



PLANNING AND ZONING PUBLIC HEARING MEETING MINUTES

June 10, 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 10, 2026, at 4:06 p.m.

BOARD PRESENT

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

BOARD ABSENT

STAFF PRESENT

Evan Balmer
Kirstin Dvorchak
Mary Kopaskie-Brown
Danika Heying
Cassidy Welch

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

Chairperson Ayers conducted a roll call.

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 Boardmember Pitcher, seconded by Boardmember Carpenter, that the consent agenda items be approved.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

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

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 May 27, 2026.

*3. Take action on the following zoning cases:

- *3-a. **ZON26-00333 "Faith Christian School,"** 9.9± acres located at 3761 South Power Road. Council Use Permit and amending Conditions of Approval Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 12 and 13 of Ordinance No. 4646. This request will allow for a Private School. **(District 6)**

Planner: Jennifer Merrill

Staff Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

4. Items not on the Consent Agenda

- 4-a. **GPA26-00111 "San Antonio Tire Shop"** 0.4± acres located at 1609 West University Drive. Minor General Plan Amendment to change the Placetype from Urban Residential to Urban Center. **(District 3).**

Planner: Emily Johnson

Staff Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

It was moved by Boardmember Peterson, seconded by Boardmember Carpenter, that case GPA26-001101 be approved.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

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

NAYS – None

ABSENT– None

- 4-b. **ZON25-00110 "San Antonio Tire Shop"** 0.4± acres located at 1609 West University Drive. Rezone from Office Commercial (OC) to Limited Commercial with a Bonus Intensity Zone Overlay (LC-BIZ) and Site Plan Review. This request will allow for an approximately 4,015± square foot Minor Automobile Repair facility. **(District 3).**

Planner: Emily Johnson

Staff Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

Representative for the applicant, Alex Hayes displayed a PowerPoint presentation for the proposed case number GPA26-00111 and associated Zoning case ZON25-00111. **(See Attachment 4)**

Mr. Hayes reiterated the applicant's request for the General Plan amendment, rezone, and site plan review to support the locally owned, father-and-son business. He emphasized that the impacts of the tire shop are already known and non-theoretical, as it has operated for over a year with zero neighborhood complaints. Mr. Hayes addressed the board's parking concerns by

clarifying that installations take only 15 to 25 minutes with no overnight staging required, making the four proposed spaces operationally sufficient. He indicated a willingness to incorporate parking solutions directly into their Good Neighbor Policy as a condition of approval, moving forward to City Council and remained available to answer any questions.

Vice Chairperson Peterson questioned the recourse available to neighbors if the proposed parking reduction from 11 to 4 spaces creates an overflow issue in adjacent areas. Mr. Hayes responded that customers typically wait on-site for brief 15-to-25-minute installations, eliminating the need for extensive vehicle staging or overnight storage. He noted that a nearby church parking lot presents a potential future opportunity for an agreement if necessary. Planning Director, Mary Kopaskie-Brown, added that because parking is prohibited on Longmore, any overflow issues would be handled via code compliance. However, Mr. Balmer noted that the applicant could administratively apply for a formal, recorded shared parking agreement with neighboring underutilized properties if needed. Chairperson Ayers suggested integrating a parking contingency plan into the applicant's Good Neighbor Policy, which staff confirmed could be added as a formal condition of approval prior to advancing to City Council.

Vice Chairperson Peterson further inquired about the historical timeline and what specific mechanism triggered the current application. Mr. Balmer clarified that the application was brought to the city's attention by a code compliance case regarding a sign violation. Mr. Balmer explained that the site's highly restrictive Office Commercial (OC) designation has been an issue since annexation in 1958, as none of the historical uses fully conformed to the zone. This application represents an opportunity to clean up a legal zoning mismatch that has persisted for decades.

Boardmember Montes asked what alternative commercial uses would be permitted on the site under its current zoning if the tire shop application were denied. Mr. Balmer responded that Office Commercial (OC) is the city's least intense commercial zoning district and features a highly restricted use palette. It is limited primarily to low-intensity professional offices, strictly prohibiting auto repairs and placing severe restrictions on restaurant uses.

