

From: [Mesa Development Services](#)
To: [Long Range Planning](#)
Subject: Proposed Text Amendments Comment
Date: Wednesday, May 27, 2026 12:26:19 PM

This Message Is From an External Sender


Use caution when clicking links, attachments, or responding to information requests.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Proposed Text Amendments Comment

Name	JAZZMINE CLIFTON
Are you submitting feedback as a:	Developer / Builder
I have a comment or question regarding:	2026 Zoning Code Refinement Fleet-Based Services & Service Station Text Amendments General Comments
2026 Zoning Code Refinement - please indicate the draft code section and your questions/comments	Since hazardous material quantities are already heavily regulated through the International Fire Code and Fire Department review, what additional land use concerns is the City trying to address through this zoning change? - Has staff evaluated whether these amendments could unintentionally discourage modern logistics, EV infrastructure, and industrial users from locating in Mesa?
Fleet-Based Services & Service Station Text Amendments - please indicate the draft code section and your questions/comments	Is the City concerned about specific types of Fleet based industrial users? - The code appears to regulate fleet parking, charging, and staging separately from traditional parking. How does the City plan to manage/enforce after occupancy?
	- What specific operational issues,

Please provide your general question/comments	complaints, or enforcement challenges is the City experiencing today that are driving these amendments? - Has the City compared these proposed standards against competing markets like Phoenix, Chandler, Gilbert, or Glendale?
Would you like a response to your question(s)?	Yes
Would you like to be notified of future public meetings?	Yes
Email	jclifton@evgre.com



[Help articles](#) | [Support portal](#)

Forms & Workflow is a [Granicus](#) product.

From: [Rachel Phillips](#)
To: jclifton@evgre.com
Cc: [Long Range Planning](#); [Nana Appiah](#)
Subject: Proposed Text Amendment Comments Response
Date: Wednesday, May 27, 2026 3:36:21 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Jazzmine,

Thank you for your comments. Below are responses to your questions. Please reach out if you have any further questions.

Question: Since hazardous material quantities are already heavily regulated through the International Fire Code and Fire Department review, what additional land use concerns is the City trying to address through this zoning change? Has staff evaluated whether these amendments could unintentionally discourage modern logistics, EV infrastructure, and industrial users from locating in Mesa?

City Response: While the International Building Code and International Fire Code regulate occupancy classifications, control areas, and operational safety requirements for hazardous materials, they do not address broader land use compatibility considerations within the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed amendments are intended to provide additional clarity regarding where certain hazardous material warehousing and storage uses are appropriate based on surrounding land uses and zoning districts, particularly near residential areas and other sensitive uses.

Staff worked collaboratively with the Chief Building Official and Fire Marshal to identify occupancy classifications and operational characteristics that may warrant additional zoning review due to scale, intensity, or compatibility considerations. The amendments are not intended to prohibit modern logistics, EV infrastructure, or industrial development, but rather to ensure that emerging industrial uses are clearly classified and located in areas appropriate for their operational characteristics.

Mesa continues to support advanced manufacturing, logistics, technology, and EV-related industries, and staff does not believe the proposed amendments will discourage these users from locating within the City. Instead, the amendments are intended to provide greater predictability and transparency for both applicants and surrounding property owners.

Question: Is the City concerned about specific types of Fleet based industrial users? The code appears to regulate fleet parking, charging, and staging separately from traditional parking. How does the City plan to manage/enforce after occupancy?

City Response: The proposed text amendments were not prompted by concerns regarding a specific operator or business type. Rather, the amendments respond to evolving technologies and operational models, including electric vehicle fleets, drone delivery services, and other emerging fleet-based operations, to provide clearer use classifications and operational standards within the Zoning Ordinance.

The proposed standards distinguish fleet vehicle parking, charging, and staging areas from traditional customer or employee parking because these areas function operationally differently and may involve specialized equipment, infrastructure, and screening considerations.

As with any development, fleet-based operations would be subject to the City's standard planning, permitting, and inspection processes, including zoning review, Development Plan approval where applicable, and building permits. Following occupancy, compliance with approved plans and applicable Zoning Ordinance standards would be enforced through the City's Code Compliance process in coordination with Planning staff as necessary.

Question: What specific operational issues, or enforcement challenges is the City experiencing today that are driving these amendments? Has the City compared these proposed standards against competing markets like Phoenix, Chandler, Gilbert, or Glendale?

City Response: The proposed amendments were not initiated in response to a particular enforcement issue, complaint, or operational problem. Instead, the amendments are proactive in nature and are intended to address evolving technologies and emerging business models that are not specifically addressed within the City's existing use classifications and development standards.

As new forms of logistics, delivery services, fleet operations, EV charging infrastructure, and aerial-based technologies continue to emerge, staff identified a need to modernize portions of the Zoning Ordinance to improve clarity, predictability, and consistency in how these uses are classified and reviewed.

Staff has had discussions with several peer jurisdictions regarding how they are approaching these emerging land uses. In many cases, jurisdictions are still evaluating how to classify and regulate these operations. Mesa's proposed amendments are intended to position the City proactively by establishing clear definitions and standards before

significant uncertainty or inconsistency arises during the development review process.

Best Regards,
Rachel



Rachel Phillips, AICP | Assistant Planning Director

Tel: (480) 644-2762

55 N. Center St. | Mesa, AZ 85201

Office Hours: M-Th 7am to 6pm | Closed Fridays & Holidays

From: [Rachel Phillips](#)
To: jclifton@evgre.com
Cc: [Long Range Planning](#)
Subject: Fleet Services Text Amendment Follow Up
Date: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 7:58:38 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Jazzmine,

Our Building Official is back from break and I was able to connect with him regarding your question on control areas and whether those would apply to the building or tenant space. He said they would apply to the building.

Best Regards,
Rachel



Rachel Phillips, AICP | Assistant Planning Director
Tel: (480) 644-2762
55 N. Center St. | Mesa, AZ 85201
Office Hours: M-Th 7am to 6pm | Closed Fridays & Holidays

From: [Jazzmine Clifton](#)
To: [Rachel Phillips](#)
Cc: [Laura Ortiz](#); [Sean Pesek](#)
Subject: Re: Hazardous Warehousing and Storage amendment
Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 4:33:30 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

This Message Is From an External Sender

Use caution when clicking links, attachments, or responding to information requests.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Rachel,

Thank you for the prompt response. I am glad to hear that you and your team were able to discuss internally and allow hazardous material warehousing as a CUP in the LI district.

