

# Planning and Zoning Board

## *Meeting Minutes*

Mesa City Council Chambers – Upper Level, 57 East 1<sup>st</sup> Street

Date: December 15, 2021 Time: 4:00 p.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Chair Jessica Sarkissian  
Vice Chair Deanna Villanueva-Saucedo  
\*Shelly Allen  
Jeffrey Crockett  
Troy Peterson

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Ben Ayers  
Tim Boyle

(\*Boardmembers and staff participated in the meeting through the use of telephonic and audio conference equipment)

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Nana Appiah  
Rachel Prelog  
Michelle Dahlke  
Lesley Davis  
Sean Pesek  
Charlotte Bridges  
Jennifer Gniffke  
Josh Grandlienard  
Charlotte McDermott  
Sarah Staudinger  
Rebecca Gorton

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

None

Call Meeting to Order.

Chair Sarkissian declared a quorum present and the meeting was called to order at 4:15 p.m.

1. Take action on all consent agenda items.

**Items on the Consent Agenda**

2. **Approval of minutes:** Consider the minutes from the November 17, 2021, study session and regular hearing.

- \*2-a** Boardmember Crockett motioned to approve the minutes from the November 17, 2021 study session and regular hearing. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Allen.

Vote: 4-0 Continue to January 12, 2022 (Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Sarkissian, Villanueva-Saucedo, Boyle, Allen, Crockett, and Peterson

NAYS – None

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

Boardmember Crockett motioned to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Petersen.

Zoning Cases: ZON21-00467, ZON21-00451, ZON21-00458, ZON21-00786, ZON21-00886, ZON21-00288, ZON21-00588, ZON21-00595, ZON21-00693, ZON21-00788, ZON21-00790, ZON21-00928, Preliminary Plat Sossaman Business Center, Preliminary Plat Mesa Gateway 202, Preliminary Plat Eastpoint, Preliminary Plat Project 4 Multi-Family, Preliminary Plat Eastmark Development Units 5 & 6.

Vote: 4-0 (Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Sarkissian, Villanueva-Saucedo, Allen, Crockett, and Peterson

NAYS – None

- \*3-a ZON21-00467 District 6.** Within the 3300 block of South Sossaman (east side). Located North of Elliot Road on the east side of Sossaman Road. (24± acres). Site Plan Review. This request will allow for an industrial development. Robert Ward, ADW Architects, applicant; Charles Stewart, SJJ Land Investments, LLC, owners. **(Companion case to Preliminary Plat, “Sossaman Business Campus”, associated with item \*5-a). (Continued from November 17, 2021).**

**Planner: Sean Pesek**

**Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions**

**Summary:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed as a separate individual item.

Boardmember Crockett motioned to approve case ZON21-00467 and associated Preliminary Plat “**Sossaman Business Campus**” with conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Petersen.

**That: The Board recommends the approval of case ZON21-00467 conditioned upon:**

1. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations.
3. Compliance with the final site plan submitted.
4. Compliance with all requirements of Design Review.
5. All off-site improvements and street frontage landscaping to be installed with the first phase of construction.
6. Dedicate the right-of-way and easements required under the Mesa City Code at the time of application for a building permit, at the time of recordation of the subdivision plat, or at the time of the City's request for dedication whichever comes first.
7. Compliance with all requirements of Chapter 19 of the Zoning Ordinance including:
  - a. Owner shall execute and record the City's standard Avigation Easement and Release for Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport prior to the issuance of a building permit.
  - b. Due to the proximity to Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport, any proposed permanent, or temporary structure, as required by the FAA, is subject to an FAA filing, for review in conformance with CFR Title 14 Part 77 (Form 7460) to determine any effect to navigable

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

airspace and air navigation facilities. If required, an FAA determination notice of no hazard to air navigation shall be provided prior to building permit issuance.

- c. Provide written notice to future property owners that the project is within 1 mile of Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport.

Vote: 4-0 (Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Sarkissian, Villanueva-Saucedo, Allen, Crockett, and Peterson

NAYS – None

- \*3-b ZON21-00451 District 6.** Within the 1300 block of South Sossaman Road (west side) and the 7500 block of East Hampton Avenue (south side). Located south of Southern Avenue on the west side of Sossaman Road (1.3± acres). Site Plan Review. This request will allow for a parking expansion within a commercial center. Terry Odle, MG2, applicant; Sossaman Development, LLC, owner.

**Planner: Kellie Rorex**

**Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions**

**Summary:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed as a separate individual item.

Boardmember Crockett motioned to approve case ZON21-00451 with conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Petersen.

**That: The Board recommends the approval of case ZON21-00451 conditioned upon:**

1. Compliance with the final site plan and landscape plan submitted.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all conditions of approval for case No. Z14-048.
4. Apply for and receive an Administrative Use Permit to exceed 125% of the minimum number of required spaces per MZO Section 11-32-3(C)(5).
5. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, provide the City with a recorded cross access agreement with the Costco Shopping Center.

Vote: 4-0 (Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Sarkissian, Villanueva-Saucedo, Allen, Crockett, and Peterson

NAYS – None

- \*3-c ZON21-00458 District 6.** Within the 7200 E Ray Road (north side), within the 7100 block of East Seaver Avenue (south side) and within the 4900 to 5100 blocks of South 71<sup>st</sup> Street (east side). Located East of Power Road on the north side of Ray Road. (10.8± acres). Site Plan Review. This request will allow for an industrial development. Omar Cervantes, XCL Engineering, LLC, applicant; Theresa Corral, Phelan Development Company, LLC, owner.

**Planner: Sean Pesek**

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

### **Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions**

Boardmember Crockett motioned to approve case ZON21-00458 with conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Petersen.

### **That: The Board recommends the approval of case ZON21-00458 conditioned upon:**

Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.

1. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
2. Compliance with the final site plan submitted.
3. Compliance with all requirements of Design Review.
4. Prior to issuance of a building permit, an affidavit of change must be recorded with Maricopa County Recorder's Office to adjust lot lines.
5. Compliance with all requirements of Chapter 19 of the Zoning Ordinance including:
  - a. Owner shall execute and record the City's standard Avigation Easement and Release for Phoenix Mesa Gateway Airport prior to the issuance of a building permit.
  - b. Any proposed permanent or temporary structure is subject to an FAA filing for review in conformance with CFR Title 14 Part 77 (Form 7460) to determine any effect to navigable airspace and air navigation facilities. An FAA determination notice of no hazard to air navigation shall accompany any building permit application for the property.
  - c. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, provide documentation that a registered professional engineer or registered professional architect has certified that noise attenuation measures have been incorporated into the design and construction of the buildings to achieve a noise level reduction to 45 decibels as specified in Section 11-19-5 of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance.
  - d. Provide written notice to future property owners that the project is within 1 mile of Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport.

Vote: 4-0 (Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Sarkissian, Villanueva-Saucedo, Allen, Crockett, and Peterson

NAYS – None

- \*3-d ZON21-00786 District 1.** Within the 1300 block of East McKellips Road (north side) and within the 2000 block of North Doran (west side). Located East of Stapley Drive on the north side of McKellips Road. (2.15± acres). Site Plan Review; and Special Use Permit. This request will allow for a multi-tenant retail building with a dental office and restaurants with outdoor seating areas and a drive-thru. Julie Margetich, Covenant Real Estate Group, LLC, applicant; STAPLEY & DORAN CORPORATION, owner.

**Planner: Jennifer Gniffke**

**Staff Recommendation:**

**Summary:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed as a separate individual item.

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

Boardmember Crockett motioned to approve case ZON21-00786 with conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Petersen.

**That: The Board recommends the approval of case ZON20-00786 conditioned upon:**

1. Compliance with final site plan submitted.
2. Compliance with all requirements of DRB21-00783.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.

Vote: 4-0 (Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Sarkissian, Villanueva-Saucedo, Allen, Crockett, and Peterson

NAYS – None

- \*3-e ZON21-00886 District 1.** Within the 1400 block of West Bass Pro Drive (north side). Located west of Alma School Road and south of the 202 Red Mountain Freeway. (2.5± acres). Site Plan Review. This request will allow for an office development. Butler Design Group, applicant; Mesa Hotel LLC, owner.

**Planner: Josh Grandlienard**

**Staff Recommendation:**

**Summary:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed as a separate individual item.

Boardmember Crockett motioned to approve case ZON21-00886 with conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Petersen.

**That: The Board recommends the approval of case ZON20-00886 conditioned upon:**

1. Compliance with the final site plan submitted.
2. Compliance with all requirements of Design Review.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.

Vote: 4-0 (Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Sarkissian, Villanueva-Saucedo, Allen, Crockett, and Peterson

NAYS – None

- \*3-f ZON21-00923 District 1.** Within the 500 block of West Brown Road (north side). Located west of Country Club Drive on the north side of Brown Road. (4.8± acres). Site Plan Review, and Special Use Permit (SUP). This request will allow for a multiple residence development. Ashley Marsh, Gammage & Burnham, PLC, applicant; FIFO LLC, owner.

**Planner: Jennifer Gniffke**

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

### **Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions**

#### **Summary:**

Staff member Jennifer Gniffke presented ZON21-00923

The location is on the north side of brown road west of Country Club drive. And the request is for site plan review and a special use permit for a parking reduction. The purpose is to allow for conversion of medical offices into multiple residences. The general plan character area for this site is employment. And per chapter 16. It states that it is the zoning ordinance that establishes the permitted land use and Chapter Four encourages infill with neighborhood appropriate development. The site is already zoned RM four and RM four zoning district does allow for apartment uses for multiple residents. The multiple residence for zoning district allows for apartments.

The site plan shows the existing building in the center of the site. It's an existing four-story building and there is also covered parking north of that building, proposed to remain the building will undergo some modifications to convert it into apartments. There is a new proposed three-story apartment building to be located to the south of the existing building. Proposed new landscaping, proposed new amenities, new multi-use paths, and the request also includes a parking reduction per the Mesa Zoning Ordinance chapter 32. For the number of proposed units, 217 parking spaces are required, and the request is for 159 parking spaces due to the location along the bike lane and its proximity to the bus routes. The design review board discussed the architecture and the landscaping yesterday at the work session. Some neighborhood concerns include concerns about an increase in traffic as well as the impact on the local schools. In summary, the request conforms to the Mesa 2040 General Plan. It meets the criteria for site plan review, and it meets the criteria for the request for a special use permit for the parking reduction and Staff recommends approval with conditions.