The following citizens addressed the Board in opposition to case number GPA26-00111 and associated case ZON25-00110:

- Reed Done, a Mesa resident
- James Adamec, a Mesa resident
- Jose Hernandez, a Mesa resident
- Wendy Madison, a Mesa resident
- Edward Delke, a Mesa resident
- Matt Taylor, a Mesa resident
- Don Klinker, a Mesa resident
- Veronica Erran, a Mesa resident
- Roxanne Jetson, a Mesa resident
- Tess Taylor, a Mesa Resident

The above speakers offered a series of comments in opposition to the case number GPA26-00111 and associated case ZON25-00110 including, but not limited to the following:

• **Parking Concerns:** Severe apprehension regarding the reduction from the code-required 11 parking spaces down to 4 spaces on a highly constrained 0.4-acre parcel. Residents expressed concern that this configuration will trigger illegal overflow parking along Longmore, or force customer and employee vehicles to overflow directly into the adjacent residential cul-de-sacs and streets, such as Bedford Street and Henkel Street, impacting local residential spaces.

- **Concerning 24-Hour Operations, Noise, Light, and Operational Disruption:** Strong neighborhood opposition to the proposed 24/7 operating window. Residents noted that the surrounding residential area is quiet after 5:00 PM and voiced concerns over late-night light pollution from unshielded fixtures, structural noise from nocturnal impact tool usage, and general operational disruptions running directly counter to the peace and character of an established low-density neighborhood.
- **Public Safety:** Concerns that a 24-hour commercial storefront will serve as an unwanted late-night gathering hub or crime nexus. Neighbors noted existing ongoing struggles with late-night loitering from nearby apartment complexes and autonomous vehicle drop-offs and argued that keeping a business open all night will attract unnecessary vehicle and pedestrian traffic through residential streets during early morning hours.
- **Existing Code Violations and Visual Blight:** Immediate frustration regarding the site's current unpermitted operations, highlighting that the applicant has already created a neighborhood eyesore by stacking tires high above the property line wall. Residents expressed skepticism that proposed aesthetic improvements, such as the mural, will be upheld or properly enforced over time.
- **Failure to Meet the Burden of Proof, Public Necessity, or Market Demand:** Objections that the applicant provided no market study, demand analysis, or data proving a community need for a 24-hour tire shop on this specific corner. Neighbors highlighted that the applicant already operates a location blocks away on Broadway, and that an active direct competitor (Pineda Tires) is located immediately adjacent to the subject property.
- **Failure to Demonstrate Need for a General Plan Amendment and Consistency with Area Plans:** Critical opposition to forcing a square peg into a round hole by shifting the site's place type designation from Urban Residential to an Urban Center. Residents argued that the Urban Center designation is a severe geographical outlier, given that approximately 9,300 acres directly surrounding the site are exclusively low-density residential, and that the closest established Urban Centers are located a full mile south along the light rail corridor.

Mr. Hayes returned to the podium to address the public comments. He emphasized that the proposed site plan and landscaping layouts are fully reviewed by staff and are legally binding under the site plan review, representing a substantial capital reinvestment that will permanently eliminate current blighted conditions. He clarified that the property is an existing commercial corner, and the high volume of BIZ modifications reflects trying to bring an older corner parcel into compliance. Addressing the 24/7 concerns, Mr. Hayes explained that the request supports a mobile roadside service unit handling highway emergency, requiring only one employee on-site overnight to retrieve tires from indoor storage. He added that the visual blight of tires stacked over the back wall would be resolved because outdoor storage is strictly prohibited.

Boardmember Pitcher requested the draft Good Neighbor Policy be displayed and asked staff to confirm if the document is binding on future successors. Mr. Balmer confirmed that because compliance with the Good Neighbor Policy is included as a formal condition of approval alongside the site and landscape plans, it legally runs with the land and binds all future property owners.

Boardmember Pitcher expressed concern for the neighbors on Bedford Street regarding potential customer and employee parking overflow, suggesting a formal parking contingency be added to the policy. Mr. Hayes noted that because operations run on an appointment basis with 15-to-25-minute indoor service times, they have experienced no parking issues during 18

months of operation but agreed to incorporate a proactive parking table and remediation strategy into the Good Neighbor Policy.

Boardmember Montes asked staff if any official citations or neighborhood complaints had been filed against the property regarding parking over the last 18 months of active operation. Mr. Balmer confirmed that no formal parking or noise complaints have ever been filed against the site, noting the sole code enforcement action that triggered this public process was strictly limited to a commercial sign violation.