Thank you,

Jazzmine Clifton **Development Manager**

Main: 602.808.8600 | Mobile: 720.519.6577

From: Rachel Phillips <Rachel.Phillips@MesaAZ.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2026 4:35 PM
To: Jazzmine Clifton <jclifton@evgre.com>
Cc: Laura Ortiz <lortiz@evgre.com>; Sean Pesek <Sean.Pesek@mesaaz.gov>
Subject: Hazardous Warehousing and Storage amendment

Jazzmine,

I met with Laura today to discuss the upcoming text amendments. She passed along your comments and I wanted to let you know that I discussed them with staff and we made the change to allow Hazardous Material Warehousing in Storage in the LI District with a CUP.

Best Regards,
Rachel



Rachel Phillips, AICP | Assistant Planning Director

Tel: (480) 644-2762

55 N. Center St. | Mesa, AZ 85201

Office Hours: M-Th 7am to 6pm | Closed Fridays & Holidays

From: [Rachel Phillips](#)
To: [Jake Robinson](#)
Cc: [Hector Soliman-Valdez](#); [Eric Daniel](#); [Long Range Planning](#); [Ian Linssen](#); [Chris Tiller](#); [Alexis Wagner](#); [Sean Pesek](#)
Subject: RE: Proposed Text Amendments Comment
Date: Thursday, June 4, 2026 4:15:04 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[Fleet Services and Service Station Text Amendments\(revised\).pdf](#)
[image002.png](#)

Jake,

I wanted to follow up and share with you and your team revisions that staff has made to the proposed text amendments in response to stakeholder comments. I hope you'll see that we tried to address several of your comments such as the threshold for Fleet-Based Services and screening requirements.

Please let us know if you have any other thoughts/comments.

Best Regards,
Rachel



Rachel Phillips, AICP | Assistant Planning Director

Tel: (480) 644-2762

55 N. Center St. | Mesa, AZ 85201

Office Hours: M-Th 7am to 6pm | Closed Fridays & Holidays

From: Jake Robinson <jake.robinson@flyzipline.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2026 2:43 PM
To: Rachel Phillips <Rachel.Phillips@mesaaz.gov>
Cc: Hector Soliman-Valdez <hector.soliman@flyzipline.com>; Eric Daniel <eric.daniel@flyzipline.com>; Long Range Planning <LongRangePlanning@mesaaz.gov>; Ian Linssen <Ian.Linssen@mesaaz.gov>; Chris Tiller <Chris.Tiller@mesaaz.gov>; Alexis Wagner <Alexis.Wagner@mesaaz.gov>
Subject: Re: Proposed Text Amendments Comment

This Message Is From an External Sender

Use caution when clicking links, attachments, or responding to information requests.

[Report Suspicious](#)



Good afternoon,

Thank you again for the opportunity to discuss the proposed text amendments for Service Stations and Fleet-Based Services and how they will impact drone delivery in Mesa.

In addition to the feedback we shared on the call, I wanted to follow up regarding the 24-vehicle threshold that separates light from heavy fleet based services. Due to the rapidly-changing nature of drone delivery, site infrastructure, and the number of drones each charging site can house, we support replacing the set vehicle limit with a square footage threshold of <10,000 sq ft. We believe this threshold likely accomplishes the city's goal of separating large from small fleet based services while also giving Zipline and other operators the ability to grow and iterate sites within the ordinance's confines.

Please let us know if there is anything else Zipline can provide going forward.

Best regards,

Jake Robinson, State & Local Government Affairs Manager

www.zipline.com

p: +1-830-203-9453



From: [Rachel Phillips](#)
To: eric.daniel@flyzipline.com
Cc: [Long Range Planning](#); [Ian Linssen](#); [Chris Tiller](#)
Subject: RE: Proposed Text Amendments Comment
Date: Tuesday, May 19, 2026 7:28:44 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi Eric,

Thank you for your comments. It would be great to meet and hear your feedback on the proposed text amendments. Please let me know when a good time is and I can have someone from our team set something up.

Best Regards,
Rachel



Rachel Phillips, AICP | Assistant Planning Director
Tel: (480) 644-2762
55 N. Center St. | Mesa, AZ 85201
Office Hours: M-Th 7am to 6pm | Closed Fridays & Holidays

From: Mesa Development Services <noreply@openforms.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2026 7:20 AM
To: Long Range Planning <longrangeplanning@mesaaz.gov>
Subject: Proposed Text Amendments Comment

This Message Is From an External Sender

Use caution when clicking links, attachments, or responding to information requests.

[Report Suspicious](#)



Proposed Text Amendments Comment

Name	Eric Daniel
Are you submitting feedback as a:	Other: Drone Delivery Operator
I have a comment or question regarding:	Fleet-Based Services & Service Station Text Amendments
2026 Zoning Code Refinement - please indicate the draft code section and your questions/comments	
Fleet-Based Services & Service Station Text Amendments - please indicate the	These comments are submitted on behalf of Zipline International Inc. ("Zipline") in connection with the City of Mesa's proposed Fleet-Based Services & Service Station Text Amendments. We welcome the opportunity to offer perspective from an industry leader actively deploying autonomous drone delivery services across the country. About Zipline Zipline is a global leader in autonomous drone delivery, with extensive operational experience delivering medical supplies, consumer goods, and food and beverage products in communities across the country and around the world. It operates using a two-part system in which a small, tethered "pod" descends from a drone to pick up packages from local business partners and again to deliver packages directly to a customer's doorstep, before returning to a Zipline Charger. This approach eliminates the need for the drone itself to land at the pickup or delivery point. Zipline Chargers are compact, low-profile units purpose-built to integrate safely into commercial environments. Zipline operates with an industry-leading safety record in full compliance with FAA requirements. Our platform is fully electric, produces zero direct emissions, and reduces local vehicle

draft code section and your questions/comments	miles traveled making deliveries by drone instead of conventional delivery vehicles. Comments As the City refines these standards, we respectfully encourage attention to the evolving federal and state regulatory landscape governing drone operations, and to ensuring that local requirements complement rather than conflict with that framework. Building reasonable flexibility into the ordinance will help ensure it remains workable as that landscape continues to develop. We would also welcome the opportunity to consult with City staff as standards applicable to aerial-based vehicle infrastructure are reviewed. Drone delivery technology differs meaningfully in character, scale, and community impact from the ground-based fleet operations these amendments are primarily designed to address, and we believe that early engagement with industry can help ensure that the City's standards are technically feasible, appropriately calibrated to actual impacts, and supportive of the deployment of infrastructure that benefits Mesa residents and businesses.
Please provide your general question/comments	
Would you like a response to your question(s)?	Yes
Would you like to be notified of future public meetings?	Yes
Email	eric.daniel@flyzipline.com

From: [Kevin Xue](#)
To: [Rachel Phillips](#); [Long Range Planning](#); [Sean Pesek](#)
Cc: [Francesca Wahl](#); [David Ely](#); [Drew Sartell](#); [Ian Linssen](#); [Chris Tiller](#); [Kirstin Dvorchak](#); [Nana Appiah](#)
Subject: Re: Tesla Comments - City of Mesa Proposed Text Amendment - Service Stations & Fleet-Based Services
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 3:25:03 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

This Message Is From an External Sender

Use caution when clicking links, attachments, or responding to information requests.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Hi Rachel,

Thank you so much for sharing this update and for working with us on this section.