Applicant Ashley Marsh with Gammage and Berman 40 North Central presented information regarding the ZON21-00923.

The property is approximately 4.5 acres on the north side of Brown, just west of Country Club. And this property is a failing office property. It's an existing four-story building.

This is currently an existing Office medical building; it was built in the 1980s. And the properties have basically been unchanged since that point in time. And we're here today for a site plan and a use permit. This is not a zoning request; the use is established by right. The RM for zoning district does allow apartment uses and that's a zoning designation from the 80s. The proposal is to improve the existing four-story office building and to create 64 units within the building envelope of that existing building. The proposal also includes another component, a new build of three stories which will be 39 units for a total of 103 market rate residences, and I bring that number to your attention of zoning by right under RM four would allow for 150 residences, however, our request is limited to 103 per site plan. The project is proposing significant upgrades to the existing building not only a retrofit of the current and an addition of a new building, but also significant improvements in terms of landscape creating connectivity from brown road up towards the crosscut canal on the northern end of the property via by means of a Paseo bringing an active amenities, both in terms of barbecue pool area ramada, and additional landscaping above and beyond what would be required by the ordinance. Again, the request today is not a zoning case. This is not asking from one designation to the other.

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

This is a site plan, exercise as well as a use permit and that is to bring forward the proposed redevelopment to this body, and also a special use permit to reduce parking, which is a blanket ordinance under the city of Mesa, as this board knows, of 2.1, regardless of unit composition, and better reflect what the unit composition and in need of this community is, which is a 1.5 ratio, which is actually above and beyond what our parking study recommended at a one 1.3 to one unit ratio.

The Banner hospital is across the street. This is a great opportunity for a rehabilitation of an underperforming office building that fits squarely with what's been developed around us with those often those hospital uses, existing apartments, and then to the southern perimeter, the eight story Banner Corporate Center. On the Design Review, we were asked to change the colors. The second request is the special use permit for a reduction in parking just based on the blanket ordinance from the City of Mesa. One is the conditions of the site and proximity to characteristics and potential renters. It is already positioned for multimodal transportation, which our residents will utilize and it's another value add to the site.

Again, the other criteria is that the use will adequately serve the proposed parking. The parking study found that 139 spaces are appropriate. We're over parking that per our own study with 159. We are already in excess of what the parking studies recommended by providing additional parking. And again, the last criteria is that the parking will not impact the supply of on street parking. There is no available on-street parking adjacent to our site. It is illogical to assume that our site would add to that because it's just not available. I'd like to just remind this board that this is not a zoning case, the RM four allows for multifamily residential uses and our request for 103 Apartments is less than what would be allowed. In terms of the density calculation. We are compatible with the surrounding land uses, we meet all the criteria which I walked through, and which staff recommended, we did go to the board of adjustment for the proposal to address some inconsistencies from the 1980 build with today's zoning ordinance and received approval from the board of adjustment for that skip request. We were at the design review board last night and received positive remarks. We do have support from the adjacent property owner, the Valleywise Hospital and we are working on an access agreement with them for emergency access on our shared perimeter and have staff recommendation for approval.

Board member Crocket inquired about access to the adjoining property.

Conversation ensued and Ashley clarified:

An agreement is in place with the adjacent property owner

Submitted comments were read by Chair Sarkissian.

David Farnsworth, 938 West 10th Street: was opposed to the item.

Amy Campbell, 937 West 10th Pl.: is opposed to the item.

Brandon Giles, 844 West 11th Pl.: does not wish to speak but is opposed to the development. There are plenty of rental apartments already in this area. 844 West 11th Pl.

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

Jenny Richardson, 529 N. Orange, does not wish to speak and is opposed to this item. This area has plenty of rental units, high school mobility issues, poverty and crime follow high density housing.

Ashton Clark, 839 West Mountain View Drive: opposed. We are oversaturated with apartments, or the neighborhood can't handle more.

Tonya Collins 864 W. 10th Street: I lived on 10th Street for 40 plus years and have watched that single-family owner-occupied residents neighborhood homes become increasingly hemmed in by high density apartment complexes. They have increased traffic over literary schools and generally compromise the quality of life in Northwest Mesa because there are just too many and too many concentrated in the area.

Brent and Lucille Kelis on 813 W. 10th Street: Our home is at 813 West 10th street in Mesa; it is vacant right now because you're on a mission for our church and we live in Montreal until August. We want to make sure our voices are heard and that we are against the proposed permit plans to put in apartments, please take our vote into consideration just the same as if we were in attendance.

Linda Lloyd 1137 N. Cherry: I'm a longtime resident of Santo Tomas Mesa on Cherry Street and I'm opposed to the project and the DevCon project. My main concern is the added traffic the complex will bring to our streets specifically along the designated bike path that runs through the curb on brown road directly in front of the proposed complex and onto 10th street. A 103-unit apartment complex will add an average 800 more cars per day to his local streets. That is a significant increase along a path the city has spent hundreds of 1000s of dollars to designate for cyclists and onto the neighborhood street not designed for high-capacity traffic. I also think this project will add more stress under schools. I truly hope you'll take all these things into consideration when we're looking at the proposed project.

Catherine Turner says I have been recently notified of a proposed project to turn the office buildings on brown into more apartments. I grew up in Mesa and I'm raising my young family. I don't know the exact statistics, but it seems to me like that cheap large production apartments don't support a long-lasting neighborhood of families that want to invest in the community. I remember when the city council told my dad 20 years ago that he couldn't build apartments on this land on Rio Salado because there were too many apartments already in the area. Now there are hundreds of more units in 85201. I understand we are in an older neighborhood, but our area is so saturated with apartments and people that another large apartment building in the area would cause more traffic and other undesirable issues. This may not be the most persuasive email, but I love this neighborhood and I try my best to make it better and I hope that the city council is trying to make it better too. I know some new apartments may seem like a quick fix but will not. The long-term solution to improving the area.

Jonathan Harris, 841 W 11th Street: I am writing regarding the meeting this afternoon at four o'clock regarding 560. With the Brown site I lived about a quarter mile from the site for over 30 years. My request is that this does not become more section eight subsidized or non-subsidized apartment housing. This will be very detrimental to our community. If there's a need for housing, I would prefer that the site become owner occupied housing like the Santo Tomas development 200 yards to the west.



## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

David Palmer says I've lived in this neighborhood for all my 72 years, and I've seen the area developed from farmland to houses and apartments. And this is my observation that the people who own homes or condos have a commitment to this neighborhood. And as a result, they are good neighbors, and over 95 of the time. But the people that live in apartments are short term neighbors and they don't have the same commitment to be neighbors. It is my observation that the police spend most of their time working crime in the neighborhood, in the apartments, and very little in the housing or condos that we own. We have had our share of apartments in this neighborhood. And now we do not need anymore. I oppose this project. We need more housing in our community but put new apartment projects in other neighborhoods where they don't have as many apartments as our neighborhood does now, that effect on schools, crime, traffic and lack of neighborhood commitment.

Adelle Atwood, I recently heard about the 560 West brown project proposal of adding 100 Plus more apartments to our Northwest Mesa area. I've grown up here and have lived here for nearly 40 years. I live down the street and around the corner from the site and I'm writing to let you know the City Council and anyone else has the power to make decisions that affect your area. Know that I am against it. I'm vehemently opposed to more multifamily housing in West Mesa, we are saturated beyond capacity, our neighborhoods, our schools, and our community, we absolutely cannot bear the burden of more multifamily housing. Please do not allow this proposal to go through.

Delight Clark, 1035 West Greenway Street, stated: Our neighborhood recently went through a big renovation right before council member Richins served his time on the board and that was to reduce flow into our neighborhood. Large construction projects were had as you come west into our neighborhood bringing Brown Road down into one lane. And that lane happens to go right through this proposed area where people would come and go exiting and entering the apartment complex there. And though I appreciate a lot of the efforts to provide a well-done apartment complex with less density, we really do have a lot of infill in our area, I also applaud the idea to create something great out of an existing building. However, every entrance into our neighborhood now has been restricted to hopefully meet that goal of reducing flow through our neighborhood. And this project would absolutely go against what was supposed to happen with that. I'm a member of the West Mesa, CDC, somewhat a little bit of a watchdog group in our area, because our area tends to get a lot of proposals like this for infill of apartments and more social services. We're not opposed to any of those things. But we really do feel like our area is saturated. We have behavioral health right next door, we have a great site with the ruins on the corner, right next to this existing apartment complex is yet another apartment complex. If you cross over onto Country Club, then we have more apartments. And we're especially concerned with what this will do to our school that already houses children from the Child Crisis Center, to save the family. And our school really can't take a lot more stress and strain that we think those apartments would bring.

JR Wright, W. 10th place stated: I've been in that house for 25 years, I've seen the neighborhood go up and down in lots of different ways. I've taken my two kids to the same apartment complex, or what was proposed to be an apartment complex with Dr. Terry wood. It doesn't check our personal boxes for our community in our neighborhood.

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

It will have a tremendous negative impact on our schools, which Delite already mentioned are stressed. My wife is a substitute teacher at Emerson. And she sees these things on a daily basis, the impact that just an incredible amount of low-income apartments has in our neighborhood. We have the Mesa Grande, Indian ruins, which is just tremendous. And why do we now want to put this giant density filled apartment complex right in the middle of everything that we already have plenty of. So, I think that's just a bad choice. Now, what are some alternatives? There are great condos at 30. East Brown at 222. Maybe take this failing office complex and make it a successful office complex. I do know that increased density creates lower income which creates lower test scores, which creates less learning which creates more traffic in our neighborhoods, which creates more crime which creates all kinds of negative things. And while I do appreciate reusing an existing failing project, I don't believe this is the right solution.

