Dedicate the right-of-way and easements required under the Mesa City Code at the time of application for a building permit, at the time of recordation of a subdivision plat, or at the time of the City's request for dedication whichever comes first.
36. Compliance with all requirements of the City's Subdivision Regulations.
37. Execute and comply with the development agreement, as approved by the City Council.

Vote: 3-2 Approval with conditions of approval (Vice Chair Astle and Boardmember Allen, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Dahlke, Sarkissian and Villanueva-Saucedo

NAYS – Boyle, Crockett

\* \* \* \* \*

**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.gov](http://www.mesaaz.gov)