The revised language ("Where provided...") is a fantastic solution. It gives us the operational flexibility we need for challenging infill sites, while ensuring that when we do build shade structures or solar canopies, they are high-quality and integrate well with the site's character.

We will circle back if we have additional feedback. Thank you.

Best Regards,
Kevin

Kevin Xue

Policy Analyst, North American Charging
3500 Deer Creek Road, Palo Alto, CA 94304
E. zixue@tesla.com

From: Rachel Phillips <Rachel.Phillips@MesaAZ.gov>

Sent: Thursday, June 11, 2026 1:51 PM

To: Kevin Xue <zixue@tesla.com>; Long Range Planning <LongRangePlanning@MesaAZ.gov>; Sean Pesek <Sean.Pesek@mesaaz.gov>

Cc: Francesca Wahl <fwahl@tesla.com>; David Ely <daely@tesla.com>; Ian Linssen <Ian.Linssen@MesaAZ.gov>; Chris Tiller <Chris.Tiller@mesaaz.gov>; Kirstin Dvorchak <Kirstin.Dvorchak@mesaaz.gov>; Nana Appiah <Nana.Appiah@mesaaz.gov>

Subject: RE: Tesla Comments - City of Mesa Proposed Text Amendment - Service Stations & Fleet-Based Services

Kevin,

Thank you for your input regarding the shade structure requirements. After discussing the request, staff is proposing the following revisions:

ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING SHADE STRUCTURE DESIGN. WHERE PROVIDED,

Best Regards,
Rachel



Rachel Phillips, AICP | Assistant Planning Director
Tel: (480) 644-2762
55 N. Center St. | Mesa, AZ 85201
Office Hours: M-Th 7am to 6pm | Closed Fridays & Holidays

Kevin,

Thank you for that clarification. Let us (staff) consider that information.

For **Accessory Vehicle Charging**, yes, I can confirm it isn't subject to the 6-foot masonry wall requirement. When there are specific regulations for a land use their location is listed in the "Additional Use Regulations" column. I do want to make sure that you see the footnotes that pertain to Accessory Vehicle Charging at the bottom of the table.

Table 11-6-2: Commercial Districts						
Proposed Use	NC	LC	GC	OC	MX	Additional Use Regulations
...						
Commercial Use Classifications						

32. ACCESSORY ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING SPACES SHALL NOT OCCUPY MORE THAN 20% OF THE REQUIRED ON-SITE PARKING UNLESS A PARKING STUDY DEMONSTRATES THAT ADDITIONAL PARKING EXISTS. IN SUCH CASES, EXCESS PARKING SPACES MAY BE CONVERTED TO ACCESSORY VEHICLE PARKING.

33. ACCESSORY ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING SPACES SHALL NOT CONTAIN SIGNAGE INDICATING THAT THE SPACES ARE RESERVED EXCLUSIVELY FOR ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING.

34. ANY REQUIRED LANDSCAPING REMOVED AS A RESULT OF EVSE INSTALLATION SHALL BE REPLACED ELSEWHERE ON THE SITE TO MAINTAIN COMPLIANCE WITH THE LANDSCAPING REQUIREMENTS OF THIS ORDINANCE.

In regards to the **Fleet-Based Services** wall and fencing requirement, Section 11-30-4 specifies permitted materials. Staff recommended the masonry wall for a couple of reasons: 1) Due to existing Code requirements for screening of mechanical equipment; 2) The assumption that operators would want to secure their property; 3) Because chain-link isn't permitted within public view it would be challenging to make the transition in materials from street adjacent side yard toward the rear; and 4) In Mesa, unless in a group commercial center with cross access, most commercial and industrial properties end up installing a masonry whether for security or buffering from surrounding uses.

Instead, staff tried to provide a more flexible approach along street side setbacks with requirements that mirror those for typical parking lots.

2. Fence Materials in Commercial and Employment Districts.

a. *Materials.* Walls and Fences shall be constructed of high-quality materials, such as tinted, textured blocks; brick; stone; or ornamental metal; and shall complement the design of an overall development and its surroundings.

i. Chain link may only be used when not visible from public view.

ii. Wood fencing is not allowed, except wood may be used in conjunction with metal frames for gates used in conjunction with required Screening walls.

iii. The use of barbed wire, razor wire, embedded glass shards, ultra barrier, electrified and other hazardous fencing is prohibited in Street-facing yards or where adjacent to any public Right-Of-Way.

Hope this helps explain some of the rationale and provides some surety on the Accessory Electric Vehicle Charging regulations.

Best Regards,
Rachel



Rachel Phillips, AICP | Assistant Planning Director
Tel: (480) 644-2762
55 N. Center St. | Mesa, AZ 85201
Office Hours: M-Th 7am to 6pm | Closed Fridays & Holidays

From: Kevin Xue <zixue@tesla.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 3:29 PM
To: Rachel Phillips <Rachel.Phillips@MesaAZ.gov>; Long Range Planning <LongRangePlanning@MesaAZ.gov>; Sean Pesek <Sean.Pesek@mesaaz.gov>
Cc: Francesca Wahl <fwahl@tesla.com>; David Ely <daely@tesla.com>; Ian Linssen <Ian.Linssen@MesaAZ.gov>; Chris Tiller <Chris.Tiller@mesaaz.gov>; Kirstin Dvorchak <Kirstin.Dvorchak@mesaaz.gov>; Nana Appiah <Nana.Appiah@mesaaz.gov>
Subject: Re: Tesla Comments - City of Mesa Proposed Text Amendment - Service Stations & Fleet-Based Services

Hi Rachel,

Thank you for confirming the 16-stall cap correction, and for the clarification regarding accessory screening.