Kate Arnett, 948 W. 10th Street spoke: I am an 8521 lifer. I grew up in this neighborhood. I am raising my six children there in that neighborhood. They attend the same schools I did. I worked at Mesa Lutheran hospital until they closed. I love our neighborhood. And we want to do all we can to help keep it to be a great place to live. Statistics show that the more multifamily using multi or the more students who have out of school from multifamily housing it as that increases the math and reading scores decrease. The district average as stated in my email is 55% for students coming from multifamily, or 55% coming from single family homes, whereas in our neighborhood, it's down at 33%. We oppose anything that doesn't help bring us up to that average. I talked to someone from the developers on Tuesday and on Monday, and they had told me that most of the apartments would be their one bedroom or studio. So when it had that many families impacting the schools. But on the slide up there, it showed that 60% of the apartments would be two-bedroom apartments, which means families which means more kids and students and our schools. And then as far as the parking reduction goes the apartment complex next door you can see what happens when there are not enough parking spaces. There are cars parked illegally all over in that complex every day when we drive by, we can see that. There is no on street parking available, but they'll find somewhere to park. Parking reduction doesn't seem like a suitable solution. As Jr stated condos, owner occupied units would be a viable solution. People who own their homes, invest in their neighborhoods. We want people that want our neighborhood to be a great place to be.

David Farnsworth, 938 West 10th St spoke: I completely concur with my neighbors that have already spoken and the things that have been addressed. One thing that really hasn't been discussed though, is the traffic issue. We already live in a heavy, overly saturated neighborhood with cross traffic moving from Alma School, over to the curve and on to Country Club. I have witnessed children almost hit by cars that just fly through. Even though we have speed bumps people ignore them frequently. People look at our street on 10th Street as a quick access. Rather than simply going up to Rio Salado. They just want to fly through our neighborhood. And I don't think that's acceptable, especially when you have so many children on the street that I live on the stop sign at Westwood and 10th street. So much of the time that we think it doesn't even exist, I realize it's a four way stop. But it really concerns me. What are the possibilities of accidents occurring at that intersection? In the three years I've lived here. I'm surprised I haven't seen any. But I know it's going to be inevitable. I commend what has been proposed here. I completely agree with my neighbors and the effects that this could possibly have.

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

Applicant Ashley Marsh responded:

I appreciate the input and the feedback. And I do want to remind this board in this body that this is not a zoning case. This is not a use case. We are not here asking for apartment uses. We are here today with a site plan and a use permit. The things that you heard today as we're hesitant to have low-income apartments. We're concerned about traffic; we're concerned about our schools. So those are the three points that I heard and just to alleviate those concerns. These are market rate homes, and they are rental opportunities. Much of those rental costs though, are these market rates are more than most mortgages. There are a mix of one and two bedrooms, we'd envision a lot of professionals, we don't envision a lot of big families living here. To that respect, though, we did reach out to the schools and heard that feedback. Mesa public school told us that they are under capacity at all their schools, they are not concerned about a capacity issue with this proposal. Last thing I'd like to mention is the traffic. And when you think about medical office space, which this is, think about all the people that come into a medical office, for doctor's appointments, you have cars in and out of there, regularly. That happens five times an hour multiple times a day. A single doctor might be seeing upwards of 40 patients a day. Those are 40 trips in and out. It's much less for a residential use than a medical office use. We went ahead and followed up with our traffic engineer who did our parking study. They anticipate less than 1700 trips a day with that reimagined, repurposed multifamily use. So this transition to use will actually alleviate traffic concerns with a reduction of 1700 trips. I just wanted to point that out for this board while you're considering again, a site plan and a use permit, but that this will relieve any type of traffic concern. Finally, I'd also just like to reinforce where this specific property is located. It's not located in the middle of a neighborhood. The closest residential district is more than 600 feet away from this site. We are located next to a hospital across the street from the Banner Corporate Center, and adjacent to additional multifamily complexes, the egress and ingress points are out of Brown Rd. immediately adjacent to Country Clubs. People aren't going to be cutting through the neighborhood, they're going to be using Brown Rd, they're going to be getting on at the Country Club, and they're going to be moving on. We are adjacent to the bus route. We are adjacent to bikes, we are adjacent to the canal, we have multimodal transportation, which we showed you and this property is zoned for multifamily uses and is a significant improvement and investment in this underserved property. Those aren't good for communities when you have vacancies, a vibrant multifamily, appropriately sized under the density that we would have by right with thought to traffic and to schools. We do ask that you approve the site plan and the use permit, which we're here today to discuss.

Board member Allen stated,

I have given a lot of thoughts, and I'm very familiar with this area. I was one of those kids who used to cut through Brown Rd, you know, on the way to school, but I think that there's an oversaturation of apartments in that whole area. There's apartments on the north side of Rio Salado that's like less than a half a mile away. There are a lot of apartments within that block to the east of where Banner Hospital is. I agree with a comment that was made, that if it's owner is occupied, it's a whole different level. I would support something like that. But I think that there is a parking deficit and parking is going to be provided. I don't agree with that either. So at this point, I will not be supporting the project site plan review or this special use permit.

Board member Crockett stated,

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

I have a little different perspective on this. I do applaud the homeowners and the neighbors in that area, because for being concerned about the neighborhood and for everything they've done, but as I look at our responsibility here, we're not being asked to approve a zoning request here. The use that the applicant is brought forward is an allowable where they are located. Our responsibility is to look at the plan that has been presented and to determine whether it is consistent with the requirements of our zoning ordinance. And as I look at it, it looks like a quality project. It's going to repurpose an existing property that's not doing well. I do have a bit of a concern about the parking reduction, because it seems like there's always there's always issues and multifamily homes or residences with parking. I'm not sure exactly where people go for overflow, I suspect that they either go next door to the Behavioral Health Center, or perhaps across the street in the Banner parking lot. I have a little bit of a concern there. But in terms of whether this is the right use for the property. I don't think that's within our jurisdiction to say. I think we'd look at the site plan and either approve it or deny it based on whether it is consistent with the zoning ordinance.

Vice Chair Villanueva-Saucedo added,  
I agree with board member Crocket. Unfortunately, we're here to look at the site plan, not the underlying zoning. And it is a nice plan. I like the amenities, the reuse aspect, I won't be supporting it however, because of the special use permit, I think the reduction in parking is just not sustainable. If it's professionals they need to leave for work and the bus is sufficient if you want to leave for work. So that's the reason I will be not supporting this request, I think long term, the fact that the zoning allows this, is going to be a consistent issue. I appreciate the residents coming forward. I'm very familiar with this area, I am entirely sympathetic with the points that have been made. The purview of this board however is not to change the underlying zoning, so I just would caution you that this is going to be a consistent concern but based upon the conjoining of the special use permit that's my rationale for not supporting this request.

Chair Sarkissian stated:

While I agree with the neighbors and Boardmember Allen, I also agree with what we're reviewing here. I think when one of the neighbors mentioned, we vote very differently than City Council does. We vote based on if it checks boxes, and it was mentioned it does check boxes. For the site plan it's a technical code review and it does check those boxes. I believe for the parking; they had the parking study done and on existing structures. It's for one- and two-bedroom apartments. I know our own code is under review for parking, we're getting a parking study done and part of the entire code to possibly adjust that and especially because I feel that the hospital right there in the Banner facilities; you'll probably get some a lot of employees from that to walk over or use the bypass so you might see reduction request that way. But it is the existing use permitted by right, so that is what we were discussing today.

Boardmember Petersen motioned to approve case ZON21-00923 with conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Crockett.

**That: The Board recommends the approval of case ZON20-00923 conditioned upon:**

1. Compliance with the final site plan submitted.

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

2. Recordation of a vehicular cross-access easement with the adjacent property to the west.
3. Compliance with all requirements of DRB21-00977 and BOA21-01027.
4. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.

Vote: 3-2 (Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Sarkissian, Crockett, and Peterson

NAYS – Allen, Villanueva-Saucedo

- \*4-a ZON21-00288 District 2.** Within the 4700 block of East Main Street (north side). Located East of Greenfield Road on the north side of Main Street. (6.8± acres). Site Plan Review; and Special Use Permit (SUP). This request will allow for a large-scale commercial recreation center. Katy James, Architectural Collaborative Team LLC, applicant; KARNO NORTON S/RONALD B TR ETAL, owner.

**Planner: Jennifer Gniffke**

**Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions**

**Summary:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed as a separate individual item.

Boardmember Crockett motioned to approve case ZON21-00288 with conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Allen.

**That: The Board recommends the approval of case ZON20-00288 conditioned upon:**

1. Compliance with the final site plan submitted.
2. Compliance with all requirements of DRB21-00289 .
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Prior to issuance of a building permit, record a vehicular and pedestrian cross-access easement with the adjacent Towerpoint RV park property.

Vote: 4-0 (Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Sarkissian, Villanueva-Saucedo, Allen, Crockett, and Peterson

NAYS – None

- \*4-b ZON21-00588 District 6.** Within the 6600 block of South Sossaman Road (east side) Located north of Pecos Road on the east side of Sossaman Road. (4.5± acres). Rezone from Light Industrial with a Planned Area Development Overlay (LI-PAD) to Light Industrial with a Planned Area Development overlay, Bonus Intensity Zone overlay, and Council Use Permit (LI-PAD-BIZ-CUP); and Site Plan Review. This request will allow for the development of a new hotel. Will Moseley, Mesa Skybridge, LLC, applicant; Phoenix Mesa Gateway Airport Authority, owner.

**Planner: Sean Pesek**

**Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions**

**Summary:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed as a

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

separate individual item.

Boardmember Crockett motioned to approve case ZON21-00588 with conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Allen.

