

Exhibit 4 - Summary of Planning and Zoning Board Comments Related to Data Centers					
June 11, 2025 Study Session					
Line	Feedback	Topic	Last Name	Response	Revision Made
1	What is the problem that we are solving?	Land Use	Blakeman	<p>Data centers have distinct operational impacts, such as noise from generators and cooling systems, and aesthetic impacts related to design, height, and proximity to homes, that have prompted consistent feedback from the community and City boards.</p> <p>In response, City Council requested staff develop clearer criteria to ensure higher quality design, better oversight, and more proactive coordination with utility departments.</p> <p>The text amendments formalize requirements related to sound studies, separation from sensitive uses like homes and schools, and early evaluation of water and energy demands to address these impacts.</p> <p>The text amendments reflect ongoing consideration of impacts and efforts over the past two and a half years to address and mitigate the specific impacts of data centers.</p>	N/A
2	Are the concerns coming from the citizen and neighborhoods?	Land Use	Blakeman	Yes. Residents in neighborhoods impacted by the existing data centers have voiced noise, aesthetic and neighborhood compatibility concerns.	N/A
3	Was their an open stakeholder meeting for this text amendment?		Pitcher	No. But staff met individually with many stakeholders.	N/A
4	Have the architectural criteria been reviewed by the design review board and is there intent to do so?	Land Use	Peterson	<p>No. The standards are based on the City's current development standards and are tailored specifically to data centers, based on reviews the City has completed, to ensure that they meet the City's standards for high-quality development.</p> <p>Typically staff does not consult with the DRB on text amendments.</p>	N/A
5	Acoustical engineer is not a term consistent with ARS, Acoustical Consultant would be more Consultant with the board of technical registration.		Peterson	We will make sure that we use language that is consistent with the Drive-thru ordinance.	Revised Section 11-31-36(E)(7) and 11-31-36(G)(2) to Acoustical Consultant

Exhibit 4 - Summary of Planning and Zoning Board Comments Related to Data Centers					
June 11, 2025 Study Session					
Line	Feedback	Topic	Last Name	Response	Revision Made
6	What defines an accessory use if it is defined by ownership?	Land Use	Peterson	The text amendments ensure that the use remains ancillary to the main function of a use that is not considered a data center.	Revised Section 11-31-36(A)(1) to remove requirement (d)
				In preparing the text amendments, staff reviewed Chandler’s adopted ordinance and Phoenix’s on-going ordinance to align the criteria for accessory uses. Public feedback emphasized the importance of consistency across municipalities, which informed the approach.	
				Data Centers as an accessory use is outlined in Section 11-31-36(A)(1)	
7	Where did the 10% of the building footprint come from?	Land Use	Peterson	The 10% threshold was included both to reinforce the ancillary nature of the use and to maintain consistency with other cities.	N/A
				This is consistent with Chandler and the ordinance being considered by Phoenix.	
8	Is it accurate that the storage cannot be done in a separate standalone structure?	Land Use	Peterson	Yes. But based on input from the Planning & Zoning Board and stakeholder, this requirement has been removed.	Revised Section 11-31-36(A)(1) to remove requirement (d)
9	Is it correct that beyond building height, there will be no development standard or criteria modifications allowed through variances or other processes?	Land Use	Peterson	Yes. This is to ensure high quality development of the data centers and mitigate potential impacts on residential land uses and other sensitive receptors.	N/A
10	Would separation apply to undeveloped county residential land?	Land Use	Peterson	Yes. This would apply to undeveloped county residential land.	N/A
11	What does it mean that the building be oriented towards arterial roadways and intersection?	Land Use	Peterson	Yes. The front-facing public facade(s) will be required to orientate to the public realm, specifically the arterial or the intersection.	Revised Section 11-31-36(F)(4)(b) for clarification
				If it is an intersection, the data center would face the corner (both sides of that roads). If the data center is on a straight arterial with only one front edge, it would face the arterial.	

Exhibit 4 - Summary of Planning and Zoning Board Comments Related to Data Centers June 11, 2025 Study Session					
Line	Feedback	Topic	Last Name	Response	Revision Made
12	Why is there a minimum size for the PADs?	Land Use	Peterson	<p>This is an existing requirement of the PAD so the acreage was not modified.</p> <p>The City has been working closely with the development community on assessing possible changes to several aspects of the MZO. The PAD modifications are part of a larger text amendment and additional discussions are on-going. Because of this, only changes related to modifications of uses are being included at this time.</p> <p>Smaller parcels are captured with the Bonus Intensity Zone and modifications to this will be done at the same time.</p>	N/A
13	Is there a timeline for the PAD text amendments?	Land Use	Peterson	<p>This is likely to occur in the Fall 2025.</p> <p>Development Services has been coordinating with the development community to identify ways to streamline processes and explore new opportunities. The PAD modifications are part of a broader conversation that will include various improvements.</p> <p>Future text amendments will be prioritized based on this discussion with City Council. We expect the PAD text amendment to be part of that larger conversation.</p>	N/A
14	Is the new parking standard arbitrary? Where did that calculation come from?	Land Use	Peterson	<p>No. The measurement aligns with the typical deviations and requests seen from data centers and accounts for ancillary uses, such as associated office space with additional employees.</p> <p>Based on additional research, and input from stakeholders, the text amendments now include: 1/5,000 SF for the first 200,000 SF and 1/10,000 SF thereafter.</p>	Revised Table 11-32-3.A - minimum parking requirement
15	Are we now trying to snuff out the use?	Land Use	Blakeman	<p>No. The text amendments are focusing on the distinct operational impacts, such as noise from generators and cooling systems, and aesthetic impacts related to design, height, and proximity to homes, that have prompted consistent feedback from the community and City boards.</p> <p>Because many of the Light Industrial Districts are proximate to residential areas, the text amendments would allow data centers in the General Industrial and Heavy Industrial District.</p> <p>A waiver, which has been successfully implemented in the City, is included as part of the text amendment process to protect built, data centers in review and future potential users.</p>	N/A

Exhibit 4 - Summary of Planning and Zoning Board Comments Related to Data Centers June 11, 2025 Study Session					
Line	Feedback	Topic	Last Name	Response	Revision Made
16	How does balancing jobs and economic growth tie into this proposal?	Economic Development	Blakeman	<p>Mesa has seen strong demand for data centers—15 facilities within a five-mile radius.</p> <p>The data centers occupy about 1,400 acres and generate roughly 1,400 jobs (about one job per acre).</p> <p>By comparison, ten high-probability projects would yield 3,000 jobs on just 300 acres (about ten jobs per acre).</p> <p>To achieve the City's Economic Development goal of attracting 100,000 advanced-manufacturing jobs, a balance of data-center growth and more land-efficient industries that deliver higher job densities is needed.</p>	N/A
17	With this proposed amendment, data centers would not be allowed?	Land Use	Blakeman	<p>Data centers have been treated as warehousing under LI zoning and will not be prohibited in the City.</p> <p>But because data centers were not envisioned in the MZO, a new land use category - data center - is needed to address the unique impacts of the use. Specific and unique regulations were developed and the zoning districts where allowed have been identified.</p> <p>Our approach is modeled on Chandler’s ordinance which has been adopted and also considers the Phoenix ordinance still in draft form.</p>	N/A
18	So this amendment creates a process for data centers?	Land Use	Blakeman	<p>Yes. The text amendments would require approval of a PAD by City Council to specifically allow for Data Centers.</p>	N/A
19	If they do not submit the waiver, the after three years the use would not be allowed?	Land Use	Blakeman	<p>No. The three-year window is the timeframe in which a property owner has to only submit the waiver. The waiver then runs with the land.</p> <p>The waiver only becomes void if the property is rezoned, at which point the data center must follow the new development standards.</p> <p>The waiver allowance is based on State Statute.</p>	N/A
20	Does staff feel that they are addressing the concerns from the companies that are reaching out?	Utility/Infrastructure	Blakeman	<p>Yes. The feedback that the City has received has been positive. Most of the questions have centered on clarifications and stakeholders requested minor edits, most of which have been incorporated into the draft ordinance.</p> <p>Overall the response has been collaborative and supportive.</p>	N/A