Boardmember Carpenter asked if the shop had been actively operating its 24-hour model during that 18-month trial window without generating complaints, and inquired if the new restricted traffic loop was currently active. Mr. Hayes confirmed that the shop did actively operate 24/7 without neighborhood incident until the sign violation occurred, at which point they voluntarily ceased late-night hours pending board approval. He clarified that the new traffic loop, which closes two existing corner curb cuts, routes traffic in from University Drive and exits them onto Longmore, is not yet active and will be fully constructed upon project approval.

Vice Chairperson Peterson questioned the absolute operational necessity of the 24-hour window and asked staff if any other surrounding businesses on that intersection currently operate 24 hours a day. Mr. Hayes maintained that 24/7 flexibility is a core component of the business model to support their mobile dispatch unit. Mr. Balmer noted they did not have the exact operational hours of the surrounding intersection on hand but stated that the large commercial shopping center directly to the north carries a variety of commercial uses that are legally permitted to maintain 24-hour or extended late-night operations under current zoning text.

Applicant Joaquin Guadarrama clarified that the shop's standard hours of operation are from 8:00 AM to 8:00 PM. Prior to receiving the sign violation, the business did operate 24 hours a day without any neighborhood complaints. During that initial move-in and setup period, the operators established strong, friendly relations with both the immediate residential neighbor and the adjacent tire shop. The request for 24/7 flexibility is intended to support their mobile service truck operations. The family owns two shops in Mesa: a full-service major auto repair facility at Alma School Road and Broadway Road, and the subject site at 1609 West University Drive, which is strictly minor tire repairs and indoor tire inventory storage. Without 24/7 access to this localized inventory, the mobile dispatch truck would be forced to drive 20 minutes to their Phoenix (32nd Street and Van Buren Street) or Chandler locations, significantly increasing roadside wait times for stranded highway motorists. Mr. Guadarrama noted that the overnight model would require only one or two employees to pull inventory or perform occasional emergency flat repairs indoors. He stated the business was previously unaware of the neighbors' frustration regarding tires stacked above the rear fence line, pledged to resolve the visual issue immediately, and expressed a strong desire to maintain a collaborative relationship with the community. Lastly, he confirmed that the proposed exit drive aisle is located entirely on the shop's property and remains structurally separate from the residential alleyway to the south.

Following a collaborative dialogue between the Board and staff, Mr. Balmer recommended addressing the parking issue via a separate, standalone condition of approval rather than inside the Good Neighbor Policy. This mechanism allows staff to work out a flexible solution before the case reaches City Council, such as utilizing alternative compliance provisions under the code to resolve any parking deficiencies within 30 days should operational or code violations arise.

It was moved by Boardmember Peterson, seconded by Boardmember Carpenter, that case ZON25-00110 be approved subject to the added requirement that staff resolve potential parking

issues before the case proceeds to City Council should the four on-site spaces prove insufficient during operations.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

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

NAYS – None

ABSENT– None

Chairperson Ayers declared the motion carried unanimously by those present.

5. Adjourn.

Without objection, the Planning and Zoning Board Public Hearing adjourned at 5:37 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 10th day of June 2026. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.



BENJAMIN AYERS, CHAIRPERSON

DH
(Attachments – 4)

City of Mesa

Planning and Zoning Board

ZON26-00333


Faith Christian School

Jennifer Merrill, Senior Planner




Request

- CUP for a Private School
- Modification of Conditions of Approval from Case No. Z06-088, Ordinance No. 4646




Location

- 3761 South Power Road
- 9.9± parcel
- South of Elliot Road
- East side of Power Road



General Plan

- Regional Employment Center Placetype
- Evolve Growth Strategy



Zoning

- LI-PAD-PAD & LC-PAD-PAD



Site Photos




Looking East from Power Road



Site Plan

(no proposed changes)

- Existing 49,036 sq. ft. school building
- Accessed from Power Road
- Existing parking and landscaping to remain
- No physical changes to the building and site






Elevations

(no proposed changes)



FRONT ELEVATION




REAR ELEVATION




Elevations

(no proposed changes)



RIGHT SIDE ELEVATION - NORTH




LEFT SIDE ELEVATION - SOUTH



Council Use Permit (CUP)

Per MZO Section 11-70-6, a CUP shall only be granted if the approving body determines that the project as submitted or modified conforms to all of the following criteria:

1. Approval of the proposed project will advance the goals and objectives of and is consistent with the policies of the General Plan and any other applicable City plan and/or policies;
2. The location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed project are consistent with the purposes of the district where it is located and conform with the General Plan and with any other applicable City plan or policies;
3. The proposed project will not be injurious or detrimental to the adjacent or surrounding properties in the area of the proposed project or improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the City; and
4. Adequate public services, public facilities and public infrastructure are available to serve the proposed project.