**That: The Board recommends the approval of case ZON20-00588 conditioned upon:**

1. Compliance with the final site plan submitted.
2. Compliance with all requirements of Design Review.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations, except the modifications to the development standards as approved with the BIZ overlay and shown in the following table:

Development Standards	Approved
Maximum Building Height – <i>MZO Section 11-7-3</i>	55'6"
Landscaping within proposed retention basins – <i>MZO Section 11-33-6</i>	No Landscaping required in retention basins

4. Compliance with all conditions of approval associated with Case No. Z96-023.
5. Compliance with all conditions of approval associated with Case No. Z07-014.
6. Compliance with all requirements of Chapter 19 of the Zoning Ordinance including:
  - a. Owner shall execute and record the City's standard Aviation Easement and Release for Phoenix Mesa Gateway Airport prior to the issuance of a building permit.
  - b. Any proposed permanent or temporary structure is subject to an FAA filing for review in conformance with CFR Title 14 Part 77 (Form 7460) to determine any effect to navigable airspace and air navigation facilities. An FAA determination notice of no hazard to air navigation shall accompany any building permit application for the property.
  - c. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, provide documentation that a registered professional engineer or registered professional architect has certified that noise attenuation measures have been incorporated into the design and construction of the building to achieve a noise level reduction to 45 decibels as specified in Section 11-19-5 of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance.
  - d. Provide written notice to future property owners that the project is within 1 mile of Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport.

Vote: 4-0 (Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Sarkissian, Villanueva-Saucedo, Allen, Crockett, and Peterson

NAYS – None

- \*4-c ZON21-00595 District 6.** Within the 4400 to 4700 blocks of South Ellsworth Road (west side) and within the 8700 to 9200 blocks of East Warner Road (south side). Located south of Warner Road and west of Ellsworth Road. (165.7± acres). Rezone from Light Industrial with a Planned Area Development overlay (LI-PAD) and Limited Commercial with a Planned Area Development overlay (LC-PAD) to Light Industrial with a Planned Area Development overlay (LI-PAD); and Site Plan Review. This request will allow for a

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

mixed-use development including commercial, office and industrial uses. Sean Lake on behalf of Pew & Lake PLC, applicant; Scannell Properties, owner.

**Planner:** Josh Grandlienard

**Staff Recommendation:** Approval with conditions

**Summary:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed as a separate individual item.

Boardmember Crockett motioned to approve case ZON21-00595 with conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Allen.

**That: The Board recommends the approval of case ZON20-00595 conditioned upon:**

1. Compliance with the final site plan submitted.
2. Specific site plan shall be submitted and approved before the construction of Phase II and Phase III of the subject development.
3. Compliance with all requirements of Design Review.
4. Compliance with the Preliminary Plat submitted.
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations.
6. Dedicate the right-of-way and easements required under the Mesa City Code at the time of application for a building permit, at the time of recordation of the subdivision plat, or at the time of the City's request for dedication whichever comes first.
7. All off-site improvements and perimeter landscaping along Ellsworth Road to be installed with the first phase of construction.
8. All off-site improvements and perimeter landscaping along Warner Road to be installed with the first phase of construction.
9. Access and circulation, drainage, and retention, internal landscaping, and landscape yard landscaping will be installed with the corresponding phase.
10. Compliance with all requirements of Chapter 19 of the Zoning Ordinance including:
  - a. Owner shall execute and record the City's standard Avigation Easement and Release for Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport prior to the issuance of a building permit.
  - b. Due to the proximity to Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport, any proposed permanent, or temporary structure, as required by the FAA, is subject to an FAA filing, for review in conformance with CFR Title 14 Part 77 (Form 7460) to determine any effect to navigable airspace and air navigation facilities. If required, an FAA determination notice of no hazard to air navigation shall be provided prior to building permit issuance.
  - c. Provide written notice to future property owners that the project is within one mile of Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport.
11. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations, except the modification to the development standards as approved with this PAD as shown in the following table:

Development Standards	Approved
Maximum Building Height – <i>MZO Section 11-6-3 Limited Commercial</i>	30 feet
<i>MZO Section 11-7-3 Light Industrial</i>	44 feet (Buildings 1-5 & 7-9) 49 feet (Building 6) 66 feet (Buildings in Lot 11, future

# MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

	<b>development on the northwest portion of the site)</b>
<u>Interior Parking Lot Landscaping –</u> <i>MZO Section 11-33-4(A)</i>	<p>Interior parking lot landscaping requirement standards apply to all off-street parking lots containing 10 or more parking spaces.</p> <p><b>Exception: They do not apply to storage lots, vehicle and equipment storage lots, truck loading areas, or parking in truck loading areas.</b></p>
<u>Foundation Base–</u> <i>MZO Section 11-33-5(A)(1)(a)(i)</i> <i>Along Exterior Walls with a Public Entrance for Buildings Larger than 10,000 Square Feet</i>	<p><b>Additional foundation base for a minimum of 4 entries per building unless there are less than 4 entries at any one building, in which case, additional foundation base shall be provided at every entry to the building. Plaza area shall have a minimum width and depth of 20 feet, and a minimum area of 900 Square feet. (Buildings 1, 4, 7, and 9).</b></p>

Vote: 4-0 (Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Sarkissian, Villanueva-Saucedo, Allen, Crockett, and Peterson

NAYS – None

- \*4-d ZON21-00651 District 6.** Within the 5600 block of South Mountain Road (west side). Located north of Williams Field Road on the west side of Mountain Road. (11.02± acres). Rezone from Agriculture (AG) to Residential Small Lot 4.5 (RSL-4.5). This request will allow for a single residence small lot development. Blake McKee, Skybridge Companies, applicant; MARILYN A LANDE REVOCABLE TRUST, owner. **(Companion case to Preliminary Plat, “Eastpoint”, associated with item \*5-c).**

**Planner: Josh Grandlienard**

**Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions**

## **Summary:**

Staff member Joshua Grandlienard presented case ZON21-00651

This project called Eastmark or Eastpointe start. It is located just west mountain road and north of Williams Field road is located is currently zoned AG, due to it being currently zoned within Maricopa County within Maricopa County Zoning it is RU 43. As part of this case, it is being presented and taken to council as part of that annexation



## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

case concurrently. And that annexation case numbers ANX21- 00649 And so again, location is located west of mountain road north of Williams Field road and east of signal Butte is the Perth General Plan is a neighborhood designation of safe places to live as well as primarily single residences and support uses includes schools, parks etc. As also it is currently zoned, are you 43 within the county is the associated annexation case. And as part of the annexation there a comparable zoning of ag would be applied to the site for which is why the rezone request is from ag to Rs 4.5. As part of the RSL lot or the RSL site plan requirements, they have provided 1.3 acres of open space to be provided for use by the residents. As part of that citizen participation was performed for property owners within 1000 feet, as well as HOA and rich stampers heads within a mile. There was a neighborhood meeting on August 31 of 2021, where there's 18 attendees, mostly citizens that were concerned with the overall density. They did feel that the density was better than what the original two proposals were. I did receive 20 different letters, that are in support as well as 12 in opposition to this project. Of those 12, only one of those is a citizen within the city of Mesa while all the other 11 are citizens within Maricopa County. I also received a petition that was 15 pages, number of residences, throughout the communities that are both city of Mesa and Maricopa County. 43 of the comments were that they wanted to see similar one acre lots, while the lots to the north the current RS six PID, the minimum lot size on those is 5000 square feet, which is only 50 feet a lot more square feet than the current smallest size on this proposal. Staff finds that the proposed project Eastpointe meets and complies with the 2040 general plan, as well as chapter 69 of The Mesa zoning ordinance for site plan review as well as section 9.9 Dash six dash two for preliminary plat. And staff is recommending approval with conditions.

Applicant Blake McKee, 4017 N 59th St. Phoenix Arizona spoke:

East Point is 11 and a half acres at the southwest corner of mountain road, and the Galveston Rd. alignment. Our proposal reflects the reality of a couple of rather significant development challenges and expensive to resolve. The first being the sewer. The City of Mesa sewer line on Mountain Rd. From our Northeast corner to our Southwest corner, there's five ft. of drop, which means we slope away from that sewer line. Knowing that the sewer can't flow uphill, we know we have a significant challenge to overcome there. One of those solutions is going to be rather expensive. The second significant issue is the drainage, there is significant sheet flow that comes across the property from the northeast to the southwest. We simply don't have any choice. But to install a rather expensive, hardened drainage channel at the south end of our property is approximately 30 feet in depth. Because we have a regional drainage issue that we need to address and resolve. We've done quite a bit of community outreach on the project. And so, I know we have some folks here in opposition. I have spoken with quite a few of them. A comment that was made by our neighbors in the county second went back to density in lot size. The opposition from our neighbors of Belavia. I will say there's a significant regional drainage channel on the north end of our property. The closest house at Belavia from our northern property line is 150 feet, a significant setback. We have the 30-foot drainage channel on the south significant setback, the drainage channel to the north significant setback on the east side, all of our lots have an exaggerated setback of 30 to 35 feet with a just open space from the mountain road, right of way line. So, we really are buffered in every direction. And although I understand and appreciate their opposition, with the significant challenges that we do face, I don't know how to bridge that gap. We identify with the existing development in the city of

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

Mesa to the north and to the west, and our neighbors to the south and the east would prefer if we identified with their housing choices.

Boardmember Crockett asked the applicant to clarify if the lots in the county to the south and east of your property are on septic or sewer?

Applicant Blake answered, Septic

Chair Sarkissian read submitted comment:

Darell Blackwell: does not wish to speak as opposed to building somewhere other than our rural area or building one acre lots.

Ashlyn Mueller, 22735 E Carla Vista Dr: is opposed to the item. I purchased my property expecting to be surrounded by lots that would ensure I retained my property value and also my way of living.

Jeffrey Tenny, 22721 E Carla Vista Dr: is opposed to the item. I am part of a very large group of homeowners within 1000 feet of the development. I strongly, strongly oppose annexation and rezoning of skybridge development with their currently planned project Skybar just starting on their project narrative, lot sizes are consistent with the surrounding communities, and this is not true. Skybridge is proposing much smaller lots, mostly 4300 square feet, which is not consistent with any of the lots on all surrounding borders on immediate borders to the both the east side and the south side is County, are you 43, which with one acre lots.

Victor Delgado, 22743 E Carla Vista Dr: is opposed and says I oppose skybridge development of the property of mountain road and Galveston.

Manuel Perez, 23024 E Galveston St: is opposed and says I oppose development of property, Mount ridge and Galveston and then I have a couple people who are also the rest of arrays here.