Exhibit 4 - Summary of Planning and Zoning Board Comments Related to Data Centers June 11, 2025 Study Session					
Line	Feedback	Topic	Last Name	Response	Revision Made
21	When considering site selection, to what degree are water and power constraints more limiting than land use constraints?	Utility/Infrastructure	Peterson	<p>The Meta data center was water-cooled, but all new facilities use air-cooling, which has dramatically increased power demand.</p> <p>Water use is no longer the primary concern, but power is a concern.</p> <p>At a recent SRP event, officials noted that last summer’s peak supply was 8.9 GW, while data center inquiries across their service territory are requesting about 9 GW.</p> <p>As a result, SRP must nearly double its output within five years at considerable expense.</p>	N/A
22	Is the intention with converting the distribution and transmission to have these data centers underground a 230 or a 500 KV line and would this only apply to new transmission lines?	Utility/Infrastructure	Carpenter	<p>The Utility’s goal is not to underground large transmission lines, but to respond to development feedback about overhead versus underground service while managing costs for all 18,000 customers.</p> <p>Each data center’s service plan will vary based on its site and existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Wherever possible, we will reuse current transmission lines to minimize expense, and if undergrounding is requested, the data center will cover the additional cost.</p>	N/A
23	Concerned that the 10% building footprint limit for accessory uses, especially as defined in the code, may be too restrictive. Once you factor in servers, networking equipment, office space, and staff areas, it's easy to exceed that threshold, even for internal use. The need for in-house data infrastructure is only growing, and we don’t want the ordinance to unintentionally limit business expansion just because they can’t fit within that 10%	Land Use	Pitcher	<p>The 10% threshold was included both to reinforce the ancillary nature of the use and to maintain consistency with other cities.</p> <p>This is consistent with Chandler and the ordinance being considered by Phoenix.</p>	N/A
24	It's unclear why the code requires a data center to be in a standalone structure on the parcel. If the primary concern is leasing storage or processing services to third parties, that seems like the key criteria. The additional requirements, like needing a separate building, don’t seem necessary and may limit flexibility without a clear benefit	Land Use	Pitcher	Based on input from the Planning & Zoning Board and stakeholder, this requirement has been removed.	Revised Section 11-31-36(A)(1) to remove requirement (d)

Exhibit 4 - Summary of Planning and Zoning Board Comments Related to Data Centers					
June 11, 2025 Study Session					
Line	Feedback	Topic	Last Name	Response	Revision Made
25	I fully agree with the need for screening, but there should be flexibility. For example, if a ground-mounted piece of equipment is 15 feet tall, a 15-foot fence might be more of an eyesore than the equipment itself. The City often uses alternative screening methods for its own taller infrastructure, like water tanks, and a similar approach could work here	Land Use	Pitcher	<p>The screening requirements in the text amendments is in response to many of the comments related to the aesthetic impacts of data centers. The screening would have to be compatible with the architecture of the buildings and site.</p> <p>Staff met with SRP to discuss the screening and clarified that this requirement was applicable to the ground equipment to minimize the height requirements.</p> <p>Section 11-31-36(F)(9) revised to provide screen wall options for substation screen wall 10 feet or below and greater than 10 feet.</p>	Revised Section 11-31-36(F)(9)
26	The one-space-per-1,000-square-foot parking requirement needs refinement. I'm fully supportive of using PAD zoning because it allows site-specific criteria. Since most of Chandler's zoning cases already use PADs, it makes sense to determine parking needs case-by-case. Different users will have different space and staffing needs, so it should be up to them to justify what's appropriate for their site during the application process.	Land Use	Pitcher	<p>The measurement aligns with the typical deviations and requests seen from data centers and accounts for ancillary uses, such as associated office space with additional employees.</p> <p>Based on additional research, and input from stakeholders, the text amendments now include: 1/5,000 SF for the first 200,000 SF and 1/10,000 SF thereafter</p>	Revised Table 11-32-3.A - minimum parking requirement
27	Since we're already making significant changes to how the PAD operates, it makes sense to revisit the minimum site area now. If reducing it from 5 acres is already being considered and there's no strong reason to keep it as-is, why wait six months or more? If it's a simple change, let's address it now as part of the current update.	Land Use	Pitcher	<p>This is an existing requirement of the PAD so the acreage was not modified.</p> <p>The City has been working closely with the development community on possible changes to several aspects of the MZO. The PAD modifications are part of a larger text amendment and additional discussions are on-going. Because of this, only changes related to modifications of uses are being included at this time.</p> <p>Smaller parcels are captured with the Bonus Intensity Zone and modifications to this will be done at the same time.</p>	N/A
28	It sounds like existing, built projects are in the clear. We're mostly hearing from those who are approved but haven't built yet, they're uncertain about what's changing. What seems to be missing is input from those who currently have the right to build but haven't started the process at all. Has the message got to those folks?	Land Use	Blakeman	Email notice of the proposed text amendments were sent to approximately 363 recipients.	N/A

