



PLANNING AND ZONING PUBLIC HEARING MEETING MINUTES

June 24, 2026

The Planning and Zoning Board of the City of Mesa met in the Council Chambers at City Hall, 20 East Main Street, on June 24, 2026, at 5:05 p.m.

BOARD PRESENT

Benjamin Ayers, Chairperson
Troy Peterson, Vice Chairperson
Jamie Blakeman, Boardmember
Jayson Carpenter, Boardmember
Chase Farnsworth, Boardmember*
Jeff Pitcher, Boardmember

BOARD ABSENT

Genessee Montes, Boardmember

STAFF PRESENT

Evan Balmer
Danika Heying
Mary Kopaskie-Brown
Sarah Steadman
Cassidy Welch

(*Participated in the meeting through the use of video conference equipment)

Chairperson Ayers conducted a roll call.

Chairperson Ayers excused Boardmember Montes from the entire meeting.

1. Take action on all Consent Agenda items.

All items listed with an asterisk (*) are on the consent agenda which means they will be considered as a group by the Board and will be enacted in one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a Boardmember or a citizen so requests, in which event the item will be removed from the consent agenda and considered as a separate item. If a citizen wants an item removed from the consent agenda, a request must be made prior to the Board's vote on the consent agenda.

It was moved by Vice Chairperson Peterson, seconded by Boardmember Carpenter, that the consent agenda items be approved.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Ayers, Peterson, Blakeman, Carpenter, Farnsworth, Pitcher

NAYS – None

ABSENT– Montes

Chairperson Ayers declared the motion carried unanimously by those present

*2. Approval of minutes of previous meetings as written.

Minutes from the Study Session and Public Hearing meetings held on June 10, 2026.

*3. Take action on the following zoning cases:

3-a See: **Items not on the Consent Agenda**

3-b See: **Items not on the Consent Agenda**

*4. Review, discuss and make a recommendation to the City Council regarding the following proposed amendment to the Mesa City Code:

4-a See: **Items not on the Consent Agenda**

*4-b **Proposed amendments to Mesa City Code, Title 11, Chapters 6, 7, 8, 31, and 86 pertaining to the emerging technology and use of electric vehicles, specifically Fleet-Based Services and Service Stations.** The amendments include, but are not limited to: adding definitions for Fleet-Based Services, Accessory Fleet-Based Services, Heavy Fleet-Based Services, and Accessory Electric Vehicle Charging; modifying definitions for Light Fleet-Based Services and Service Stations; adding Heavy Fleet-Based Services, Accessory Electric Vehicle Charging; modifying use tables and related footnotes to reflect the new definitions; modifying Section 11-31-25 titled, "Service Stations"; and adding Section 11-31-40 titled, "Fleet-Based Services."

Staff Recommendation: Adoption

5. Items not on the Consent Agenda

3-a. **ZON26-00155. "DU 5/6 South Plan Amendment,"** 750+/- acres located between East Elliot Road and East Point Twenty-Two Boulevard, and west of South Signal Butte Road, but not including the area north of East Rubidium Avenue and east of South Binary. Major Amendment to the Development Unit 5/6 South Development Unit Plan (DUP). This request will modify the boundary of the eastern portion of the DUP to align with East Rubidium and establish new boundaries for the District Land Use Group (LUG) and transition area. **(District 6)**

Planner: Jennifer Merrill

Staff Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

Ms. Merrill Presented case ZON26-00155.

At 5:37 p.m., Chairperson Ayers excused Boardmember Farnsworth from the remainder of the meeting.

It was moved by Chairperson Ayers, seconded by Boardmember Carpenter, that case ZON6-00155 be approved.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Ayers, Peterson, Blakeman, Carpenter, Pitcher
NAYS – None
ABSENT– Farnsworth, Montes

Chairperson Ayers declared the motion carried unanimously by those present

- 3-b **ZON25-00693. "Homestead at Eastmark,"** 11.7+ acres located at the southwest corner of South Signal Butte Road and East Rubidium Avenue. Major Site Plan Review for a new 261-unit apartment development and 2.2 acres of retail/commercial development. **(District 6).**

Planner: Jennifer Merrill

Staff Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

Ms. Merrill Presented case ZON25-00693.

Representative for the applicant, Lindsay Schube with the law firm of Gammage and Burnham, displayed a PowerPoint presentation for case ZON26-00155 and the associated Homestead at Eastmark site plan review case ZON25-00693

Ms. Schube provided a historical timeline using aerial photography from 2017 to 2026 to demonstrate the evolution of Eastmark's roadway networks and built environment, noting that the construction of Rubidium necessitated these requested cleanup items. She explained that the proposed project consists of a 26-acre park expansion alongside an 11.7-acre mixed-use development, which aligns with General Plan principal uses for multifamily housing and commercial retail. Ms. Schube addressed neighborhood concerns by clarifying that Eastmark was originally master planned for 15,000 residential units and 365 acres of District land use, whereas only 5,300 units and 27.4 acres of District have been built to date, confirming that local infrastructure possesses more than adequate capacity.

Ms. Schube highlighted that the transition area was always intended by the original community plan to serve as a flexible holding pattern to protect single-family residences from northern employment sectors. She detailed the extensive landscape buffering provided between the project and the single-family homes to the south, showcasing a perspective view of an 87-to-88-foot enhanced landscape buffer, which significantly exceeds standard residential setbacks. Regarding privacy concerns, she noted that the southwest building features only 12 elevated, non-visual architectural windows designed strictly to let in light and offered a formal stipulation to glaze them if requested. Ms. Schube summarized their neighborhood outreach, noting they noticed over 2,150 residents three separate times, resulting in small turnouts across four community meetings. She concluded by highlighting that Economic Development supports the project as a vital walkability buffer against intensive industrial truck traffic and noise to the north and requested approval.