Catherine Aguilar, 14917 S MOUNTAIN RD is opposed.

Dallan Randall, 22824 East Galveston Street spoke:

I just moved to the area about four years ago and anticipated some substantial development in the area. I moved there specifically because I wanted to be on acreage. That's the lifestyle that I chose to live know that the city would be coming and moving in around me. My concern is if a project like this is able to pass, then it also opens the doors for any of the property owners in that area to do a similar type of development, which would greatly affect or change the lifestyle that's right in that vicinity. Since I've been there, I currently own six acres, just within a short distance of this property. Typically, when we look at rezoning, it's usually proposed for one of two reasons: either one, the current zoning just doesn't work. Nobody's been able to make it work for years. And there needs to be a change of things, or there's some new zoning that's proposed, that's a benefit to all involved. I don't see where that applies in either case to this rezoning application. The existing 11 acres could easily be divided into acre plus lots. I have heard the argument you might not be able to get 11 homes in there on that 11 acres but you could certainly do two acres or something similar. So that's what I see going on with that particular case. Also to Blake's point about there being substantial

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

issues with drainage and sewer on that particular parcel which makes it extremely expensive to develop into multiple houses. When you have those extra costs, you have to use higher density. How do you overcome higher cost and higher density? I keep that property in the acre plus parcels, overcomes all of those, all of those issues.

Steve Kelly 22736 E Carla Vista spoke:

The property that they're speaking of is going to backup right directly to my property on the north side of my property. I'm very concerned with the flooding that happened in the past in that area. That area, that property floods very badly coming off from the east side of the mountain road and the water flows directly into that property. If they build that property up five feet, I don't know where that water is going to go, but it's going to have to go somewhere. My other concern with Blake keeps talking of the expense over and over and the expense of redeveloping this property. My thoughts are that he's only in it to rezone the property and then flip the property and sell it off to a new developer or somewhere down the line, just get it rezoned and move on to the next project and not have anything to do with the actual building of the homes that he's proposed. I don't know if that's something that can be investigated or if that's his thoughts or what his deal is going to be with that.

Chair Sarkissian stated:

With this case, just so you're aware this case is also the associated preliminary plat. So that would put in place the lot sizes and

Wayne, 22722 East Karla Vista Dr. spoke on behalf of Eileen Kelly and Tracy Gonzales: I am the center house of five that touched this property. My North boundary is their South boundary. I have a couple of things that I'd like to do on rebuttals as far as their proposed plan. First, the citizen participation plan final letter for East Point contacts list will be developed for citizens agencies in this area interested neighbors focused on 1000 feet from site but may include more contact letters that went out 500 feet. I was part of the petition gathering group. And we found that anything beyond 500 There was no contact at all, whether they were put in the post and never delivered. I find that hard to believe with that many homes. I don't know the exact numbers I could talk to my counterpart, and she'll be able to give you the numbers of homes that were 1000 feet out. But several Bellavia residents were adamant that they never received any letters at all. And they were very, very upset. The other one is the East Point neighborhood meeting right up, the developer stated neighbors voiced concerns about increased traffic in the area to stories homes, rain, regional drainage issues. There was no discussion of regional issues. It's all local to mountain road Galveston and the property to the northeast called the MOC property. They believe that the water comes through there. It's designed to flow that way. Basically, we have to let that water flow. That's what impacts mountain roads and Karla Vista comes across that acreage. We have some pictures. We have pictures where the kids are literally canoeing and kayaking down the street. The skies are blue. So that gives you an idea of how much volume we're talking about. Yes, it can be engineered, and yes, it has.

It was brought up East Point would have minimal impact relative to the new highway 24, or the large new scale quote communities down there. We have several more developments going on, we have encore lots, we have Belavia, we have tapestry at destination, we have destination at Gateway phases one and two. And as you're aware,

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

Avalon crossing is proposed and just got permitted to go in there as well. So, we are looking at and then the 24 will have on off ramps to the meridian, which is to the west of Galveston, and we have off ramps at Signal Butte. We're going to be in between those. So, we're well aware of what that traffic can and will probably look like. We can't control traffic ebbs and flows. What we're concerned about is 100 plus cars coming in and out that development throughout the day. I talked to the Maricopa County Transportation people, that road was just basically put in as an intermediate Road. In the developer's executive summary, it talks about the project that's to the east, west, north south. Belavia is adamantly opposed to this, we explained and showed them the difference between RSL 4.5 and RS six which is what there's currently zoned for whether they're lots are a little larger or a little smaller doesn't matter. And so, we told them that we would pass that information on to the board and let them let you know that. Much like Avalon crossing does or even some of Bellavia and encore does they have larger lots than they gradually go into apartments and or condos into the area. And we're asking that a little bit more gradual between 43 and six, maybe instead of going down to a very small lot also was brought up that these houses were going to be of high quality. I asked Mr. Blake, what's going to make them high quality. The price range that was quoted for these houses during our citizen participation was 500 to 600,000. The houses are going to be about 15 to maybe 2000 square feet, that's high. You can go over to any one of those new developments and get a new house with a much larger lot. So, we're concerned that one has to have a price point and do a drop. Also, during my conversation with Mr. Blake on December 10. He stated their homes are newer and they're going to match Taylor Morrison, but they are doing nothing specific to make these a higher quality. They're not more energy efficient. They're not better built; they're using the exact same supplies as he put it. Everybody that's going to be doing the homes around us they're using the exact same, so we are kind of concerned how are you going to give us high quality homes in her neighborhood especially that size.

The big concern we have right now is security. We have four homes that back up to this property. When we were having our citizen participation meeting, it was mentioned that their canal was going to be gun night and they were going to maybe change it to rip rap. Plus, all the homes around us are basically horse property. So, we have a horse fence. So, you're not looking at just four houses. Now you're looking at maybe eight to 10 houses that are going to have to go up the block wall. And finally, the developer keeps mentioning expenses. Also, a larger lot would take care of his issue with the sewer and having to build up which would allow the flow. The residents that sign a petition are adamantly opposed. They just can't tell you how adamantly opposed they are to this to the RSL 44.5. The other thing also is that we have a community that banded together in less than a week.

Boardmembers viewed pictures provided by members of the public.

Ray Treijo, 14917 South Mountain Road spoke via telephone:

I'm the neighbor directly. The east of the property being discussed. So yeah, I agree with Wayne's points. He explained everything very well. They're basically proposing the smallest lot size I can probably conceive of, for this, and it just doesn't fit in with our neighborhood. And the security issues you mentioned, you know, with our livestock with things with our concern as well. So that's all those are the main things that I concur with. And then everything Wayne said as well.

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

Applicant Blake Mckee responded:

I would be involved in the build out of the project by partner and business partner from A to Z. second, we utilized a service that does nothing but mailers. And we most certainly did send notices to 1000-foot radius. traffic was brought up, my response to the neighbors was, we'd have a minimal impact. and hundreds and hundreds of units approved. In regard to drainage, we are part of the solution, not the problem. I mean, our design is to pick up the water at the northeast corner of our property to bring it West. I don't see security from our community. As a big issue. I will tell you the houses are 1800 to 2400 square feet. Our conversation is: what are you doing that is special or different than what Taylor Morrison is doing? And I was honest, I said, we're doing a quality project that is equal to what Taylor Morrison is doing. We're very proud of that offering. and with security questions, some of them have chain link fences, so you are going to look into block walls off the property or your yards and perimeter.

Boardmembers inquired about the drainage channel proposed by the applicant and conversation ensued. Applicant described the proposed drainage channel and lot sizes.

Chair Sarkissian and other board members discussed similar existing drainage channels.

Staff member Joshua Grandlienard spoke regarding the drainage plan

Sure, I can only provide comments as a planner, I can't as an engineer, so certainly I do have some ability to read drainage reports, but it's not at a high technical level. But throughout my reading of the drainage report, it is consistent with the history of those flows. And to maintain those flows, the proposed drainage system is consistent with the historical flows as well as reducing the existing flows on site, just because those are being carried through in order to maintain those historic flows. The proposed retention ditch proposed retention systems are essentially going to help to alleviate the concerns in the area. I can say that I am confident that the that Development Service will ensure that the drainage on site will flow

Dr. Nana Appiah stated:

The project was also reviewed by Development Review engineering, both the preliminary plat and the rezoning case. They have provided comments.

Boardmember Crockett inquired:

Would you comment on the existing infrastructure and what's planned and whether that's adequate to convey the traffic from your subdivision?

Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard stated: North of Galveston, have a bit wider shoulder due to meeting city standards, because it is still technically within Maricopa County jurisdiction. But because those were developed through the city of Mesa, those are consistent to the north. All the properties to the south are consistent. I do understand there's concerns with the traffic in the area. But certainly, over time, Maricopa County will no longer be the jurisdiction and I'm not sure at what time that would occur. Most likely, when the City of Mesa is on both sides and has the right of way.

Boardmember Allen inquired:

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

The property that would be just to the west of the site it would be the west of this site zoned R16 PADD. Is that under development right now? Are those design those lots of design about size wise the same as what these are?

Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard confirmed.

Boardmember Petersen stated:

Our role as the planning zoning board where our purview is limited and so a lot of the questions that we're asking are to narrow down the issues to those things that we have purview over. Those are good planning practices, resolving issues that come with development and those types of things and so from that perspective, and with this site, it is where it is in, and this is a rapidly developing area of the city and then just to the east of yours and other rapidly undeveloped areas. Apache Junction just annexed 10 square miles. It's going to be rapidly developing like this as well. As I look at this as was discussed, the master plans to the north and to the west within those master plans are some varying lot sizes but the lots immediately adjacent are 50 feet wide. The ones in the middle here 50 And then the ones around the perimeter 45. So, they're there as Josh stated in essence. We are the city of Mesa Planning and Zoning Board and so looking at this from a city general plan perspective, this matches what the voter approved, general plan for this area of the city, the drainage area to the south and the channel. It's looking at the preliminary grading plan that was submitted with the preliminary plat application it's a trapezoidal channel on the it doesn't detail whether you know exactly what the side slopes are, but it's a V Shanell that handles 220 CFS, which looks like that conveying that to the West will only serve to help some of the drainage issues in the in that area.