Notification

- Notified property owners within 1,000', HOAs, and registered neighborhood
- Staff and the applicant have not received any feedback from the neighbors



Findings

- Complies with the 2050 Mesa General Plan
- Complies with Section 11-70-6 of the MZO for Council Use Permit



Recommendation

Approval with conditions

City of Mesa

Planning and Zoning Board

City of Mesa

Planning and Zoning Board

GPA26-00111


San Antonio Tire

Emily Johnson, Planner II




Request

- Minor General Plan Amendment
- From Urban Residential Placetype to Urban Center Placetype




Location

- 1609 W University Dr
- 0.4± parcel
- South of University Dr
- West of Alma School Rd




Zoning

- Existing – OC
- Proposed – LC-BIZ
- Minor Automobile Repair is permitted in LC district



General Plan

- Current Placetype – Urban Residential
- Provide for areas that contain a diverse mix of uses where commercial, residential, and public/semi public coexist
- Convenience Service not a principal or supporting land use



General Plan

- Proposed Placetype – Urban Center
- Contains retail, personal services, public/semi-public uses, entertainment and recreation facilities, and convenience services
- Convenience Service is a principal land use




GPA Approval Criteria

1. Whether the amendment will result in a shortage of land for other planned uses
2. Whether events after the adoption of the General Plan have changed the character or condition of the area, making the amendment appropriate
3. The degree to which the proposed amendment will impact the community by:
 - a. Altering existing land use patterns in a significant way that is contrary to the Vision, Guiding Principals, or Strategies of the General Plan
 - b. Requiring larger or more extensive improvements to roads, sewer or water systems that may negatively impact development of other lands
 - c. Adversely impacting existing uses due to increased traffic congestion that is not accommodated by planned roadway improvements or other planned transportation improvements such as nonmotorized transportation alternatives or transit



GPA Approval Criteria

4. Whether the proposed amendment is consistent with the Vision, Guiding Principles, or Strategies of the General Plan
5. Whether the proposed amendment constitutes an overall improvement to the General Plan and the City of Mesa
6. The extent to which the benefits of the proposed amendment outweigh any of the impacts identified by these criteria



Notification

- Notified property owners within 1,000', HOAs, and registered neighborhood
- Neighborhood meeting held June 12, 2025, no attendees
- Neighborhood meeting held April 29, 2026, questions/concerns with parking, light, noise, use



Findings

- Complies with the amendment criteria in Chapter 5 of the 2050 Mesa General Plan and Chapter 75 of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance



Recommendation

Approval with conditions

City of Mesa

Planning and Zoning Board

City of Mesa

Planning and Zoning Board

ZON25-00110


San Antonio Tire Shop Rezone

Emily Johnson




Request

- Rezone from OC to LC-BIZ
- Site Plan Review
- Minor General Plan Amendment (GPA26-00111)




Location

- 1609 West University Drive
- 0.4± parcel
- South of University Dr
- West of Alma School Rd



General Plan

- Current Placetype – Urban Residential, Evolve Growth Strategy
- Proposed Placetype – Urban Residential, Evolve Growth Strategy
- Convenience Services



Zoning


- Existing – OC
- Proposed – LC-BIZ
- Minor Automobile Repair is permitted in LC district



Site Photos




Looking southwest from University and Longmore



Site Plan

- Existing 4,015 SF Minor Auto Repair Facility and canopy
- 4 parking spaces
- Enter from University and exit to Longmore





Landscape Plan

- Trees: Desert Museum Palo Verde, Canary Island Palm
- Shrubs: Octopus Agave, Organ Pipe, Parry's Agave, Red Hesperaloe, Ocotillo, Golden Barrel Cactus etc.