Exhibit 4 - Summary of Stakeholder Comments Related to Data Centers							
Comment Date	Line	Feedback	Support Oppose	Topic	Last Name	Response	Revision Made After 6.11.25
06/03/25	1	1. How do the text amendments affect current entitlements (Novva)?	N/A	Land Use	Mike	Current Entitlements: Your client is within the Eastmark Community and zoned PC. The Eastmark Community Plan established the development standards applicable within the Eastmark Community. Data centers located within the Eastmark (Mesa Proving Grounds) Planned Community will not be required to comply with Section 11-31-36 of the Zoning Ordinance. Your client may want to submit a Waiver to address land use rights.	N/A
		2. How can a site plan be considered vested?					
		3. How will approved data centers be reviewed if they get a waiver?				Site Plan Vesting: Site plans are considered exercised per Section 11-67-9(A)(3) of the MZO.	
		4. How would future site plan modifications be reviewed (Novva)?				Site Plan Modification Review: Any future modification to the approved plans would be in accordance with the process outlined in the Eastmark Community Plan. The amendment process can be found in Section 6.1(l) of the Eastmark Community Plan.	
		5. Once a waiver is completed, will the site be considered a legal non-conforming or a legal-permitted use?				Application: Modifications to site plans would require compliance with Section 11-31-36 and other provisions of the MZO. They would follow the typical standards for Site Plan Modifications, eligibility for Substantial Conformance Improvement Permits, and the applicability sections of various Chapters of the MZO.	
		6. How would the TA be applied if their were modifications to the site plan, rezoning actions, PAD modifications, use permits, etc..?					
		7. How do these TA's affect development approved under the Eastmark Community Plan (Novva)?				Waiver: If a Waiver is issued for a specific parcel that had an existing data center, or an approved site plan for a data center, on the specific parcel as of the effective date of this Ordinance, the existing or approved data center will be considered a legal conforming use.	
06/04/25	2	1. Please clarify the acceptable sound-study thresholds and what enforcement actions would follow if a data center exceeds them.	N/A	Land Use	Lyons	Sound Study: The measurements from the initial sound study would determine the baseline ambient levels onsite and at the property lines. The proposed development standards require that the data center be designed and built with mitigation methods to prevent the sounds levels from exceeding the ambient noise levels taken by the initial sound study (See Section 11-31-36(F)(4)(c)). If the sound levels were increased, the data center operators would be required to provide additional mitigation to meet the ambient noise level at the time of development	N/A
		2. Confirm whether waivers are limited to parcels with an existing approved PAD (in PEP, LI, GI, HI, DB-2 zones, or Eastmark LUGs), or if any parcel meeting the other criteria may apply, even without a PAD.				Waiver: A PAD is not required to qualify for the waiver. The property must be zoned Planned Employment Park (PEP), Light Industrial (LI), General Industrial (GI), Heavy Industrial (HI), or Downtown Business-2 (DB-2); or (2) located within the Eastmark (Mesa Proving Grounds) Planned Community and had an identified Land Use Group (LUG) of Village, District, Regional Center/Campus, or Urban Core and may or may not have a PAD.	
06/10/25	3	Please confirm that the waiver:	N/A	Land Use	Palmer	Waiver: The waiver runs with the land. The waiver only becomes void if the property is rezoned, at which point the data center must follow the new development standards.	N/A
		1. Runs with the land and only terminates upon rezoning.					
		2. Allows data centers in PC districts to follow the Community Plan standards (e.g., Eastmark) rather than the new text-amendment standards.				PC District Applicability: The text amendments Section 11-31-36 will not apply to data centers in Eastmark. Regarding other Planned Communities, data centers are not allowed in either of the other Planned Community districts in the City (Cadence and Avalon Crossing) per the land use regulations in those community plans. Future PC Districts would determine how to address data centers.	
		3. Is not discretionary and that once a complete waiver application is filed, approval is automatic.				Waiver: If the owner has a valid claim under ARS 12-1134 and the request for a waiver meets all the requirements in Section 12 of the data center ordinance, the waiver will be granted.	
06/10/25	4	1. What would an operational plan entail?	N/A	Land Use	Taylor	Operational Plan: Operational Plans describe the onsite operations of various land uses and how the site is proposed to be developed to comply with all zoning, building, and fire safety regulations.	Revised Section 11-31-36(F)(8)(b)
		2. Can we separate water usage into landscaping and operational categories?				Water Usage: When submitting the report the applicant may specify these usages.	
		3. Can you provide a copy of the Sustainable Water Service Application?				Sustainable Water Service Application: The application was provided 6.16.25.	
		4. Can we get more details on the protocols for the sound studies?				Sound Study: The requirements for the sound study are found in Sections 11-31-36(G)(2) &(3). The ambient noise may not increase the baseline level measured at the nearest residential zoning district, residential use, or sensitive use. Data Centers which result in an increase to ambient noise will be required to employ addition mitigation efforts to address the sound levels.	
		5. Ensuring no increase to ambient noise would generally be impossible; can this be modified to ensure that there is no net increase in noise at these locations?					
		6. The locations for the mechanical equipment placement may be impractical.				Mechanical Equipment: This location requirement was revised to prioritize the public realm and state that when possible mechanical equipment should be located at the rear or side of the building.	
		7. Please clarify the scope of the developer's responsibility for undergrounding utilities.				Utility Undergrounding: Section 11-31-36(10) was revised prior to the 6.11.25 P&Z hearing to clarify.	
06/11/25	5	Though I realize the need for development of such centers, it was like adding insult to injury as far as making it an eyesore when they painted the surrounding fence with big brown and white squares. Someone in the neighborhood said that they spoke to someone working on the project, and they were told that the company didn't want to flip the bill, totally paint the fence, a solid color. This is in reference to the project on the NW corner of Sossaman and Elliot.	Support	Land Use	Taylor	Fences and Walls: The proposed amendments require fences and walls to be architecturally compatible with the data center building(s) and surrounding development. These requirements will minimize the potential visual impacts of the data center that require security walls.	N/A
06/11/25	6	In addition to this Data Center amendment, its important to require that:	Support	Land Use	Kenyon	Building Height: Proposed amendments limit Data Centers to a maximum 60 feet in height.	N/A
		1. All future Data Centers that back up to residential neighborhoods be BELOW 3 stories high.				Sound: The proposed amendments require an initial sounds study, sound study at issuance of certificate of occupancy, and an annual sound study for 5 years to ensure that the baseline levels at the property line to residential uses or zoning is need increased by the Data Center operations.	
		2. Have reduced sound and light pollution in that area.				Light: Proposed developments are required to design their onsite lighting and must provide a photometric study demonstrating that no light trespasses their property line.	
		3. Comply to the visual ethics of that neighborhood using external cladding or building enclosures. This may add thoughtful design and some resources to the build but would reduce complaints and maintain property values.				Building Enclosures: The proposed amendments contain development standard pertaining to: building placement and design; architectural design; screening of truck dock, loading, and service areas; design of fences and walls; screening of mechanical equipment; and substation screening.	
		4. Moreso, existing residential communities like Eastmark, should be recategorized to fit into this ordinance going forward as well as any and all in process.				Eastmark: Eastmark has unique zoning which established its own set of land uses processes and development standards when created. Therefore, it is not subject to the same standards of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance.	