To answer your question regarding charger types: If Tesla were to operate a standalone public site (classified as a Service Station), we would be deploying Level 3 / DC Fast Chargers (DCFC).

From a site design perspective, our Level 3 dispensers and power cabinets are fully NEMA-rated, self-contained, weatherproof outdoor appliances. Unlike liquid fuel pumps, which require canopies for fire safety, spill suppression, and to keep rainwater out of underground tanks, DC Fast Chargers are designed specifically to sit safely exposed to the elements. This is why mandating a shade structure for EV charging is unnecessary from a safety standpoint and why making them optional ("may be covered") allows us to deploy capital much more efficiently on challenging infill sites.

Regarding your comment on screening: It is very helpful to know that standard Accessory EV Charging will not trigger the fleet screening rules. However, we want to clarify how the revised code treats actual fleet uses:

- **Accessory Fleet Uses:** If a site is approved for "Light Fleet-Based Services" as an accessory use (which is permitted in LC, GC, LI, GI, and HI), can you confirm that this accessory fleet use is also exempt from the internal side and rear masonry screening walls? We want to ensure that is clear in the language.
- **Primary Fleet Uses (Fencing vs. Masonry):** For a standalone private fleet hub, a 6-foot masonry wall along the side and rear property lines is cost-prohibitive. Does the addition of 11-31-40(C) Fences and Walls allow for standard commercial fencing to be used in lieu of a masonry wall?

Thank you again for taking this into consideration. We have noted the June 24th Planning and Zoning Board date and look forward to seeing the final draft!

Best,
Kevin

Kevin Xue

Policy Analyst, North American Charging
3500 Deer Creek Road, Palo Alto, CA 94304
E. zixue@tesla.com

From: Rachel Phillips <Rachel.Phillips@MesaAZ.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 10:28 AM

To: Kevin Xue <zixue@tesla.com>; Long Range Planning <LongRangePlanning@MesaAZ.gov>; Sean Pesek <Sean.Pesek@mesaaz.gov>

Cc: Francesca Wahl <fwahl@tesla.com>; David Ely <daely@tesla.com>; Bill Ehrlich <wehrlich@tesla.com>; Ian Linssen <Ian.Linssen@MesaAZ.gov>; Chris Tiller <Chris.Tiller@mesaaz.gov>; Kirstin Dvorchak <Kirstin.Dvorchak@mesaaz.gov>; Nana Appiah <Nana.Appiah@mesaaz.gov>

Subject: RE: Tesla Comments - City of Mesa Proposed Text Amendment - Service Stations & Fleet-Based Services

Kevin,
Thank you for the feedback.

We did see this miss on the 16-stall cap and corrected that. Thank you for mentioning it.

Staff will take your comments on #2 into consideration. If I could ask a follow up question. If Tesla were to operate a Service Station would they have a standardized type of charger? (Type 1, 2,3?)

On your comment #3 I want to clarify one item. Accessory Electric Vehicle Charging is not subject to Service Station or Fleet-Based Service development standards. That being said they wouldn't be required to provide any screening.

Thanks again for the comments and we'll be in touch with any further revisions and a reminder that we're heading to the Planning and Zoning Board for their recommendation on June 24th.

Best Regards,
Rachel



Rachel Phillips, AICP | Assistant Planning Director
Tel: (480) 644-2762
55 N. Center St. | Mesa, AZ 85201
Office Hours: M-Th 7am to 6pm | Closed Fridays & Holidays

From: Kevin Xue <zixue@tesla.com>

Sent: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 9:52 AM

To: Rachel Phillips <Rachel.Phillips@MesaAZ.gov>; Long Range Planning <LongRangePlanning@MesaAZ.gov>; Sean Pesek <Sean.Pesek@mesaaz.gov>

Cc: Francesca Wahl <fwahl@tesla.com>; David Ely <daely@tesla.com>; Bill Ehrlich <wehrlich@tesla.com>; Ian Linssen <Ian.Linssen@MesaAZ.gov>; Chris Tiller <Chris.Tiller@mesaaz.gov>; Kirstin Dvorchak <Kirstin.Dvorchak@mesaaz.gov>; Nana Appiah <Nana.Appiah@mesaaz.gov>

Subject: Re: Tesla Comments - City of Mesa Proposed Text Amendment - Service Stations & Fleet-Based Services

Hi Rachel,

Thank you for sharing the revised draft and for taking the time to incorporate stakeholder feedback. We appreciate you and the team working with us on this.

The new allowance for EV spaces to utilize up to 20% of required parking, as well as increasing the Light Fleet threshold to 50 vehicles, are promising updates. These changes will significantly help us deploy charging at commercial host sites.

As we reviewed the revised text, we wanted to flag one quick drafting cleanup, along with our two primary remaining concerns regarding physical site design:

1. Drafting Cleanup: The 16-Stall Cap

We saw that staff successfully removed the 16-stall limit for accessory charging in the

Commercial Districts (Table 11-6-2, Note 33). However, it appears the 16-stall limit was accidentally left intact in the Employment Districts (Table 11-7-2, Note 24) and Downtown Districts (Table 11-8-2, Note 19). We assume the intent was to remove this universally, so we wanted to flag those sections for consistency.

2. Standalone Hubs: Mandatory Shade Structures (Section 11-31-25.D)

We see that staff separated EV charging from fuel pump canopies and created a new "Shade Structure" requirement. While we appreciate the distinction, the new text still dictates that EV spaces "shall be covered" by a shade structure. While we frequently build solar shade structures where site geometry allows, mandating them on every standalone site will render many urban and infill locations physically or economically unfeasible due to underground utility conflicts, footing setbacks, and massive civil costs. We respectfully request that Section 11-31-25(D) be amended to state that EV spaces "may be covered" by a shade structure, keeping it optional.

3. Private/Fleet Hubs: Internal Masonry Screening (Section 11-31-40.B.1.b)

The requirement to build a 6-foot masonry wall along internal side and rear property lines is a major blocker for our private charging pipeline.

- For standalone private hubs, this is cost-prohibitive.
- For accessory sites, commercial landlords will simply not allow us to build 6-foot concrete walls in the middle of their properties.
- Furthermore, because Section 11-31-40(A)(2)(b) already requires accessory fleet vehicles to be parked on the side or rear of a building, an additional internal masonry wall is redundant. We ask that this internal 6-foot masonry wall requirement be removed or replaced with flexible landscaping options.