Boardmember Crockett motioned to approve case ZON21-00651 and associated Preliminary Plat "Eastpoint" with conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Allen.

**That: The Board recommends the approval of case ZON20-00651 conditioned upon:**

1. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations.
2. Compliance with the final building product types elevations, and floor plans submitted with application, including building materials.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Dedicate the right-of-way and easements required under the Mesa City Code at the time of application for a building permit, at the time of recordation of the subdivision plat, or at the time of the City's request for dedication whichever comes first.
5. Compliance with the preliminary plat submitted.
6. Compliance with all requirements of Chapter 19 of the Zoning Ordinance including:
  - a. Owner shall execute and record the City's standard Avigation Easement and Release for Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport prior to the issuance of a building permit.
  - b. Due to the proximity to Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport, any proposed permanent, or temporary structure, as required by the FAA, is subject to an FAA filing, for review in conformance with CFR Title 14 Part 77 (Form 7460) to determine any effect to navigable airspace and air navigation facilities. If required, an FAA determination notice of no hazard to air navigation shall be provided prior to building permit issuance.

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

- c. Provide written notice to future property owners that the project is within one mile of Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport

Vote: 4-0 (Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Sarkissian, Villanueva-Saucedo, Allen, Crockett, and Peterson

NAYS – None

- \*4-e ZON21-00693 District 2.** Within the 5600 block of East Albany Street (south side), within the 100 block of North 56<sup>th</sup> Street (east side), and within the 100 block of North 57<sup>th</sup> Street (west side). Located west of Recker Road and north of Main Street. (1.5± acres). Rezone from Limited Commercial (LC) to Multiple Residence 4 with a Planned Area Development overlay (RM-4-PAD); and Site Plan Review. This request will allow for a multiple residence development. Tim Boyle, Tim Boyle Design, applicant; Craig Ahlstrom, owner.

**Planner: Sean Pesek**

**Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions**

**Summary:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed as a separate individual item.

Boardmember Crockett motioned to approve case ZON21-00693 with conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Allen.

**That: The Board recommends the approval of case ZON20-00693 conditioned upon:**

1. Compliance with the final site plan submitted.
2. Compliance with Design Review Case No. DRB21-00658.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations, except the modifications to the development standards as approved with the PAD overlay and shown in the following table:

<b>MZO Development Standards</b>	<b>Approved</b>
Required Parking Spaces – <i>MZO Section 11-32-3(A)</i> - Multiple Residence	2 spaces per unit (72 total spaces)
Required Bicycle Parking – <i>MZO Section 11-32-8(A)(1)</i>	3 spaces
Garages Dimensions – <i>MZO Section 11-32-4(F)</i> Double car garage	20 feet 8 inches wide 20 feet long
Minimum Setback of Cross Drive Aisles – <i>MZO Section 11-32-4(A)</i>	3 feet
Building Setbacks – <i>MZO Section 11-5-5</i> - Front (Collector - Albany St.) - Street Side (Collector - 56 <sup>th</sup> St.) - Street Side (Collector - 57 <sup>th</sup> St.)	8 feet 0 feet 14 feet 9 inches

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

- Rear (south property line)	13 feet 3 inches
Minimum Building Separation – <i>MZO Section 11-5-5</i> Two-story buildings	24 feet
Landscape Yards – <i>MZO Sections and 11-5-3(B) and 11-33-3(B)</i> - Front (Albany Street) - Street Side (N. 56th St.) - Street Side (N. 57th St.) - Non-Single Residential Uses Adjacent to Non-Single Residence (south property line)	0 feet 0 feet 14 feet 9 inches 5 feet
Required Perimeter Landscaping – <i>MZO Section 11-33-3</i> - Front (Collector - Albany St.) - Street Side (Collector - 56 <sup>th</sup> St.)	0 trees & 0 shrubs 0 trees & 0 shrubs
Required Minimum Dimension for Private Open Space at ground level – <i>MZO Section 11-5-5(A)(3)(e)(i)(1)</i>	4 feet 1 inch
Private Open Space Coverage – <i>MZO Section 11-5-5(A)(3)(e)(2)</i>	10%

Vote: 4-0 (Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Sarkissian, Villanueva-Saucedo, Allen, Crockett, and Peterson

NAYS – None

- \*4-f ZON21-00788 District 2.** Within the 3800 to 4000 blocks of East University Drive (south side). Located east of Val Vista Drive on the south side of University Drive. (1.04± acres). Site Plan Review. This request will allow for a multiple residence development. Young Kim, Esquire Architecture and Planning, LLC, applicant; Dan Thompson, owner.

**Planner: Sean Pesek**

**Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions**

**Summary:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed as a separate individual item.

Boardmember Crockett motioned to approve case ZON21-00788 with conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Allen.

**That: The Board recommends the approval of case ZON20-00788 conditioned upon:**

1. Compliance with the final site plan submitted.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Board of Adjustment's approval for a Development Incentive Permit (Case No. BOA21-00787).



## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

3. Compliance with all City development codes and Regulations, except the modifications to the development standards approved by the Board of Adjustment (Case No. BOA21-00787).
4. Compliance with all requirements of Chapter 19 of the Zoning Ordinance including:
  - a. Owner shall execute and record the City's standard Avigation Easement and Release for Falcon Field Airport prior to the issuance of a building permit.
  - b. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, provide documentation that a registered professional engineer or registered professional architect has certified that noise attenuation measures have been incorporated into the design and construction of the buildings to achieve a noise level reduction to 45 decibels as specified in Section 11-19-5 of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance.
  - c. Provide written notice to future property owners that the project is within five mile(s) of Falcon Field.
  - d. Any proposed permanent or temporary structure is subject to an FAA filing for review in conformance with CFR Title 14 Part 77 (Form 7460) to determine any effect to navigable airspace and air navigation facilities. An FAA determination notice of no hazard to air navigation shall accompany any building permit application for the property.

Vote: 4-0 (Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Sarkissian, Villanueva-Saucedo, Allen, Crockett, and Peterson

NAYS – None

- \*4-g ZON21-00790 District 6.** Within the 4900 to 5100 blocks of South Ellsworth Road (west side) and within the 9000 to 9200 blocks of East Ray Road (north side). Located west of Ellsworth Road and north of Ray Road. (17.04± acres). Rezone from Agriculture (AG) to Light Industrial (LI); Site Plan Review, and Special Use Permit (SUP). This request will allow for an industrial development. Ryan Companies US, Inc., applicant; Mushson Partners LLC, owner.

**Planner: Josh Grandlienard**

**Staff Recommendation: Approval with condition**

**Summary:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed as a separate individual item.

Boardmember Crockett motioned to approve case ZON21-00790 with conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Allen.

**That: The Board recommends the approval of case ZON20-00790 conditioned upon:**

1. Compliance with the final site plan submitted.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of Design Review.
4. Dedicate the right-of-way and easements required under the Mesa City Code at the time of application for a building permit, or at the time of the City's request for dedication whichever comes first.
5. Compliance with all requirements of Chapter 19 of the Zoning Ordinance including:

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

- a. Owner shall execute and record the City's standard Avigation Easement and Release for Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport prior to the issuance of a building permit.
- b. Due to the proximity to Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport, any proposed permanent, or temporary structure, as required by the FAA, is subject to an FAA filing, for review in conformance with CFR Title 14 Part 77 (Form 7460) to determine any effect to navigable airspace and air navigation facilities. If required, an FAA determination notice of no hazard to air navigation shall be provided prior to building permit issuance.
- c. Provide written notice to future property owners that the project is within one mile of Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport.

Vote: 4-0 (Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Sarkissian, Villanueva-Saucedo, Allen, Crockett, and Peterson

NAYS – None

- \*4-h ZON21-00800 District 5.** Within the 8200 to 8300 blocks of East University Drive (north side), within the 400 block of North 82nd Street (east side), and within the 400 block of North 83rd Street (west side). Located east of Sossaman Road on the north side of University Drive. (4.1± acres). Rezone from Single Residence 43 (RS-43) to Multiple Residence 2 with a Planned Area Development overlay (RM-2-PAD); and Site Plan Review. This request will allow for a multiple residence development. Jon Gillespie, Pew and Lake, P.L.C., applicant; C & K Investments, Inc., owner. **(Companion case to Preliminary Plat, "Project 4 Multi-Family" associated with item \*5-d).**

**Planner: Charlotte Bridges**

**Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions**

### **Summary:**

Staffmember Charlotte Bridges presented case ZON21-00800:

A site plan review, preliminary plat and alternative components. And the purpose is to allow the development of 32 Multiple residential units. The project is located between 82nd Street and 83rd Street on the north side of University Dr. further to the west of Sossaman. To the east as the 202 freeway. The general plan designation for this area is neighborhood and neighborhoods provide a safe place for people to live variety of housing types including multiple residences, and that neighborhoods also allow for higher density residential along arterial streets. This proposed project, I believe in the notes is 7.3 dwelling units per acre. The site plan shows eight buildings on eight lots. Each building has four units. So, there's a total of 80, excuse me, 30 to two units. There are three-bedroom units. Each unit has a single car garage, but then has a driveway space for that additional parking space. And then there's visitor parking spaces provided by the amenity areas. The access to the property is through a central drive from 82nd to 83rd. And amenities in the project include a playground area, a pickleball, court and then just Ramada and some more passive amenity areas. Part of the request is for a planned Area Development. And so, with the PID request they're allowing, they're asking for a modification to the RM two development standards to reduce the side yard requirements for the one-story portion of the project and the two-story project portion of the project. The units themselves are one story garages with more two-story living areas. And the code has different requirements for that one story product. And the two-story project.

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

The applicant is asking for a reduction from code from that requirement. They're also asking for reduction from the minimum yard requirements for the two-story portions of the unit. The primary justification for the reduction in these codes, or the primary justification for these code modifications is because of the configuration of the lots, if this were all one lot, the setbacks and the building separations would be code. But because they're eight individual pads, and they provide that track along the north, and that track along itself, they need the modifications to the code to meet the setback and site requirements. And then one last PID request is to allow mechanical units on one set for the mechanical units on the end units closer to 83rd, to be within the required landscape yard. And because of all the additional landscape space on the property to the north, to the south. That's the justification to allow those units within those areas. This project is not required to go to Design Review Board.