Exhibit 4 - Summary of Stakeholder Comments Related to Data Centers							
Comment Date	Line	Feedback	Support Oppose	Topic	Last Name	Response	Revision Made After 6.11.25
06/11/25	7	We support the ordinance but urge you to remove or revise the Eastmark waiver. Eastmark is a residential-first community, not an industrial-first. Singling it out without clear justification undermines trust. Any exceptions should be transparent. Please treat Eastmark with the same standards applied citywide. A waiver here contradicts the very principles the ordinance is designed to uphold. This waiver sends a message that protections other communities receive will not apply equally to Eastmark — one of the city’s largest residential communities, who already is subject to additional CFD taxes	Support	Land Use	Grinevich	<p>Waiver: The waiver is eligible to properties City wide who currently have the right to develop a data center under the classification "Indoor Warehousing and Storage).</p> <p>Eastmark: Eastmark has unique zoning which established its own set of land uses processes and development standards when created. Therefore, it is not subject to the same standards of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance.</p>	N/A
06/11/25	8	<p>1. I request a stakeholder meeting prior to approval or adoption.</p> <p>2. There have been no public hearings or input.</p> <p>3. We wish to discuss items including C1 & F1 why is there PAD requirement in addition to the restriction to GI or HI base zoning.</p> <p>4. E7 Noise study requirements and allowable decibels, F2 setbacks, F3 heights, F8a screen walls, F8b Mechanical equipment Location, G4 clarify this applies to operations phase not construction.</p> <p>5. Are there revised requirements for parking?</p>	Oppose	Land Use	Maples	<p>Stakeholder Input: Staff has had multiple individual meetings, phone calls and emails with stakeholders to discuss the amendments.</p> <p>Public Hearing: The Planning & Zoning hearings and City Council hearings are public hearing at which the amendments can be discussed.</p> <p>PAD: City Council requested that the approval of the new use be under their purview.</p> <p>E7, F2, F3, F8a, F8b: Staff is willing to discuss specific questions regarding these sections.</p> <p>Parking: Proposed parking requirements are in Section 5 of the Ordinance.</p>	N/A
06/11/25	9	<p>I am writing on behalf of the Data Center Coalition, a national membership association for the industry. Our members include data center owners and operators with investment, facilities and teams in the City and companies that lease data center capacity.</p> <p>We encourage the City to pursue a deliberative process that ensures time is given to all stakeholders to consider impacts and unintended consequences. Without additional input, the modifications establish policies that create uncertainty and impose restrictive and disparate requirements. Additional comments have been submitted to City staff.</p>	Oppose	Land Use	Boender	Stakeholder Input: Staff has had multiple individual meetings, phone calls and emails with stakeholders to discuss the amendments, including Russell Smolden with the Data Center Coalition.	N/A
06/11/25	10	On behalf of NAIOP Arizona, we oppose the proposed data center ordinance. While we support thoughtful land use planning, the current draft imposes overly restrictive standards that could deter economic investment. Data centers intersect with infrastructure, energy policy, and regional growth. We urge the Board to delay action and direct staff to engage in a more inclusive stakeholder process. This will lead to better outcomes for residents, businesses, and the city. We welcome collaboration on a balanced path forward.	Oppose	Economic Development	Baumer	N/A	N/A
06/11/25	11	<p>There are three main parties to be concerned with:</p> <p>1. Land owners that may have the right today to build a data center but have not proceeded.</p> <p>2. There are existing built data centers within Mesa that will be impacted by the new law and</p> <p>3. Then there's where NOVA is my client which I hope you could agree is the most precarious of the three which is they have obtained all entitlements and they have received final site plan but have not yet broken ground and yet the law is about to change. The text amendment does not contemplate that the waiver could apply to someone or a developer with site plan approval now that's been fixed as of tonight</p>	Oppose	Land Use	Graff	<p>Waiver: This concern is addressed in several places within the ordinance.</p> <p>Section 15 "Data center projects that have received approvals prior to the effective date of this Ordinance may file applications for permits and plats, and may be constructed, as set forth in Section 11-1-6(B) of the Zoning Ordinance.</p> <p>Complete applications for proposed data center projects filed prior to the effective date of this Ordinance may be approved as set forth in Section 11-1-6(C) of the Zoning Ordinance."</p>	N/A
06/11/25	12	It's not clear that someone like Nova could come in for administrative minor site plan changes that should be under the old code old requirements	Oppose	Land Use	Graff	<p>Site Plan Modification: If a waiver is submitted, the use would continue to reviewed as a permitted use.</p> <p>Modifications to site plans would require compliance with Section 11-31-36 and other provisions of the MZO. They would follow the typical standards for Site Plan Modifications, eligibility for Substantial Conformance Improvement Permits, and the applicability sections of various Chapters of the MZO.</p>	N/A
06/11/25	13	There's a section that seems to include substations battery storage power generation other equipment to be included as of right but again that's not clear	Oppose	Utility/ Infrastructure	Graff	Mechanical Equipment: Section 11-31-36(F)(8) referenced by this comment was discussed with Josh Mike. This section pertains to development standards for mechanical screening which include screening, location, and architectural consistency. If any such equipment was considered a separate land use it would follow the requirements for the underlying zoning.	
06/11/25	14	If you rezone from LI you lose your rights under the waiver... but what if you rezone to LI Council Use Permit?	Oppose	Land Use	Graff	Waiver: A Council Use Permit is a Conditional Use Permit and is not a rezone action. Therefore it would not affect the waiver.	N/A
06/11/25	15	<p>Respectfully request additional consideration regarding:</p> <p>1. Noise including utilizing a decibel level range appropriate for the zoning area.</p> <p>2. Backup generators to establish flexibility for the city utility and data center to work together.</p> <p>3. The impact that the ordinance will have on data centers currently in development within the city to ensure that the data centers are able to continue that development</p>	Oppose	Land Use	Rice	<p>Sound Study: The proposed amendments require that the baseline noise level at the nearest residential property line not be increased by the data center operations. This baseline level could be very different depending on the context (e.g. adjacent to an arterial roadway). Therefore this ensures that existing conditions are maintained.</p> <p>Backup Generators: Section 11-31-36(G)(4) allows generators to be used but requires 24 hr. notice unless needed for emergency back up or electric utility demand response events.</p> <p>Existing Data Centers Rights: Sections 12-15 of the Ordinance address waivers, the applicability of Section 11-31-36, and the ability of approved project to continue through permitting and platting.</p>	N/A

Exhibit 4 - Summary of Stakeholder Comments Related to Data Centers

Comment Date	Line	Feedback	Support Oppose	Topic	Last Name	Response	Revision Made After 6.11.25
06/11/25	16	Encourages the city to permit variances to the development standards established in 11-31-36 in order to allow the city maximum flexibility for future development decisions	Oppose	Land Use	Rice	Variances: The text amendments do not recommend that deviations to the requirements of Section 11-31-36 be permitted or modified to ensure data centers are developed to high standard	N/A
06/11/25	17	The ordinance does not clearly match the cities intent and the current language is extremely broad in regard to distance separation, architectural standards, substation screening, and operational regulations and on its face could be mistakenly applied in ways that would deprive owners of their vested rights.	Oppose	Land Use	LeRoy	Objective Standards: The proposed standards are objective and measurable so they are consistently used by reviewing staff to eliminate subjectivity. Substation Screening: Section 11-31-36(F)(9) revised to provide screen wall options for substation screen wall 10 feet or below and greater than 10 feet. Residential Separation Requirement: The text amendments do not include a 400 foot setback, but a 400 foot separation requirement from residential uses (and other sensitive receptors). Because the data center/associated equipment produce noise, exhaust, and heat, this mitigates potential impacts on these uses. This is in line with other municipalities. Mariana requires 400 feet from residential and 100 feet from non-residential uses. Tempe is proposing 500 feet from residential uses. Phoenix is proposing 150 feet from residential and additional standards when within 300 feet.	N/A
06/11/25	18	The burden of utility upgrades are being paid by the developers and the taxes from the projects are coming into the cities tax revenues, we need to make sure these amendments do not have a negative effect.	Oppose	Economic Development	Bower	Negative Effects: It is unclear what negative effects are being eluded to.	N/A
06/11/25	19	400 foot setback is a sign significant departure from the standards in GI HI and LI zoning setbacks in those areas typically range from 15 to 30 feet even when adjacent to residential the standard is usually 20 ft plus one foot for every building for every foot of building height if the project meets sound visual sound and visual screenings it's unclear what additional benefits this 400 foot buffer provides particularly when the space when space is at a premium in many areas	Oppose	Land Use	Irvin	Residential Separation Requirement: The text amendments do not include a 400 foot setback, but a 400 foot separation requirement from residential uses (and other sensitive receptors). Because the data center/associated equipment produce noise, exhaust, and heat, this mitigates potential impacts on these uses. This is in line with other municipalities. Mariana requires 400 feet from residential and 100 feet from non-residential uses. Tempe is proposing 500 feet from residential uses. Phoenix is proposing 150 feet from residential and additional standards when within 300 feet.	N/A
06/11/25	20	The 60-foot height limit could unintentionally hinder functional design data centers often require greater internal clearances to accommodate equipment cooling systems and structural in infrastructure, we suggest re-evaluating this height limit especially if adequate architectural screening is provided	Oppose	Land Use	Irvin	Height: Several Data Centers have been developed within the City below this height limit. This requirement is to minimize the visual impacts of data centers. In discussions with stakeholders, staff has been told that the height was not a concern.	N/A
06/11/25	21	For parking, the purpose of one per thousand square foot ratio could result in large underutilized lots, data centers are not high capacity occupational facilities. This approach may create unnecessary paving heat island effects and poor sight aesthetics. Perhaps a more user specific or performance-based approach would be appropriate	Oppose	Land Use	Irvin	Parking: The measurement aligns with the typical deviations and requests seen from data centers and accounts for ancillary uses, such as associated office space with additional employees. Based on additional research, and input from stakeholders, the text amendments now include: 1/5,000 SF for the first 200,000 SF and 1/10,000 SF thereafter	Revised Table 11-32-3.A - minimum parking requirement
06/11/25	22	The proposed mechanical yard location requirements pose a challenge requiring yards to be placed away from entrance entrances public facades residential uses and any roads makes citing these systems extremely difficult. A performance-based approach focusing on effective screening could achieve the same goals with greater flexibility	Oppose	Land Use	Irvin	Mechanical Equipment: This location requirement was revised to prioritize the public realm and state that when possible mechanical equipment should be located at the rear or side of the building.	Section 11-31-36(F)(8)(b) revised
06/11/25	23	Mechanical screening of equipment, calling for a solid masonry wall tall enough to fully screen the highest adjacent piece of equipment may itself become a visual issue and in some cases the screening would create more of an eyesore than the equipment. We'd encourage exploration of other solutions like architectural enclosures or integrated design elements	Oppose	Land Use	Irvin	Screening: The screening requirements in the text amendments is in response to many of the comments related to the aesthetic impacts of data centers. The screening would have to be compatible with the architecture of the buildings and site. Staff met with SRP to discuss the screening and clarified that this requirement was applicable to the ground equipment to minimize the height requirements. Substation Screening: Section 11-31-36(F)(9) revised to provide screen wall options for substation screen wall 10 feet or below and greater than 10 feet.	Revised Section 11-31-36(F)(9)
06/11/25	24	We ask that their be a public hearing to discuss these amendments	Oppose		Maples	Public Hearing: The Planning & Zoning hearings and City Council hearings are public hearing at which the amendments can be discussed.	N/A
06/11/25	25	Not allowing a data center for it and it is really severely restricting GI and HI is less than 3/4 of 1% of your land it's not it is restricting to say that that's where it's going to be allowed and to ask other folks to invest their money in others and chase a waiver that that's doesn't feel good to invest billions of dollars and chase a waiver	Oppose	Land Use	Maples	% of Zoned Land: GI & HI account for approximately 4.2% of the land in Mesa. If a waiver is submitted, a data center would be permitted in zoning districts - including the LI District - that currently permit Indoor Warehousing and Storage.	N/A
06/11/25	26	We heard that there is one employee per acre and I would dispute that. But that would say you should have 16 parking spaces as written you would ask for 240 parking spaces he talked about a heat island and he talked about it would really not be visually appealing for you to require that the truth is obviously somewhere in between is there one you know is there one per thousand or is there one employee per acre but it's really a lot less than what's being called for it's really a lot closer to 16 spaces being required it's probably 30 spaces not 240	Oppose	Land Use	Maples	Parking: The measurement aligns with the typical deviations and requests seen from data centers and accounts for ancillary uses, such as associated office space with additional employees. Based on additional research, and input from stakeholders, the text amendments now include: 1/5,000 SF for the first 200,000 SF and 1/10,000 SF thereafter	Revised Table 11-32-3.A - minimum parking requirement
06/11/25	27	Economic opportunity economic innovation are key to Mesa's future. Please take into account all the economics behind it but also realize there's a personal element too. Please take your time let's work together with the stakeholders to come up with an ordinance that helps create jobs and also saves lives.	Oppose	Economic Development	Alizadeh	Economics: The text amendments do not prohibit data centers.	N/A