Thank you again for your continued partnership in helping us remove barriers to EV infrastructure. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Best,
Kevin

From: Rachel Phillips <Rachel.Phillips@MesaAZ.gov>

Sent: Thursday, June 4, 2026 4:38 PM

To: Francesca Wahl <fwahl@tesla.com>; Long Range Planning <LongRangePlanning@MesaAZ.gov>; Sean Pesek <Sean.Pesek@mesaaz.gov>

Cc: Kevin Xue <zixue@tesla.com>; David Ely <daely@tesla.com>; Bill Ehrlich <wehrlich@tesla.com>; Ian Linssen <Ian.Linssen@MesaAZ.gov>; Chris Tiller <Chris.Tiller@mesaaz.gov>; Kirstin Dvorchak <Kirstin.Dvorchak@mesaaz.gov>; Nana Appiah <Nana.Appiah@mesaaz.gov>

Subject: RE: Tesla Comments - City of Mesa Proposed Text Amendment - Service Stations & Fleet-Based Services

Francesca,

I wanted to follow up and share with you and your team revisions that staff has made to the proposed text amendments in response to stakeholder comments. I hope you'll see that we tried to address several of your comments such as the threshold for Accessory Electric Vehicle Charging, the use of required parking for Accessory Vehicle Charging, and canopy requirements for Service Stations.

Please let us know if you have any other thoughts/comments.

Best Regards,
Rachel



Rachel Phillips, AICP | Assistant Planning Director
Tel: (480) 644-2762
55 N. Center St. | Mesa, AZ 85201
Office Hours: M-Th 7am to 6pm | Closed Fridays & Holidays

From: Rachel Phillips
Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2026 8:03 AM
To: Francesca Wahl <fwahl@tesla.com>; Long Range Planning <LongRangePlanning@MesaAZ.gov>; Sean Pesek <Sean.Pesek@mesaaz.gov>
Cc: Kevin Xue <zixue@tesla.com>; David Ely <daely@tesla.com>; Bill Ehrlich <wehrlich@tesla.com>; Ian Linssen <Ian.Linssen@MesaAZ.gov>; Chris Tiller <Chris.Tiller@mesaaz.gov>; Kirstin Dvorchak <Kirstin.Dvorchak@mesaaz.gov>; Nana Appiah <Nana.Appiah@mesaaz.gov>
Subject: RE: Tesla Comments - City of Mesa Proposed Text Amendment - Service Stations & Fleet-Based Services

Francesca,
Thank you for your comments. We will review them in greater detail as part of our continued evaluation of the proposed text amendment. I did, however, want to provide clarification on a few items, as there may be some misunderstanding regarding how new and existing language is presented within a text amendment, as well as how certain requirements related to electric vehicle charging interact with other applicable standards within the Zoning Ordinance.

If you have any questions or would like to discuss any of the comments further, please feel free to reach out.

Thank you,
Rachel

|



Rachel Phillips, AICP | Assistant Planning Director

Tel: (480) 644-2762

55 N. Center St. | Mesa, AZ 85201

Office Hours: M-Th 7am to 6pm | Closed Fridays & Holidays

From: Francesca Wahl <fwahl@tesla.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2026 6:40 PM

To: Long Range Planning <longrangeplanning@mesaaz.gov>; Sean Pesek <Sean.Pesek@mesaaz.gov>

Cc: Kevin Xue <zixue@tesla.com>; David Ely <daely@tesla.com>; Bill Ehrlich <wehrlich@tesla.com>

Subject: Tesla Comments - City of Mesa Proposed Text Amendment - Service Stations & Fleet-Based Services

Please find attached Tesla's comments on the proposed text amendments to related to Service Stations and Fleet-Based Services.

We'd be happy to jump on a brief call if you have any questions regarding our comments.

City of Mesa Response : 5/27/26

TO: City of Mesa Planning Division

FROM: Kevin Xue, Policy Analyst, Tesla

DATE: May 26, 2026

SUBJECT: Public Comment – Proposed Text Amendments (Service Stations & Fleet-Based Services)

As a provider of direct current fast charging (DCFC) infrastructure, Tesla appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed text amendments that impact electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure deployment in Mesa. While incorporating EV charging into the zoning code is important, applying legacy gas-station standards to EV infrastructure will materially constrain deployments.

We respectfully request the following text modifications:

1. RECONSIDER "SERVICE STATION" LIMITS FOR STANDALONE DCFC

- **Code Section:** 11-86-4; 11-31-25(A) and (B).
- **Issue:** Standalone DCFC sites currently default to the "Service Station" classification, triggering legacy liquid-fuel limits like a maximum of two (2) stations per intersection and 100-foot frontage minimums. This directly suppresses EV hub deployment at high-traffic intersections.
- **Proposed Modification:** Either (a) create a distinct "Electric Vehicle Charging Station" use classification, or (b) amend 11-31-25(A) and (B) to exempt facilities dispensing only electricity from the 2-per-intersection cap and 100-foot frontage minimum.

2. REMOVE OR RAISE THE 16-STALL CAP ON ACCESSORY CHARGING

- **Code Sections:** Table 11-6-2 (Notes 32, 33); Table 11-7-2 (Notes 23, 24); Table 11-8-2 (Notes 18, 19).
- **Issue:** Capping accessory charging at 16 spaces ignores modern deployments, which routinely exceed 20 stalls at retail host sites. Furthermore, prohibiting EV stalls from counting toward the principal use's minimum parking severely suppresses host-site viability.
- **Proposed Modification:** Strike the 16-space limit (or raise it to a minimum of 40 spaces). Separately, amend Notes 32, 23, and 18 to allow a defined percentage of EV-equipped stalls to count toward the principal use's minimum parking.

3. EXEMPT EV CHARGING FROM FUEL-PUMP QUEUING STANDARDS

- **Code Section:** 11-31-25(G).
- **Issue:** The 20- to 36-foot stacking distances are designed for physical lines at gas pumps. EV queuing is managed digitally, and dwell times are longer.

- **Proposed Modification:** Add subsection 11-31-25(G)(4): "Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment (EVSE) and EV charging stalls are exempt from the stacking distance requirements of this subsection, provided the site provides adequate internal circulation that does not impede the public right-of-way."
- **City Response:** Please see Section 11-31-25(G)(3) which allows for the Planning Director to consider modifications to the stacking requirements based on, "...an Onsite Circulation and Stacking Study, that the proposed modifications to the stacking requirements are sufficient to meet the demands of the development, including site-specific conditions, charging technology, demonstrated demand, and the traffic circulation." This exception was included with EV charging in mind and should already address this concern.