Therefore, since they are requesting alternative compliance. the Mesa the ordinance requires two primary building materials on each facade with those two primary materials being 25% or more of the total facade. In this case, the side facades are stucco, which is around 86-87%. And then they also have some composite siding up in the gable area that is about 7%. They did complete a citizen participation plan for the neighborhood meeting; they did the 1000-foot notification and notified the homeowners and homeowners associations and neighborhoods within the area per the general standards and recommendations of the board. There were some comments about the project.

This project was reviewed by engineering, there's no concern with water at this location. As far as the property, the location of the neighbor's meter to the north, engineering evaluated that and does not have any concerns. secondary to the citizen participation, they made the public notice that public notice went out to the residents within 500 feet, neighborhoods, and neighborhood associations and HOA. In summary, staff evaluate this project, and it meets the 2040 Mesa General Plan criteria. It meets the criteria for Chapter Two for a PD overlay. And it meets the review criteria for site plan review outlined in Section 1169, five of the MCL. And it meets alternative compliance requirements outlined in Section 11. Five, six of the MCL and staff is recommending approval with conditions.

Applicant Reese Anderson stated:

This is consistent with the general plan located on arterial, a fair amount of density, separated by a significant landscaping track more than what's required under the code. And when you add that to the buffer of the waterpower line, I'm happy to show you an exhibit we created but honestly, between Karen Ingram's property that building to our building is approximately 240 plus feet of separation. So, it's a significant buffer to the north. And if you'd like me to, I'm happy to show that to you. But with that, were we would urge your support on this item as well as companion preliminary plat. And then again, just remind you that those PhD requests really are technical in nature. When you measure to the outside boundaries of this property, we satisfy all the code requirements for the arm to district advice channel, you've been here a long time, I'll let me sit down and ask or answer any questions that you may have.

Vice Chair Villanueva-Saucedo read submitted comments after unsuccessful attempt to reach individual over the phone:

Karen Ingram, 319. North 85th St. is opposed to the project.

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

Boardmember Peterson motioned to approve case ZON21-00800 and associated Preliminary Plat "Project 4 Multi-Family" with conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Allen.

**That: The Board recommends the approval of case ZON20-00800 conditioned upon:**

1. Compliance with the final site plan and landscape plan submitted.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations.
3. Compliance with the final building elevations submitted.
4. Dedicate the right-of-way and easements required under the Mesa City Code at the time of application for a building permit, at the time of recordation of the subdivision plat, or at the time of the City's request for dedication, whichever comes first.
5. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations, except the modifications to the development standards as approved with the PAD overlay and shown in the following table:

<b>MZO Development Standards</b>	<b>Approved</b>
<u>Maximum Building Coverage:</u> – [MZO Table 11-6-3]	<b>53 feet</b>
<u>Minimum Yards:</u> [MZO Table 11-5-5] Side (three or more units: One-story Two-stories:  Rear (three or more units, two-story):	<b>10 feet</b> <b>10 feet</b>  <b>15 feet</b>
<u>Landscape Yard Width:</u> [MZO Section 11-33-3(B)(a)] Sides:	<b>10 feet</b>
<u>Landscape Yard –</u> [MZO Section 11-33-(2)(A)]:	<b>Required landscape yard shall be maintained free from any feature not a part of the landscape design., except ground mounted mechanical units within required yards</b>

Vote: 4-0 (Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Sarkissian, Villanueva-Saucedo, Allen, Crockett, and Peterson

NAYS – None

- \*4-i ZON21-00928 District 1.** Within the 2600 to 2800 blocks of East Lehi Road (west side). Located north of McDowell Road and east of the 202 Red Mountain Freeway. (41.4± acres). Modify the existing Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay. This request will accommodate an increase for lot coverage on individual lots. Sean Lake, Pew and Lake, P.L.C., applicant; Reserve 100 LLC, owner.

**Planner: Josh Grandlienard**

**Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions**

**Summary:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed as a separate individual item.

Boardmember Crockett motioned to approve case ZON21-00928 with conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Allen.

**That: The Board recommends the approval of case ZON20-00928 conditioned upon:**

1. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations.
2. Compliance with the final building product types submitted with application, including elevations and materials.
3. Dedicate the right-of-way and easements required under the Mesa City Code at the time of application for a building permit, at the time of recordation of the subdivision plat, or at the time of the City's request for dedication whichever comes first.
4. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations, except the modifications to the development standards as approved with this PAD and shown in the following table:

Development Standard	Approved
Minimum Lot Area (sq. ft.) – <i>MZO Section 11-5-3(A)(1)</i>	9,100 square feet
Minimum Lot Width – <i>MZO Section 11-5-3(A)(1)</i>	65 feet
Minimum Lot Depth – <i>MZO Section 11-5-3(A)(1)</i>	140 feet
Minimum Yard – <i>MZO Section 11-5-3(A)(1)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Front and side (garage)</li><li>- Front (enclosed livable areas, porches and porte cocheres)</li><li>- Interior side, aggregate of two sides</li><li>- Interior side, street side</li><li>- Rear</li></ul>	20 feet (front facing) 15 feet (side facing) 15 feet  15 feet 7 feet 25 feet
Maximum Building Coverage (% of lot) – <i>MZO Section 11-5-3(A)(1)</i>	40% (Two-Story)

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

	50% (Single Story)
Garage Frontage and Location – <i>MZO Section 11-5-3(B)(4)(b)</i>	Garages with three (3) or more doors, or designed to accommodate three (3) or more non-tandem parked cars, are permitted only on lots 65 feet wide or greater
Maximum Wall Height in the RS District – <i>MZO Section 11-30-4(A)(1)(b)</i>	8 feet
Lots and subdivision (street frontage) <i>MZO Section 11-30-6(H)</i>	Every lot must have frontage along a private street
Garage Dimensions – <i>MZO Section 11-32-4(2)</i> - Double-car garage	20 feet wide and 19 feet long (floorplan numbers 2342, 2568, and 3177)

Vote: 4-0 (Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Sarkissian, Villanueva-Saucedo, Allen, Crockett, and Peterson

NAYS – None

- \*5-a “Sossaman Business Campus”, District 6.** Within the 3300 block of South Sossaman (east side). Located North of Elliot Road on the east side of Sossaman Road. (24.3± acres). Preliminary Plat. Robert Ward, ADW Architects, applicant; Charles Stewart, SJJ Land Investments, LLC, owners. **(Companion case ZON21-00467, associated with item \*3-a). (Continued from November 17, 2021).**

**Planner: Sean Pesek**

**Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions**

**Summary:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed as a separate individual item.

**That: The Board recommends the approval of Preliminary Plat “Sossaman Business Campus” conditioned upon:**

1. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations.
3. Compliance with the final site plan submitted.
4. Compliance with all requirements of Design Review.
5. All off-site improvements and street frontage landscaping to be installed with the first phase of construction.
6. Dedicate the right-of-way and easements required under the Mesa City Code at the time of application for a building permit, at the time of recordation of the subdivision plat, or at the time of the City's request for dedication whichever comes first.
7. Compliance with all requirements of Chapter 19 of the Zoning Ordinance including:
  - a. Owner shall execute and record the City's standard Avigation Easement and Release for Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport prior to the issuance of a building permit.

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

- b. Due to the proximity to Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport, any proposed permanent, or temporary structure, as required by the FAA, is subject to an FAA filing, for review in conformance with CFR Title 14 Part 77 (Form 7460) to determine any effect to navigable airspace and air navigation facilities. If required, an FAA determination notice of no hazard to air navigation shall be provided prior to building permit issuance.
- c. Provide written notice to future property owners that the project is within 1 mile of Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport.

Boardmember Crockett motioned to approve Preliminary Plat “Sossaman Business Campus” and associated case ZON21-00467 with conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Allen.

Vote: 4-0 (Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Sarkissian, Villanueva-Saucedo, Allen, Crockett, and Peterson

NAYS – None

- \*5-b “Mesa Gateway 202” District 6.** Within the 4400 to 4700 blocks of South Ellsworth Road (west side) and within the 8700 to 9200 blocks of East Warner Road (south side). Located south of Warner Road and west of Ellsworth Road. (165.7± acres). Preliminary Plat. Sean Lake on behalf of Pew & Lake PLC, applicant; Scannell Properties, owner. **(Companion case ZON21-00595, associated with item \*4-c).**

**Planner: Josh Grandlienard**

**Staff Recommendation: Approval with Conditions**

**Summary:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed as a separate individual item.

Boardmember Crockett motioned to approve Preliminary Plat “Mesa Gateway 202” and associated case ZON21-00651 with conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Allen.

**That: The Board recommends the approval of Preliminary Plat “Mesa Gateway 202” conditioned upon:**

1. Compliance with the final site plan submitted.
2. Specific site plan shall be submitted and approved before the construction of Phase II and Phase III of the subject development.
3. Compliance with all requirements of Design Review.
4. Compliance with the Preliminary Plat submitted.
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations.
6. Dedicate the right-of-way and easements required under the Mesa City Code at the time of application for a building permit, at the time of recordation of the subdivision plat, or at the time of the City's request for dedication whichever comes first.
7. All off-site improvements and perimeter landscaping along Ellsworth Road to be installed with the first phase of construction.