Vice Chairperson Peterson questioned staff regarding the citizen input received online and requested an assessment of three items: the land use boundary shift, the building height, and the buffer adjacent to existing homes. Ms. Merrill clarified that the district land use group boundary shift meets all District Plan (DUP) amendment requirements, as the principal multifamily and retail uses are fully aligned with the General Plan.

Regarding the southern buffer, Ms. Merrill stated that staff worked with the applicant to remove previously proposed parking lots and replace them with a 50-foot minimum north-south open space landscape buffer that directly connects to the existing park to the south. Assistant Planning Director, Evan Balmer, elaborated that the distance from the southwest apartment building corner to the nearest single-family lot line is exactly 87.9 feet. He noted that under traditional off-site city zoning parameters (such as RM-2 or RM-4), the standard setback requirement would be 15 feet per story (45 feet total for a three-story building), meaning the applicant's proposed 87.9-foot buffer substantially exceeds traditional development standards.

Chairperson Ayers expressed strong recommendations that the city formally require visual structural section diagrams for all future development applications featuring similar neighborhood interfaces, noting that a visual perspective section would have much more clearly illustrated the substantial 88-foot distance for the public and the board.

The following citizens addressed the Board in opposition to case number ZON25-00693 and case ZON26-00155:

- Rich Baliff, a Mesa resident

The above speaker offered a series of comments in opposition to the case number ZON25-00693 and case ZON26-00155 including, but not limited to the following:

- Noted that low turnout at previous neighborhood meetings was due to a perceived lack of collaboration from the developer.
- Stated that when residents purchased their homes in 2018, they were promised a continuous 250-to-300-foot-wide park buffer extending north to the existing Safeway complex, making the replacement of this open space with apartments unacceptable.
- Cited specific mandatory language within the adopted community plan declaring that the residential character of District Unit 6 South *"will be"* single-family or mid-density single-family, arguing that three-story apartments undermine the plain language of the plan.
- Highlighted past instances where the board successfully held the developer accountable to community commitments.

Ms. Schube returned to the podium to address the public comments. She countered that no false promises were made, explaining that the community plan was intentionally written to remain flexible. She emphasized that the overall open space has actually doubled—increasing by 16 acres to create a 26-acre community park that the developer will construct and deed to the city. She reiterated that the 87.9-foot landscape buffer represents the largest setback buffer between a single-family neighborhood and a mixed-use project she has recorded in the State of Arizona, which will serve as an excellent visual and auditory shield against northern industrial truck corridors.

Chairperson Ayers asked staff to address written citizen concerns regarding regional school capacities and traffic impacts. Ms. Merrill confirmed that local school districts reviewed the project and stated they possess ample capacity and further verified that city transportation staff reviewed the traffic impact statements and resolved all initial comments without outstanding concerns.

Boardmember Peterson expressed continuing concerns regarding the building height and the buffer width, stating that despite the 87.9-foot buffer offer, the project still represents a net loss of a large historical buffer area for the residents, leaves a smaller buffer than what exists on the east side of those homes, and creates a three-story structure looking directly down into five single-family backyards.

Chairperson Ayers opened the floor to additional board discussion and motions, noting that historical research from the study session revealed the "transition zone" land use designation was originally left broad, mapping out a holding pattern classified under a generalized civic and open space framework across the entirety of Eastmark.

It was moved by Chairperson Ayers, seconded by Boardmember Carpenter, that case ZON25-00693 be approved with the additional condition that all glazing on the south elevation of the southwestern most building shall be frosted glass.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Ayers, Peterson, Blakeman, Carpenter, Pitcher

NAYS – None

ABSENT– Farnsworth, Montes

Chairperson Ayers declared the motion carried unanimously by those present

- 4-a **Proposed amendments to Mesa City Code, Title 11, Chapters 5, 6, 7, 8, 30, 31, 33, 34, 43, 67, 81, 86, and 87.** The amendments include, but are not limited to: modifying entryway monumentation requirements; refining building material and color standards; updating Employment District use tables and development standards; clarifying lot and land division requirements; modifying pedestrian connection requirements; modifying standards for Detached Accessory Buildings or Structures and Accessory Dwelling Units; updating Live/Work Unit and residential use standards in Commercial Districts; refining Data Center and Battery Energy Storage System screening requirements; modifying landscaping and alternative landscape plan provisions; modifying landscape diversity requirements; updating Manufactured Home and Recreational Vehicle Accessory Structure standards; clarifying sign regulations; updating procedural requirements related to written protests, application review, and expirations; modifying definitions of "Home Occupations," "Live/Work Units," and "Indoor Warehousing And Storage"; relocating the definition of "Skilled Nursing Facility" to Public and Semi-Public Use Classification, and adding a definition for "Hazardous Material Warehousing and Storage."

Staff Recommendation: Adoption

It was moved by Chairperson Ayers, seconded by Boardmember Carpenter, that Proposed amendments to Mesa City Code, Title 11, Chapters 5, 6, 7, 8, 30, 31, 33, 34, 43, 67, 81, 86, and 87 be approved with the agreed bollard condition for pedestrian and auto separation to section 11-30-8 subsection of the Mesa City Code amendments.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Ayers, Peterson, Blakeman, Carpenter, Pitcher

NAYS – None

ABSENT– Farnsworth, Montes

5. Adjourn.

Without objection, the Planning and Zoning Board Public Hearing adjourned at 6:04 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the Planning and Zoning Board meeting of the City of Mesa, Arizona, held on 24th day of June 2026. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

TROY PETERSON, VICE CHAIRPERSON

DH
(Attachments – 4)