4. MAKE CANOPIES OPTIONAL AND ADJUST DESIGN STANDARDS

- **Code Sections:** 11-31-25(C)(1) and (C)(2).
- **Issue:** Section 11-31-25(C) mandates that EV charging stations "shall be covered by a canopy." Mandating canopies for all DCFC sites is financially and physically unfeasible for many deployments. Furthermore, if a canopy is built, the 16-foot height limit restricts solar integration, and requiring fascia to match a "primary building" is impossible for standalone EV sites where no primary building exists.
- **Proposed Modification:**
 - Amend (C) to make EV canopies optional: "Fuel pump islands shall be covered by a canopy... Electric Vehicle Charging Stations may be covered by a canopy."
 - Amend (C)(1): "The maximum height of the service station canopy shall be 16 feet, except that canopies integrating solar photovoltaic generation may extend up to 20 feet, subject to administrative approval."
 - Amend (C)(2): "When a primary building is present, the canopy fascia shall match or complement the color and texture of the primary building. Service Stations without a primary building shall meet the fascia width standard but are exempt from the matching requirement."
 - **City Response:** Please see Section 11-31-25(C) which states that fuel and charging canopies must match and complement the design of the main structure (when present). The current text should already address this concern.

5. STREAMLINE THE SOUND STUDY REQUIREMENT

- **Code Section:** 11-31-25(H).
- **Issue:** Requiring site-specific sound studies for the 100-foot residential setback adds unnecessary cost and delay, as DCFC power cabinets have standardized, manufacturer-published acoustic profiles.
- **Proposed Modification:** Amend 11-31-25(H)(2) to allow the Planning Director to

accept a manufacturer-provided acoustic profile for standard DCFC equipment in lieu of a site-specific sound study, provided it demonstrates compliance with the 60 dB property-line standard.

6. RESOLVE FLEET-BASED SERVICES THRESHOLDS, CLASSIFICATION GRAY ZONE, AND SSD PROTECTIONS

- **Code Section:** 11-86-4 (Service Station & Fleet-Based Services definitions).
- **Issue:** The draft creates regulatory uncertainty: (1) Conflicting vehicle-count triggers (5 vs. 3 vs. 2). (2) An undefined "dedicated to fleet charging" exclusion creates ambiguity for public hubs incidentally serving fleets. (3) Failing to exclude vehicle delivery or mobile service dispatch puts Sales, Service, and Delivery (SSD) locations at risk of being reclassified as industrial Fleet-Based Services, triggering severe screening, parking, and setback penalties. (4) The classification gray zone runs in both directions: a Fleet-Based Service site that incidentally offers charging to the public could likewise be reclassified as a Service Station, blocking mixed-use deployments.
- **Proposed Modification:**
 - Standardize thresholds: Conform all Fleet-Based Services definitions to a "more than five (5) vehicles" threshold.
 - Define "dedicated" bidirectionally: Add to the Service Station definition: "A Service Station that incidentally serves fleet vehicles shall not be reclassified as Fleet-Based Services unless the site provides fleet-only stalls, dispatching, or staging, or fleet use represents the majority of charging sessions on an annualized basis." Add a corresponding clarification to the Fleet-Based Services definition: "A Fleet-Based Service that incidentally provides charging or fueling to the general public shall not be reclassified as a Service Station, provided that fleet use remains the primary purpose of the site."
 - Extend exclusions: Append to the Fleet-Based Services exclusion list: "This use also does not include vehicle delivery operations, mobile service dispatch, or other vehicle-based activities incidental to an Automobile/Vehicle Sales and Services principal use."
 - City Response to 1: Please note that text shown as strike through is text that is proposed to be removed. The vehicle count threshold for Fleet Services used to be three (3); staff is proposing that be increased to five (5).
 - City Response to 2: The reference to EVSE in the definition states that EVSE may be an accessory component of Fleet Services.
 - City Response to 3: Please note that delivery services and dispatch of passenger vehicle transport such as taxi and limousine services currently fall under the City's definition of Fleet Services. This is not a proposed modification. The new definitions create a teared system based on vehicle count and size which allows the City to expand where Light Fleet-Based

Services may be permitted.

- City Response to 4: Correct a business that offered charging to private individuals, not for its fleet service, would no longer fall under the definition of Fleet Services and would be subject to the standards for Service Stations.

7. CORRECT BESS SCREENING OPACITY AND EXPAND VINYL WRAP APPLICATION

- **Code Sections:** 11-31-37(F)(7); 11-31-36(F)(9); 11-30-9(D).
- **Issue:** First, the BESS screening opacity language contains typographical contradictions (e.g., "no more LESS than 75% opaque"). Second, while we strongly support the forward-looking allowance for vinyl artistic wraps on transformers, this provision should be expanded to visually similar utility equipment (like BESS enclosures and switchgear) frequently co-located with EV charging.
- **Proposed Modification:**
 - Correct Opacity: Amend 11-31-37(F)(7)(b)(ii)(2) to correctly read: "A decorative louvered, slated, or perforated upper screen, no less than 50% and no more than 75% opaque..." to match parallel provisions.
 - Expand Vinyl Wraps: Amend 11-30-9(D) to read: "Electrical transformers, Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) enclosures, switchgear, and similar ground-mounted utility equipment may be screened using vinyl artistic wrap..."
 - City Response: Please note that text shown as strikethrough is text that is proposed to be removed. Staff corrected 11-31-37(F)(7)(b)(ii)(2). BESS infrastructure that is used by EVSE likely falls under the provisions of Section 11-31-37(B)(2) as an accessory use and therefore is not subject to the development standards of Section 11-31-37.

8. ALLOW FLEXIBLE SCREENING AT INTERNAL PROPERTY LINES FOR FLEET-BASED SERVICES

- **Code Sections:** 11-31-40(B)(1)(b); 11-31-40(B)(4).
- **Issue:** The required six (6)-foot masonry wall along all internal side and rear property lines is disproportionate to visual impact where the adjacent use is commercial, employment, or industrial rather than residential, and where the area is already internally delineated by striping or signage per 11-31-40(A)(1)(b). The existing alternative screening path at 11-31-40(B)(4) requires a line-of-sight study and Zoning Administrator approval, adding cost and delay at every site.
- **Proposed Modification:**
 - Amend 11-31-40(B)(1)(b): "Ground-based vehicle parking, charging, and/or storage areas shall be screened along internal side and rear property lines by a six (6) foot tall masonry wall when adjacent to a residential district or residential use. For all other adjacencies, screening may be provided by a

masonry wall, decorative metal fencing, landscape buffer, or building wall that achieves equivalent visual screening, subject to administrative review."