Exhibit 4 - Summary of Stakeholder Comments Related to Data Centers

Comment Date	Line	Feedback	Support Oppose	Topic	Last Name	Response	Revision Made After 6.11.25
06/11/25	28	We encourage the City of Mesa to take a thoughtful, inclusive approach to proposed changes, engaging stakeholders and allowing time to assess potential impacts. We'll follow up with specific recommendations to help address the City's goals while keeping Mesa a competitive location for data centers. These facilities support essential sectors like AI, finance, manufacturing, and government, and act as major economic drivers. In 2023 alone, the Arizona data center industry supported over 81,000 jobs and contributed \$11 billion to the state's GDP. Without additional input, the proposed changes could create uncertainty, impose restrictive requirements, and threaten Mesa's competitiveness. It's also unclear if the changes apply retroactively, adding to the uncertainty.	Oppose	Economic Development	Boender	N/A	N/A
06/11/25	29	<p>We understand the need to address evolving land use issues around data centers, but the draft ordinance raises significant concerns. As written:</p> <p>1. It imposes restrictive and impractical standards that could discourage economic investment.</p> <p>2. Given the complexity of this industry, touching infrastructure, energy, and economic policy, any ordinance should be shaped through input from technical experts and private partners.</p>	Oppose	Economic Development	Baumer	Stakeholder Input: The text amendments reflect ongoing consideration of impacts and efforts over the past two and a half years to address and mitigate the specific impacts of data centers. Staff has had multiple individual meetings, phone calls and emails with stakeholders to discuss the amendments.	N/A
06/11/25	30	<p>We've submitted marked-up revisions to clarify Section 12 and 11-31-36:</p> <p>1. Parcels with an existing or approved data center waiver or approved site plan should be exempt from all new application requirements.</p> <p>2. Accessory uses (e.g., substations, battery/storage, cooling and mechanical equipment) should be explicitly identified as permitted accessory to a data center, with clear guidance on when additional approvals (if any) are required.</p>	Oppose	Land Use	Graff	<p>Waiver: Submitted recommendations were included in the ordinance dated 6.11.25.</p> <p>Application Requirements: Approved data centers would only be subject to the new requirements if the site plan expires or the changes meets the requirement of a Major Site Plan Modification as defined in the MZO.</p> <p>Accessory Uses: Accessory uses are defined in Chapter 87 of the MZO and addressed in the land use tables.</p>	N/A
06/17/25	31	<p>1. An engaged and collaborative stakeholder process is necessary for an ordinance of this scale and impact</p> <p>2. Requiring undergrounding of utilities above 69kV is often infeasible, and the overall requirement is inconsistent with standards elsewhere in the city, as well as being unclear as to its applicability to regional power systems in addition to data centers.</p> <p>3. The height limitation deviates from those allowed in many of the city's industrial or employment districts. There should be alignment across similar zoning districts, provided the sound and screening standards are met.</p> <p>4. 400 ft setback is excessive and inconsistent with comparable uses. If sound, screening, and design criteria are met, then a reasonable additional setback should be required only for mechanical equipment and not the building.</p> <p>5. With the PAD and definition modifications, the ordinance is overly prohibitive and bans data centers throughout the city.</p> <p>6. Parking requirements are beyond the needs of most data centers and should instead use standard office ratios on a graduated scale.</p>	Oppose	Land Use	Baumer	<p>Stakeholder Process: Staff met with numerous stakeholders to discuss the proposed text amendments and incorporated several recommendations from stakeholders.</p> <p>Utility Undergrounding: The Utility's goal is not to underground large transmission lines, but to respond to development feedback about overhead versus underground service while managing costs for all 18,000 customers. Each data center's service plan will vary based on its site and existing infrastructure. Wherever possible, we will reuse current transmission lines to minimize expense, and if undergrounding is requested, the data center will cover the additional cost.</p> <p>Height: The maximum building height in the LI District is 40 feet and 50 feet in the GI and HI Districts. The proposed maximum is above the base standard and would require approval of a deviation through a PAD Overlay District.</p> <p>Residential Separation Requirement: The text amendments do not include a 400 foot setback, but a 400 foot separation requirement from residential uses (and other sensitive receptors). Because the data center/associated equipment produce noise, exhaust, and heat, this mitigates potential impacts on these uses. This is in line with other municipalities.</p> <p>Mariana requires 400 feet from residential and 100 feet from non-residential uses. Tempe is proposing 500 feet from residential uses. Phoenix is proposing 150 feet from residential and additional standards when within 300 feet.</p> <p>Data Center Ban: The proposed text amendments do not ban data centers. They would be permitted in the GI and HI Districts with approval from City Council of a PAD which specifically allows for data centers and must comply with Section 11-31-36: Data Centers.</p> <p>Parking: The measurement aligns with the typical deviations and requests seen from data centers and accounts for ancillary uses, such as associated office space with additional employees. Based on additional research, and input from stakeholders, the text amendments now include: 1/5,000 SF for the first 200,000 SF and 1/10,000 SF thereafter.</p>	Revised Table 11-32-3.A - minimum parking requirement