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

8. All off-site improvements and perimeter landscaping along Warner Road to be installed with the first phase of construction.
9. Access and circulation, drainage, and retention, internal landscaping, and landscape yard landscaping will be installed with the corresponding phase.
10. Compliance with all requirements of Chapter 19 of the Zoning Ordinance including:
  - a. Owner shall execute and record the City's standard Avigation Easement and Release for Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport prior to the issuance of a building permit.
  - b. Due to the proximity to Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport, any proposed permanent, or temporary structure, as required by the FAA, is subject to an FAA filing, for review in conformance with CFR Title 14 Part 77 (Form 7460) to determine any effect to navigable airspace and air navigation facilities. If required, an FAA determination notice of no hazard to air navigation shall be provided prior to building permit issuance.
  - c. Provide written notice to future property owners that the project is within one mile of Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport.
11. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations, except the modification to the development standards as approved with this PAD as shown in the following table:

<b>Development Standards</b>	<b>Approved</b>
<u>Maximum Building Height –</u> <i>MZO Section 11-6-3</i> <i>Limited Commercial</i>  <i>MZO Section 11-7-3</i> <i>Light Industrial</i>	30 feet   44 feet (Buildings 1-5 & 7-9) 49 feet (Building 6) 66 feet (Buildings in Lot 11, future development on the northwest portion of the site)
<u>Interior Parking Lot Landscaping –</u> <i>MZO Section 11-33-4(A)</i>	Interior parking lot landscaping requirement standards apply to all off-street parking lots containing 10 or more parking spaces.  Exception: They do not apply to storage lots, vehicle and equipment storage lots, truck loading areas, or parking in truck loading areas.
<u>Foundation Base–</u> <i>MZO Section 11-33-5(A)(1)(a)(i)</i> <i>Along Exterior Walls with a Public Entrance for Buildings Larger than 10,000 Square Feet</i>	Additional foundation base for a minimum of 4 entries per building unless there are less than 4 entries at any one building. Plaza area shall have a minimum width and depth of 20 feet, and a minimum area of 900 Square feet. (Buildings 1, 4, 7, and 9).

Vote: 4-0 (Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Sarkissian, Villanueva-Saucedo, Allen, Crockett, and Peterson

NAYS – None



## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

- \*5-c “Eastpoint” District 6.** Within the 5600 block of South Mountain Road (west side). Located north of Williams Field Road on the west side of Mountain Road. (11.02± acres). Preliminary Plat. Blake McKee, Skybridge Companies, applicant; MARILYN A LANDE REVOCABLE TRUST, owner. **(Companion case ZON21-00651, associated with item \*4-d).**

**Planner: Josh Grandlienard**

**Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions**

**Summary:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed as a separate individual item.

Boardmember Crockett motioned to approve Preliminary Plat “Eastpoint” and associated case ZON21-00651 with conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Allen.

**That: The Board recommends the approval of Preliminary Plat “Eastpoint” conditioned upon:**

1. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations.
2. Compliance with the final building product types elevations, and floor plans submitted with application, including building materials.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Dedicate the right-of-way and easements required under the Mesa City Code at the time of application for a building permit, at the time of recordation of the subdivision plat, or at the time of the City's request for dedication whichever comes first.
5. Compliance with the preliminary plat submitted.
6. Compliance with all requirements of Chapter 19 of the Zoning Ordinance including:
  - a. Owner shall execute and record the City's standard Avigation Easement and Release for Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport prior to the issuance of a building permit.
  - b. Due to the proximity to Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport, any proposed permanent, or temporary structure, as required by the FAA, is subject to an FAA filing, for review in conformance with CFR Title 14 Part 77 (Form 7460) to determine any effect to navigable airspace and air navigation facilities. If required, an FAA determination notice of no hazard to air navigation shall be provided prior to building permit issuance.
  - c. Provide written notice to future property owners that the project is within one mile of Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport

Vote: 4-0 (Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Sarkissian, Villanueva-Saucedo, Allen, Crockett, and Peterson

NAYS – None

- \*5-d “Project 4 Multi-Family” District 5.** Within the 8200 to 8300 blocks of East University Drive (north side), within the 400 block of North 82nd Street (east side), and within the 400 block of North 83rd Street (west side). Located east of Sossaman Road on the north side of University Drive. (4.1± acres). Preliminary Plat. Jon Gillespie, Pew and Lake, P.L.C., applicant; C & K Investments, Inc., owner. **(Companion case ZON21-**

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

**00800, associated with item \*4-h).**

**Planner: Charlotte Bridges**

**Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions**

**Summary:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed as a separate individual item.

Boardmember Crockett motioned to approve Preliminary Plat “Project 4 Multi-Family” and associated case ZON21-00651 with conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Allen.

**That: The Board recommends the approval of Preliminary Plat “Project 4 Multi-Family” conditioned upon:**

1. Compliance with the final site plan and landscape plan submitted.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations.
3. Compliance with the final building elevations submitted.
4. Dedicate the right-of-way and easements required under the Mesa City Code at the time of application for a building permit, at the time of recordation of the subdivision plat, or at the time of the City’s request for dedication, whichever comes first.
5. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations, except the modifications to the development standards as approved with the PAD overlay and shown in the following table:

<b>MZO Development Standards</b>	<b>Approved</b>
<u>Maximum Building Coverage:</u> – [MZO Table 11-6-3]	<b>53 feet</b>
<u>Minimum Yards:</u> [MZO Table 11-5-5] Side (three or more units: One-story Two-stories:  Rear (three or more units, two-story):	<b>10 feet</b> <b>10 feet</b>  <b>15 feet</b>
<u>Landscape Yard Width:</u> [MZO Section 11-33-3(B)(a)] Sides:	<b>10 feet</b>
<u>Landscape Yard –</u> [MZO Section 11-33-(2)(A)]:	<b>Required landscape yard shall be maintained free from any feature not a part</b>

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

	<b>of the landscape design., except ground mounted mechanical units within required yards</b>
--	---

Vote: 4-0 (Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Sarkissian, Villanueva-Saucedo, Allen, Crockett, and Peterson

NAYS – None

\* \* \* \* \*

**Note:** Audio recordings of the Planning & Zoning Board Meetings are available in the Planning Division Office for review. They are also “live broadcasted” through the City of Mesa’s website at [www.mesaaz.gov](http://www.mesaaz.gov)

- \*5-e “Eastmark Development Units 5 and 6” District 6. (ZON21-01063)** Within the 10021 to 10400 blocks of East Elliot Road (south side), within the 3600 to 4200 blocks of South Everton Terrace (east side), and within the 3900 to 4300 blocks of South Signal Butte Road (west side). Located West of Signal Butte Road and south of Elliot Road. (333.62± acres). Preliminary Plat. Christina Christian, Brookfield Properties, applicant; DMB Mesa Proving Grounds LLC, owner.

**Planner:** Lesley Davis

**Staff Recommendation:** Continue to January 12, 2022

**Summary:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed as a separate individual item.

Boardmember Crockett motioned to approve Preliminary Plat “Eastmark Development Units 5 and 6” with conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Allen.

**That: The Board recommends the approval of Preliminary Plat “Eastmark Development Units 5 and 6” upon:**

Vote: 4-0 Continue to January 12, 2022 (Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Sarkissian, Villanueva-Saucedo, Allen, Crockett, and Peterson

NAYS – None

- 6-a ZON21-00878 District 5.** Within the 2800 to 3100 blocks of North Recker Road (west side) and within the 5900 block of East Longbow Parkway (south side). Located north of McDowell Road on the west side of Recker Road. (20± acres). Minor General Plan Amendment from Employment to Mixed-Use Activity District. This request will allow for a mixed-use development. Reese Anderson, Pew & Lake, PLC, applicant; Dover Associates, LLC, owner. **(Continued from October 27, 2021)**

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

**Planner: Cassidy Welch**

**Staff Recommendation: Continue to January 12, 2022**

**Summary:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed as a separate individual item.

Boardmember Crockett motioned to continue case ZON21-00878 to January 12, 2022. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Allen.

Vote: 4-0 Continue to January 12, 2022 (Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Sarkissian, Villanueva-Saucedo, Allen, Crockett, and Peterson

NAYS – None

- 6-b ZON21-00731 District 5.** Within the 2800 to 3100 blocks of North Recker Road (west side) and within the 5900 block of East Longbow Parkway (south side). Located north of McDowell Road on the west side of Recker Road. (20± acres). Modification of the Planned Area Development Overlay (PAD); Rezone from Light Industrial (LI) to Limited Commercial (LC), Council Use Permit (CUP) and Site Plan Review. This request will allow for a mixed use development. Reese Anderson, Pew & Lake, PLC, applicant; Dover Associates, LLC, owner. **(Continued from October 27, 2021)**

**Planner: Cassidy Welch**

**Staff Recommendation: Continue to January 12, 2022**

**Summary:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed as a separate individual item.

Boardmember Crockett motioned to continue case ZON21-00731 to January 12, 2022. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Allen.

Vote: 4-0 Continue to January 12, 2022 (Chair Sarkissian, Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Villanueva-Saucedo, Allen, Crockett, and Peterson

NAYS – None

Dr Nana Appiah stated for the record:

Chair, boardmembers, it's been a pleasure working with you, as a planning director. I will still be involved with planning. But I really appreciate all your support. We've made significant changes. We move plan and zoning board from one meeting to two meetings a month. You approved the design guidelines; there's been so many changes that have taken place. I am appreciative of all the work you've done. And I'm looking forward to working with you. We also have a great staff and I am looking forward to the future of planning. Thank you very much.

Boardmember Allen thanked Dr. Appiah for his leadership and service.

Boardmember Crockett stated:

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2021 PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

Doctor Appiah came in and replaced the planning director that had been here for a long time. And I started out here under his leadership. He picked up that mantle and has provided terrific leadership has given us in a lot of ways a new way to look at things. I think his time here has been very constructive. It's moved us on a from a planning and zoning perspective. It's moved us in a very positive direction. And I wish him well, I know he's not going far. We'll continue to have that association. But it's been it's been a privilege working with you. And again, thank you for all you've done.

### **7. Adjournment.**

Boardmember Crockett motioned to adjourn the meeting at 4:34 p.m. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Peterson.

Vote: 4-0 Approved (Chair Sarkissian, Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Villanueva-Saucedo, Allen, Crockett, and Peterson

NAYS – None

Respectfully submitted,

---

Nana K. Appiah, AICP, Secretary  
Planning Director

\* \* \* \* \*

**Note: Audio recordings of the Planning & Zoning Board Meetings are available in the Planning Division Office for review. They are also “live broadcasted” through the City of Mesa’s website at [www.mesaaz.gov](http://www.mesaaz.gov)**