- Alternatively, amend 11-31-40(B)(4) to allow alternative screening methods to be approved administratively without a line-of-sight study where the site is not adjacent to a residential district or residential use.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these proposed modifications. We share the City of Mesa's objective of modernizing the zoning code to support evolving transportation technologies.



June 3, 2026

Ms. Rachel Phillips
Assistant Planning Director
City of Mesa
20 East Main Street
Mesa, Arizona 85201

Transmitted Via Email

Dear Ms. Phillips:

Thank you for the opportunity for Valley Partnership to meet with you and your team last week to discuss the City's proposed 2026 Zoning Code Refinement.

As you know, Valley Partnership, representing 350 Company Partners and almost 2,000 Members advocating for responsible development, has worked for decades in collaboration with municipalities, including Mesa, to craft and support policies that create clarity and certainty in the development process.

We want to recognize and thank you and your team for sharing these proposed Zoning Code amendments with the development community. Additionally, we truly appreciate your willingness to quickly schedule a meeting with us to clarify the questions we had, as well as your knowledgeable responses.

Thank you for continuing to work with us in partnership. Please don't hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Clark Princell
President & CEO

Cc: Scott Butler, Mesa City Manager
Nana Appiah, Development Services Director

From: [Rachel Phillips](#)
To: [Laura Ortiz](#)
Cc: [Long Range Planning](#)
Subject: RE: Accessory Fleet Based Services
Date: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 3:15:00 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

Laura,

Thank you for your continued review of the proposed ordinance and for the thoughtful feedback. We appreciate the time you and others in the industry have taken to help refine these standards.

With respect to Section 11-31-40(A)(2)(b), staff believes the provision is consistent with the broader design objectives for Employment Districts. The intent is to maintain an active and attractive street frontage by limiting the extent of parking and vehicle storage located between buildings and adjacent streets. As noted in Chapter 7, Employment District standards already allow up to two rows of required off-street parking between a building and the street, which is generally intended to accommodate visitor and employee parking.

Specifically:

H. Access, Circulation, and Parking

1. Parking Area Design

- a. Parking areas, including areas used for the parking and storage of commercial trucks and trailers, shall be located to the side or rear of buildings, except;
- b. A maximum of two (2) rows of required off-street parking may be located between the building and adjacent street.

Staff recognizes that there may be circumstances where required parking is located between a building and the street. However, the proposed fleet vehicle standards are intended to distinguish between general employee or visitor parking and the storage, staging, and dispatching of fleet vehicles. For that reason, staff is not recommending the removal or modification of Section 11-31-40(A)(2)(b) at this time.

Similarly, while we understand the desire for additional administrative flexibility as fleet-based operations continue to evolve, staff is not recommending adding Planning Director modification authority to these standards. The proposed regulations were drafted to provide clear and predictable criteria for both applicants and neighboring property owners, and staff believes the current framework strikes an appropriate balance between flexibility and consistency.

Again, we appreciate your comments and welcome any additional discussion during the study session and public hearing. Your feedback will be included as part of the public record and considered by the Planning and Zoning Board as they deliberate on the proposed amendments.

Thank you again for your engagement throughout this process.

Best Regards,
Rachel



Rachel Phillips, AICP | Assistant Planning Director

Tel: (480) 644-2762

55 N. Center St. | Mesa, AZ 85201

Office Hours: M-Th 7am to 6pm | Closed Fridays & Holidays

From: Laura Ortiz <lortiz@evgre.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 12:24 PM

To: Rachel Phillips <Rachel.Phillips@MesaAZ.gov>

Subject: RE: Accessory Fleet Based Services

This Message Is From an External Sender

Use caution when clicking links, attachments, or responding to information requests.

[Report Suspicious](#) ⓘ

Rachel – I appreciate all of the modifications that you and Staff have made to the proposed ordinance. I have talked with several other people to determine if there are any other comments and the remaining questions boil down to 11-31-40 A. (In Exhibit 2).

The language in 2b and 4 seem to conflict with each other, where 2b requires that fleet vehicles can't park between the front building façade and the street, but 4 permits fleet vehicle parking up to 50% of required parking – and typically some or much of that required parking would be located between the building façade and the street. I don't understand the concern about parking vehicles in striped parking stalls between the building and the street, since that's what the stalls are made for.

I'd suggest that 2b be removed, or at the very least revised so that there is a 50% limitation on the fleet vehicles parking between the building façade and the street, which then makes sense with the language in 4.

Additionally, given the nuances that are going to arise use-by-use that cannot be fully contemplated in the new ordinance, I'd also like for the Planning Director to be given the authority to vary from the standards in A similar to the language in B and D. One thing that comes up in each of my conversations is that these uses are continuing to evolve and there are excellent tenants that we and the City will want to attract and not have the new ordinance prevent outright, particularly unintentionally.

I made the above notes in the attached, and I acknowledge that the package went out last week with the proposed language. However, I hope this can be discussed at the study session and the modifications added in for the approval tomorrow evening. As I mentioned, I will be at both the study session and hearing and will be able to explain my suggestions and reasoning to the P&Z Board members if you'd like.

Thank you,

Laura

Laura Ortiz **President**

2390 East Camelback Rd., Suite 410, Phoenix, AZ 85016

Main: 602.808.8600

evgre.com | lortiz@evgre.com



From: Rachel Phillips <Rachel.Phillips@MesaAZ.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 4:56 PM

To: Laura Ortiz <lortiz@evgre.com>

Subject: Accessory Fleet Based Services

Laura,

Staff has been brainstorming the scenario you raised yesterday regarding accessory fleet-based services and has a proposed set of revisions I wanted to share.

1. Creating a distinct definition of Accessory Fleet-Based Services vs listing Light-Fleet Based Services as an accessory use.

ACCESSORY FLEET-BASED SERVICES. A FLEET-BASED SERVICE THAT IS CLEARLY INCIDENTAL AND SUBORDINATE TO A PRINCIPAL USE LOCATED ON THE SAME LOT OR PARCEL AND THAT SERVES ONLY THE OPERATIONAL NEEDS OF THE PRINCIPAL

USE.

AN ACCESSORY FLEET-BASED SERVICE SHALL NOT CONSTITUTE THE PRINCIPAL USE OF THE PROPERTY; FUNCTION AS AN INDEPENDENT FLEET PARKING, STORAGE, STAGING, CHARGING, FUELING, MAINTENANCE OR DISPATCH FACILITY; OR PROVIDE FLEET SERVICES TO AN OFF-SITE BUSINESS. THE AREA DEVOTED TO THE ACCESSORY FLEET-BASED SERVICE SHALL REMAIN SUBORDINATE IN SCALE AND SHALL NOT OCCUPY AN AREA GREATER THAN THE PRINCIPAL USE.