Exhibit 4 - Summary of Stakeholder Comments Related to Data Centers							
Comment Date	Line	Feedback	Support Oppose	Topic	Last Name	Response	Revision Made After 6.11.25
06/17/25	32	1. The parking standard presents a contradiction, on one hand, the land use is characterized as being a low-employment user, but the parking standard treats it as if it is a high-intensity user. We recommend that parking be determined by the function, using standard office ratios for the office portion and potentially a graduated requirement, such as 1/5,000 SF for the first 200,000 SF, and 1/10,000 SF thereafter for the warehouse portion.	N/A	Land Use	Wilkes	Parking: The measurement aligns with the typical deviations and requests seen from data centers and accounts for ancillary uses, such as associated office space with additional employees. Based on additional research, and input from stakeholders, the text amendments now include: 1/5,000 SF for the first 200,000 SF and 1/10,000 SF thereafter.	Revised Table 11-32-3.A - minimum parking requirement Revised Section 11-31-36(A)(1) to remove requirement (d) Revised Section 11-31-36(E)(7) and 11-31-36(G)(2)
		2. The definition could be misconstrued, leading to modest server rooms being classified as a data center.				Accessory Use: The text amendments ensure that the use remains ancillary to the main function of a use that is not considered a data center. In preparing the text amendments, staff reviewed Chandler’s adopted ordinance and Phoenix’s on-going ordinance to align the criteria for accessory uses. Public feedback emphasized the importance of consistency across municipalities, which informed the approach. Data Centers as an accessory use is outlined in Section 11-31-36(A)(1)	
		3. Having to meet all four criteria for an accessory use is too restrictive. The city has a precedent for a 10% accessory threshold. A building with a dedicated data-processing function using a quarter of its footprint, for example, should be considered mixed use, not a data center.				Acoustical Engineer: Revised to Acoustical Consultant	
		4. Section 11-31-36.A.2 is too restrictive and may disallow data centers throughout the city.				PAD: The restrictions of PAD modifications only apply to this data center ordinance.	
		5. Replace “Acoustic Engineer” with “Acoustic Consultant”				Residential Separation Requirement: The text amendments do not include a 400 foot setback, but a 400 foot separation requirement from residential uses (and other sensitive receptors). Because the data center/associated equipment produce noise, exhaust, and heat, this mitigates potential impacts on these uses. This is in line with other municipalities. Mariana requires 400 feet from residential and 100 feet from non-residential uses. Tempe is proposing 500 feet from residential uses. Phoenix is proposing 150 feet from residential and additional standards when within 300 feet.	
06/17/25	33	6. If the PADs cannot be used to tailor development to site-specific conditions, their utility will become limited.	N/A	Land Use	Wilkes	Sensitive Uses: This is to be interpreted by the Planning Director.	Revised Section 11-31-36(F)(4)(b)
		7. The 400 ft setback is excessive and inconsistent with the standards for other permitted uses within many industrial and employment districts. Recommending 50 ft beyond the base zoning requirement, limited to mechanical equipment.					
		8. Please define what "other sensitive uses" will be.					
		9. The 60 ft height limit restricts data centers to two stories despite taller buildings being permissible in the industrial and employment districts.				Height: The maximum building height in the LI District is 40 feet and 50 feet in the GI and HI Districts. The proposed maximum is above the base standard and would require approval of a deviation through a PAD Overlay District.	
		10. F.5.a should suffice in providing architectural quality; a class A office aesthetic is not appropriate for a building in an industrial park. b. is redundant, and c. compounds the height restrictions.				Architectural Requirements: Staff was directed by City Council to recommend additional development standards to 1) Address compatibility 2) Mitigate potential adverse impacts 3) Address the unique size of these facilities and ensure high-quality development.	
06/17/25	34	11. This section should reference existing industrial standards rather than creating new standards.	N/A	Land Use	Peterson	Substation Screening: Section 11-31-36(F)(9) revised to provide screen wall options for substation screen wall 10 feet or below and greater than 10 feet.	
		12. Requiring full screening of substations is impractical where overhead lines exist. Additional ground-mounted equipment is too broad.				Utility Undergrounding: The Utility’s goal is not to underground large transmission lines, but to respond to development feedback about overhead versus underground service while managing costs for all 18,000 customers. Each data center’s service plan will vary based on its site and existing infrastructure. Wherever possible, we will reuse current transmission lines to minimize expense, and if undergrounding is requested, the data center will cover the additional cost.	
		13. Requiring the undergrounding of 69kV is often not feasible. Language should clarify that this only applies to infrastructure serving the data center.				PAD Text Amendments: The Planned Area Development Overlay District is proposed to be modified to allow or restrict land uses different than permitted by the underlying zoning district.	
		14. It’s unclear why the PAD overlay district amendments are being discussed if they are largely nullified by "Modifications and Deviations Not Permitted."					
		1. Please confirm that development standards and operational requirements do not apply to grandfathered properties and uses. If not, it is our position that these provisions are flawed. If it is the city’s intent to apply these standards to existing facilities, it should be stated.				Existing Data Centers Rights: Sections 12-15 of the Ordinance address waivers, the applicability of Section 11-31-36, and the ability of approved project to continue through permitting and platting.	
06/17/25	34	2. A right to engage in a vested use under a site plan with design parameters reviewed and approved has little value if a city could impose operating regulations making it economically infeasible to build and operate in the buildings that house the approved use.	N/A	Land Use	Peterson	Need for Amendment: Per A.R.S. § 9-462.01, the legislative body of any municipality by ordinance, in order to conserve and promote the public health, safety, and general welfare. The whereas clauses within the ordinance may be referenced for potential impacts.	
		3. The City has not demonstrated good cause or public necessity to establish many of the proposed standards. Others are problematic because the standard chosen is too prescriptive				Residential Separation Requirement: The text amendments do not include a 400 foot setback, but a 400 foot separation requirement from residential uses (and other sensitive receptors). Because the data center/associated equipment produce noise, exhaust, and heat, this mitigates potential impacts on these uses. This is in line with other municipalities. Mariana requires 400 feet from residential and 100 feet from non-residential uses. Tempe is proposing 500 feet from residential uses. Phoenix is proposing 150 feet from residential and additional standards when within 300 feet.	
		4. There is no apparent basis for the 400-foot separation from residences. It’s an arbitrary and capricious standard.					
		5. The City has not shown a basis to treat data center uses differently than other noise-generating uses and to burden data centers with a “no noise above ambient” standard when airport operations are allowed to reach 60 decibels. Rather than adopting this ambient noise approach, the City should instead set an actual noise decibel cap, as it has done for other noise-generating uses.				Sound Study: The proposed amendments require that the baseline noise level at the nearest residential property line not be increased by the data center operations. This baseline level could be very different depending on the context (e.g. adjacent to an arterial roadway). Therefore this ensures that existing conditions are maintained.	