Elevations






Elevations



WEST ELEVATION



EAST ELEVATION



Renderings



Looking southwest from University and Longmore



Renderings



Looking south



Customer Area



MATERIAL/ COLOR LEGEND

- A**  FINISH: STUCCO
PAINT COLOR: KILIM BEIGE (SW 6106)
- B**  FINISH: STUCCO/MASONARY PAINT
PAINT COLOR: DOVER WHITE (SW 638S)
- C**  FINISH: PAINT
PAINT COLOR: CLOAK GRAY SW 6278
- D**  FINISH: EXISTING CANOPY
PAINT COLOR: BLUE BAUBLE (SW 6942)

Materials & Colors

- Existing building and canopy
- Stucco



Bonus Intensity Zone

Development Standard	MZO Required	BIZ Proposed
<u>Minimum Building and Parking Area Setbacks – MZO Table 11-6-3.A</u>		
Front and Street-Facing Side	15'	10' (east property line to building) 14' (east property line to parking area)
Interior Side and Rear	25'	23' (west property line to building) 5' (west property line to parking area) 22' (South property line to building)



Bonus Intensity Zone

Development Standard	MZO Required	BIZ Proposed
<u>Auto Service Bays</u> – <i>MZO Section 11-30-9(G)(2)(d)</i>	When bay doors are less than 200 feet from an adjacent street and the bay doors are less than perpendicular to a street, screening shall be provided at least 6' high	3' screen wall
<u>Parking Areas</u> – <i>MZO Section 11-30-9(H)(7)</i>	A setback of at least 10 feet shall be provided between the screen wall and the right-of-way	0'
<u>Automobile/Vehicle Repair</u> – <i>MZO Section 11-31-6(A)</i>	Minimum lot size is 1 acre, unless part of a larger group commercial center	0.4± acres
<u>Size of Parking Spaces and Maneuvering Aisles</u> – <i>MZO Section 11-32-2(J)</i>	One-way drive aisles that do not provide access to parking or lading spaces shall be at least 12-feet wide	11'



Bonus Intensity Zone

Development Standard	MZO Required	BIZ Proposed
<u>Required Parking Spaces by Use – MZO Table 11-32.3.A</u>	11 spaces	4 spaces
<u>Setback of Cross Drive Aisles – MZO Section 11-32-4(A)</u>	Parking spaces along main drive aisles connecting directly to a street and drive aisles that cross such main drive aisles shall be set back at least 50 feet from the property line abutting the street	18'
<u>Perimeter Landscaping – MZO Table 11-6-3.A</u> Front and Street-Facing Sides shall be Landscaped According to Ch. 33	15'	12' (minimum north property line) 11' (minimum east property line)



Bonus Intensity Zone

Development Standard	MZO Required	BIZ Proposed
<u>Required Number of Plants by Street Type</u> – MZO Table 11-33-3.A.4 1 Tree and 6 Shrubs per 25 Linear Feet of Street Frontage	Two 36-inch box trees and three 24-inch box trees	Two 36-inch box trees and two 24-inch Ocotillo (east property line)
<u>Required Landscape Yards</u> – MZO Section 11-33—(B)(1)(a)(i) Landscaping for Non-Single Residence Uses Adjacent to Single Residence Uses less than 5 Acres	20'	5' (minimum west property line) 6' (minimum south property line)
<u>Landscape Islands</u> – MZO Section 11-33-4(B)(2)	Landscape islands shall be a minimum of 8' wide and 15' in length for single-row parking	One island 3 feet wide and 18 feet long




Bonus Intensity Zone

Development Standard	MZO Required	BIZ Proposed
<u>Landscape Island Plant Material</u> – <i>MZO Section 11-33-4(D)</i>	1 shade tree and 3 shrubs shall be provided for every 15-foot parking island	0 Trees
<u>Foundation Base</u> – <i>MZO Section 11-33-5(A)</i>		
Exterior Walls with a Public Entrance	15'	5' minimum (north elevation)
Exterior Walls without a Public Entrance, not Adjacent to Parking Stalls	5'	4' (west elevation) 0' minimum (south elevation)



Bonus Intensity Zone

Development Standard	MZO Required	BIZ Proposed
<u>Landscape Area in Foundation Base – MZO Section 11-33-5(B)(1)</u> 1 Tree Per 50 Linear Feet or Less of Exterior Wall Length	6 trees	0 Trees
<u>Plant Material Within Foundation Base – MZO Section 11-33-5(B)(3)</u> Exterior Walls Visible from Public Parking or ROW with Public Entrances	33% Landscaped	0% (north elevation)



Notification

- Notified property owners within 1,000', HOAs, and registered neighborhood
- Neighborhood meeting held June 12, 2025, no attendees
- Neighborhood meeting held April 29, 2026, questions/concerns with parking, light, noise, use



Findings

- Complies with the 2050 Mesa General Plan
- Complies with Chapter 69 of the MZO for Site Plan Review
 - Complies with Chapter 21 of the MZO for a BIZ Overlay



Recommendation

Approval with conditions

City of Mesa

Planning and Zoning Board