2. Updating the land use charts from listing Light Fleet-Based Services as an accessory use to listing “Accessory Fleet Based Services” under the Accessory use heading and adding it as an allowed use to the PEP District in addition to the zoning districts previously listed.
3. Adding a subsection to Section 11-31-40(A)
4. **Accessory Fleet-Based Services.** Fleet vehicle parking, charging, storage, and staging areas for an Accessory Fleet-Based Service shall occupy no more than 50% of the required on-site parking spaces for the principal use.

We think this addresses the scenarios raised but would appreciate your feedback. As a reminder we’re trying to finalize document tomorrow for the Planning & Zoning packet to be sent out Thursday.

Thank you,
Rachel



Rachel Phillips, AICP | Assistant Planning Director

Tel: (480) 644-2762

55 N. Center St. | Mesa, AZ 85201

Office Hours: M-Th 7am to 6pm | Closed Fridays & Holidays

From: [Rachel Phillips](#)
To: [Kevin Xue](#)
Cc: [Noah Bulson](#); [Francesca Wahl](#); [David Ely](#); [Drew Sartell](#); [Neal Talaske](#); [Long Range Planning](#); [Sean Pesek](#); [Ian Linssen](#)
Subject: RE: City of Mesa Proposed Text Amendments - Notice of Planning and Zoning Board Hearing
Date: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 4:21:00 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Kevin,

Thank you for providing these additional comments and proposed revisions. We appreciate your continued engagement and the thoughtful feedback.

Regarding third-party fleets as an accessory use, the intent of Accessory Fleet-Based Services is to allow fleet activity that is incidental and subordinate to the principal use on the same site. The required parking on a site is generally intended to serve the employees, customers, and operational needs of the primary business. Allowing a separate third-party fleet operation to occupy parking, storage, staging, charging, or dispatch areas would function more like an independent fleet-based service rather than an accessory use. For that reason, staff is not recommending revisions to allow third-party fleet services under the accessory fleet-based services definition.

Regarding the screening standards, the provisions cited in Section 11-31-40(B) do not apply to Accessory Fleet-Based Services. Accessory Fleet-Based Services are subject only to the specific provisions in Section 11-31-40(A)(2)(b) and Section 11-31-40(A)(4). Because the masonry wall requirement is not one of the provisions applicable to accessory fleet-based services, staff does not believe the requested revision is necessary.

Regarding standalone EV hubs, staff continues to view electric vehicle charging stations similarly to traditional service stations. While the technology is different, both uses provide a similar service and have similar considerations related to site design, access, circulation, and location. For that reason, staff is not recommending an exemption from the service station frontage and spacing standards for facilities that dispense only electricity.

We appreciate the comments and understand the desire to ensure the ordinance remains responsive to changing transportation technologies. At this time, staff believes the proposed language provides an appropriate balance between flexibility, clarity, and compatibility with surrounding development. Your comments will be included as part of the public record for consideration through the hearing process.

Thank you again for your time and input.

Best Regards,
Rachel



Rachel Phillips, AICP | Assistant Planning Director

Tel: (480) 644-2762

55 N. Center St. | Mesa, AZ 85201

Office Hours: M-Th 7am to 6pm | Closed Fridays & Holidays

From: Kevin Xue <zixue@tesla.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 12:58 PM

To: Long Range Planning <longrangeplanning@mesaaz.gov>; Sean Pesek <sean.pesek@mesaaz.gov>

Cc: Noah Bulson <Noah.Bulson@MesaAZ.gov>; Rachel Phillips <rachel.phillips@mesaaz.gov>;
Francesca Wahl <fwahl@tesla.com>; David Ely <daely@tesla.com>; Drew Sartell
<dsartell@tesla.com>; Neal Talaske <ntalaske@tesla.com>

Subject: Re: City of Mesa Proposed Text Amendments - Notice of Planning and Zoning Board Hearing

This Message Is From an External Sender

Use caution when clicking links, attachments, or responding to information requests.

Hi Sean and the Long Range Planning Team,

Thank you for sharing the final draft. We greatly appreciate the time and effort Staff has put into this ordinance, particularly the positive updates regarding optional shade structures, the removal of the 16-stall cap, and the flexible EV parking ratios.

Attached, please find Tesla's formal written comments for the Planning and Zoning Board's consideration ahead of the June 24th hearing.

While we are highly supportive of the progress made, our memo respectfully requests three final, targeted refinements regarding accessory fleet definitions, flexible screening, and standalone hub classifications to ensure the code fully supports future third-party fleet innovation.

Thank you again for your considerations.

Best Regards,
Kevin

Kevin Xue

Policy Analyst, North American Charging

3500 Deer Creek Road, Palo Alto, CA 94304

E. zixue@tesla.com

From: Sean Pesek <Sean.Pesek@mesaaz.gov>

Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 3:16 PM

To: Rachel Phillips <Rachel.Phillips@MesaAZ.gov>

Cc: Noah Bulson <Noah.Bulson@MesaAZ.gov>

Subject: City of Mesa Proposed Text Amendments - Notice of Planning and Zoning Board Hearing

Good afternoon,

Thank you to everyone who engaged with us over these past few weeks. The input was helpful, and a number of the changes discussed have been incorporated into the final draft.

This item is scheduled for consideration and recommendation by the Planning and Zoning Board next week. Details below:

Planning and Zoning Board
Wednesday, June 24, 2026
Mesa City Hall, 20 E. Main Street
Study Session: 3:30 PM
Public Hearing: 4:00 PM

The final draft of the ordinance (Exhibit 1) and the newly proposed fleet-based services development standards MZO Section (Exhibit 2) are attached to this email and linked on our website:

[Long Range Planning - City of Mesa](#)

If you would like to submit a written comment or speak at the hearing, please visit the link below for instructions:

<https://www.mesaaz.gov/Government/Advisory-Boards-Committees/Planning-Zoning-Board>

In the meantime, please contact us at longrangeplanning@mesaaz.gov if you have any questions or concerns.

Best Regards,



Sean Pesek, AICP | Senior Planner | Development Services

Tel: (480) 644-6716

55 N. Center St | Mesa | AZ | 85201

Office Hours: M-Th 7am to 6pm | Closed Fridays & Holidays