Exhibit 4 - Summary of Stakeholder Comments Related to Data Centers

Comment Date	Line	Feedback	Support Oppose	Topic	Last Name	Response	Revision Made After 6.11.25
06/17/25	35	<p>6. Requiring a solid wall height that is one foot above the tallest equipment will lead to absurd results. This standard is too prescriptive. The standards should provide flexibility to address aesthetic interests on a site-by-site basis and to look for mitigation that is balanced, specific, and workable to achieve desired results.</p> <p>7. If adopted as proposed and if the City applies these development standards and operational requirements even to already vested uses within the City, these regulations would cause a taking of C-1 Mesa’s vested rights.</p>	N/A	Land Use	Peterson	<p>Substation Screening: Section 11-31-36(F)(9) revised to provide screen wall options for substation screen wall 10 feet or below and greater than 10 feet.</p> <p>Existing Data Centers Rights: Sections 12-15 of the Ordinance address waivers, the applicability of Section 11-31-36, and the ability of approved project to continue through permitting and platting.</p>	Revised Section 11-31-36(F)(9)
06/17/25	36	<p>On behalf of Apple, thank you for the opportunity to submit comments relating to the proposed Mesa ordinance relating to zoning regulations impacting data centers.</p> <p>While the ordinance largely appears to apply prospectively to new developments, given the initial and ongoing investment in which Apple has made in Mesa with its existing Global Command Data Center, additional clarification is necessary to ensure that the proposed ordinance does not adversely impact the potential expansion, modification and otherwise enhancements to an existing facility and its surrounding area in the future.</p> <p>It is imperative to Apple’s operations that it has the adequate flexibility to make the necessary improvements to the Mesa facility in order to meet ongoing and future corporate and customer demands.</p> <p>Apple will continue to work with the City of Mesa with all applicable permits and reviews.</p>	N/A		Goodman	<p>Current Entitlements: Your client is within the Eastmark Community and zoned PC. The Eastmark Community Plan established the development standards applicable within the Eastmark Community. Data centers located within the Eastmark (Mesa Proving Grounds) Planned Community will not be required to comply with Section 11-31-36 of the Zoning Ordinance. Your client may want to submit a Waiver to address land use rights.</p> <p>Site Plan Modification Review: Any future modification to the approved plans would be in accordance with the process outlined in the Eastmark Community Plan. The amendment process can be found in Section 6.1(l) of the Eastmark Community Plan.</p>	N/A
06/17/25	37	<p>1. Allow more time for a stakeholder meeting with staff to collaborate on acceptable outcomes.</p> <p>2. Clarify the criteria for the acoustic study, specifically dB thresholds, ambient measurement timing, and methodology.</p> <p>3. Restricting data centers to GI and HI zones is overly restrictive; less than 1% of Mesa is zoned this way, effectively blocking development due to uncertain waiver processes.</p> <p>4. The parking requirement of 1/1,000 SF is excessive and arbitrary; recommend using standard office ratios for office space only. Overparking increases the heat island effect, reduces land utility, and impacts tax revenue.</p> <p>5. Change “may issue” to “shall issue” in Section 12, Paragraph 4 for clarity and consistency.</p> <p>6. Remove the 5-acre minimum for PADs. Some smaller infill data center projects may be appropriate for PAD zoning.</p> <p>7. Accessory use restriction is too rigid. 10% IT space shouldn’t classify a business as a data center. Tech firms often need more than a 10% IT function.</p>	N/A	Land Use	Maples	<p>Stakeholder Process: Staff met with numerous stakeholders to discuss the proposed text amendments and incorporated several recommendations from stakeholders.</p> <p>Sound Study: The proposed amendments require that the baseline noise level at the nearest residential property line not be increased by the data center operations. This baseline level could be very different depending on the context (e.g. adjacent to an arterial roadway). Therefore this ensures that existing conditions are maintained.</p> <p>% of Zoned Land: GI & HI account for approximately 4.2% of the land in Mesa. If a waiver is submitted, a data center would be permitted in zoning districts - including the LI District - that currently permit Indoor Warehousing and Storage.</p> <p>Parking: The measurement aligns with the typical deviations and requests seen from data centers and accounts for ancillary uses, such as associated office space with additional employees. Based on additional research, and input from stakeholders, the text amendments now include: 1/5,000 SF for the first 200,000 SF and 1/10,000 SF thereafter.</p> <p>Architectural Requirements: Staff was directed by City Council to recommend additional development standards to 1) Address compatibility 2) Mitigate potential adverse impacts 3) Address the unique size of these facilities and ensure high-quality development.</p> <p>Accessory Use: The text amendments ensure that the use remains ancillary to the main function of a use that is not considered a data center. In preparing the text amendments, staff reviewed Chandler’s adopted ordinance and Phoenix’s on-going ordinance to align the criteria for accessory uses. Public feedback emphasized the importance of consistency across municipalities, which informed the approach. Data Centers as an accessory use is outlined in Section 11-31-36(A)(1)</p>	<p>Revised Table 11-32-3.A - minimum parking requirement</p> <p>Revised Section 11-31-36(A)(1) to remove requirement (d)</p>

Exhibit 4 - Summary of Stakeholder Comments Related to Data Centers							
Comment Date	Line	Feedback	Support Oppose	Topic	Last Name	Response	Revision Made After 6.11.25
06/18/25	38	8. Setback is excessive. Mitigation measures (screening, massing, glazing, sound) are redundant. We suggest using the base zoning setback or a maximum of 50' beyond it.	N/A	Land Use	Maples	Residential Separation Requirement: The text amendments do not include a 400 foot setback, but a 400 foot separation requirement from residential uses (and other sensitive receptors). Because the data center/associated equipment produce noise, exhaust, and heat, this mitigates potential impacts on these uses. This is in line with other municipalities. Mariana requires 400 feet from residential and 100 feet from non-residential uses. Tempe is proposing 500 feet from residential uses. Phoenix is proposing 150 feet from residential and additional standards when within 300 feet.	Section 11-31-36(F)(8)(b) revised
		9. Height limits are overly restrictive. Other ordinance provisions already address massing. Heights should align with underlying zoning.				Height: The maximum building height in the LI District is 40 feet and 50 feet in the GI and HI Districts. The proposed maximum is above the base standard and would require approval of a deviation through a PAD Overlay District.	
		10. Architectural requirements exceed base zoning and commercial office standards. Limit the requirements for enhanced finishes to the front façade only. The requirements should avoid being prescriptive.					
		11. Mechanical equipment placement restrictions are impractical. Buildings may face multiple sensitive adjacencies. Limit restriction to the front of the building only.				Mechanical Equipment: This location requirement was revised to prioritize the public realm and state that when possible mechanical equipment should be located at the rear or side of the building.	
		12. Please clarify that poles, masts, and towers are excluded from F.9.a				Substation Screening: Screening is only required of ground-mounted equipment.	
06/17/25	39	13. Align with Mesa’s underground utility standards, clarify that the requirements for undergrounding apply to 69kV and below.	N/A	Land Use	Diorio	Utility Undergrounding: The Utility’s goal is not to underground large transmission lines, but to respond to development feedback about overhead versus underground service while managing costs for all 18,000 customers. Each data center’s service plan will vary based on its site and existing infrastructure. Wherever possible, we will reuse current transmission lines to minimize expense, and if undergrounding is requested, the data center will cover the additional cost.	N/A
		14. Please confirm whether the requirements in G.4 apply to regular operations, not to construction, startup, or commissioning phases.				Backup Generators: Section 11-31-36(G)(4) addresses both routine and emergency use of backup generators. Section 11-31-36(G)(4)(c) contains an exception for the use of generators during power outages and electric utility demand response events.	
		1. Expressed grandfathering for those with vested rights is needed. Additionally, projects with vested site plan approvals should be provided some flexibility for modifications to accommodate changes that are inevitable during build-out.				Existing Data Centers Rights: Sections 12-15 of the Ordinance address waivers, the applicability of Section 11-31-36, and the ability of approved project to continue through permitting and platting.	
		2. The 400 ft buffer appears arbitrary, and staff should provide evidence or analysis to support this specific distance and its anticipated mitigation benefits. 200 ft buffers with 300 ft buffers for backup generators are more common. We'd recommend the opportunity to apply for an exception or variance to a buffer requirement if offsetting mitigation measures are proposed with compliance with a specific criterion.				Residential Separation Requirement: The text amendments do not include a 400 foot setback, but a 400 foot separation requirement from residential uses (and other sensitive receptors). Because the data center/associated equipment produce noise, exhaust, and heat, this mitigates potential impacts on these uses. This is in line with other municipalities. Mariana requires 400 feet from residential and 100 feet from non-residential uses. Tempe is proposing 500 feet from residential uses. Phoenix is proposing 150 feet from residential and additional standards when within 300 feet.	
		3. Clarify that existing non-conformities are allowed to remain if this legislation passes.				Non-conforming Use: Section 12 of the Ordinance addresses existing data centers whom have received a waiver and specifies that they will be considered legal conforming uses.	
06/17/25	40	4. Noise regulations setting standards around ambient noise conditions as a seeming limit to both issuance of a certificate of occupancy and as an operating condition are inequitable and discriminate unduly against noise generated by data centers as compared to other noise-emitting uses within the city. Mesa City Code sets a noise level for automobile and vehicle washing uses (11-31-7) at 55 decibels. The indoor noise levels attributable to airport operations are capped at 45 decibels for portions of structures that include sleeping areas and noise-sensitive areas (11-19-5). Drive-thru facilities must demonstrate not increasing ambient noise above 60 decibels (11-31-18).	N/A	Land Use	Diorio	Sound Study: The proposed amendments require that the baseline noise level at the nearest residential property line not be increased by the data center operations. This baseline level could be very different depending on the context (e.g. adjacent to an arterial roadway). Therefore this ensures that existing conditions are maintained.	Revised Table 11-32-3.A - minimum parking requirement
		5. Using ambient noise as a cap is especially problematic. Ambient noise may rise over time in general in a community. Since data centers operate 24/7, isolating their noise emissions from background noise is challenging. Unlike other facilities, data centers lack the flexibility to temporarily shut down to conduct assessments.					
		6. The City should set allowable noise standards by use and decibel levels to protect noise-receiving properties. The notice provisions also should be clarified so that it is clear who is to receive notice, under what circumstances, and with what exceptions (e.g., emergency conditions, power outages, or other temporary generation needs).				Sound Study: The proposed amendments require that the baseline noise level at the nearest residential property line not be increased by the data center operations. This baseline level could be very different depending on the context (e.g. adjacent to an arterial roadway). Therefore this ensures that existing conditions are maintained.	
		7. Parking required for any given data center should be as demonstrated by a traffic impact analysis prepared by a traffic engineer that includes a trip generation estimate identifying the parking needed to support the number of anticipated passenger car equivalent trips per day expected to access the site during construction and during regular operations. The proposed minimum parking standard of 1 space per 1,000 square feet is arbitrary and could lead to property use and design that is contrary to the public interest. It may result in empty parking lots that generate heat, amplify noise conditions, and leave less area for landscaping.				Back Up Generators: Section 11-31-36(G)(4) provides the requirements for noticing, including under what circumstances notice is required, and exceptions for power outages and electric utility demand response events.	
		8. Allow the Planning Director discretion to allow limited exceptions to the 60-foot building height restriction in appropriate circumstances and to exempt mechanical equipment and associated noise mitigation measures from the height limit, consistent with other industrial uses. This flexibility would be in addition to the proposed option to set an alternative height limit via the PAD. This flexibility is critical to accommodate essential infrastructure such as generator exhaust stacks required to meet air quality standards or noise mitigation walls, if needed.				Parking: The measurement aligns with the typical deviations and requests seen from data centers and accounts for ancillary uses, such as associated office space with additional employees. Based on additional research, and input from stakeholders, the text amendments now include: 1/5,000 SF for the first 200,000 SF and 1/10,000 SF thereafter.	
						Rooftop Mechanical Equipment: Rooftop mechanical equipment in all industrial districts is required to be screened per Section 11-30-9 of the MZO and is included in the maximum building height with the exception of mechanical penthouses per Table 11-30-3, which can exceed the maximum height by 10 feet in certain circumstances. This would apply to Data Centers as well.	

Exhibit 4 - Summary of Stakeholder Comments Related to Data Centers							
Comment Date	Line	Feedback	Support Oppose	Topic	Last Name	Response	Revision Made After 6.11.25
06/17/25	41	9. Including all equipment within the height limit places a unique and disproportionate burden on data centers, particularly when other industrial and commercial uses are not required to include rooftop mechanical equipment in height calculations.	N/A	Land Use	Diorio	Rooftop Mechanical Equipment: Rooftop mechanical equipment in all commercial and industrial districts is required to be screened per Section 11-30-9 of the MZO and is included in the maximum building height with the exception of mechanical penthouses per Table 11-30-3, which can exceed the maximum height by 10 feet in certain circumstances. This would apply to Data Centers as well.	Revised Section 11-31-36(F)(4)(b)
		10. Flexibility should be built into building placement standards by using language such as “to the greatest extent feasible given the site and use constraints.” 11. With respect to substations, the proposed requirement for a solid wall that extends one foot above the tallest piece of equipment may result in undesirable aesthetic impacts. This standard should be revisited to evaluate what elements truly need to be screened, whether a solid wall is preferable to a permeable option, and how that screening integrates with existing site fencing. The current code’s 8-foot wall height may be sufficient, and any fencing standard should be fixed rather than variable based on equipment height. We also encourage the City to consider making more allowances for providing exceptions based on specific requests, conditions, and market demand.				Building Placement: Language was modified to clarify that the primary (front) facade be oriented towards adjacent arterials or intersections. Substation Screening: Section 11-31-36(F)(9) revised to provide screen wall options for substation screen wall 10 feet or below and greater than 10 feet.	Section 11-31-36(F)(8)(b) revised
06/17/25	42	12. Currently, the Proposed Data Center Ordinance only provides for exceptions in the case of building height at the time of PAD approval. In this ever-evolving space, tying the applicants and the City to this snapshot in time may have unintended consequences of preventing adaptations that could be beneficial for the community or City and project inefficiency if they must go back for additional height modifications after the fact. 13. DCC respectfully requests that the City of Mesa include Light Industrial as a permissible zoning location for data centers in addition to General Industrial and Heavy Industrial zoning. Data center operations are typically more aligned to permissible Light Industrial uses rather than General Industrial or Heavy Industrial zoning which often have additional concerns related to smoke, traffic, and other environmental impacts more often seen in chemical manufacturing, mining, and power production. Mesa’s existing definition of Light Industrial and the proposed design requirements for data centers under the proposed ordinance are also aligned as under the definition of Light Industrial: “Individual developments include well-designed buildings on sites that may or may not have campus-like settings, and areas visible to the general public include well-designed landscape areas.” When applied, the proposed design guidance under 11-31-36 would establish such well-designed spaces.	N/A	Land Use	Diorio	Exceptions to Height: Section 11-30-3 of the MZO contains exceptions to height. Light Industrial Zoning: The proposed amendments address the unique operational characteristics of data centers and aim to mitigate potential impacts on the surrounding community, including residential uses. 1) LI zoning is commonly located adjacent to residential zoning. 2) The General Plan's Future Lan Use Plan provides guidance on future development to ensure consistency with the City's long term vision and guiding principles. Data Centers fall under the "Typical Land Use" category of "Warehouse and Storage" which in compatible with the Industrial Placetype where the HI and HI are the appropriate zoning.	N/A
* Comments received after 6.17.25 not included in the table above. However comments provided in the public comment documents.							