

Planning and Zoning Board

Study Session Minutes

Mesa City Council Chambers – Lower Level, 57 East 1st Street

Date: December 15, 2021 Time: 2:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair Jessica Sarkissian
Vice Chair Deanna Villanueva-Saucedo
Jeffrey Crockett
Troy Peterson

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Ben Ayers
Tim Boyle
Shelly Allen

(*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
Cassidy Welch
Jennifer Gniffke
Josh Grandlienard
Charlotte McDermott
Sarah Staudinger
Rebecca Gorton

OTHERS PRESENT:

None

1. Call meeting to order.

Chair Sarkissian declared a quorum present and the meeting was called to order at 2:36 p.m.

2. Review items on the agenda for the December 15, 2021, regular Planning and Zoning Board Hearing.

Call Meeting to Order.

Chair Sarkissian declared a quorum present and the meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m.
Review items on the agenda for the November 17, 2021, regular Planning and Zoning Board Hearing.

Chari Sarkissian invited the outgoing Director of Development Services to make some comments.

Director of Development Services Christina Zelonka spoke:

I am the short-term development services director and mostly why I was asked to come tonight- I really wanted to thank you, personally for all the work that you do and the commitment that you have to the City of Mesa. I pay close attention to what's going on. I have always been so impressed by the quality of your deliberations and the importance that you place on the decisions that you make about land use in the City of Mesa. I know it's a tremendous amount of work. I try to explain to people sometimes how much work it involves being on the planning and zoning board. I really did want to thank you. I've been sort of paying attention. I really wanted to exercise my privilege as one of the directors to thank you. I also wanted to make a very exciting announcement. The City Manager has appointed Nana, Dr. Appiah, as the new Development Services Director, and he and I have worked very closely over his tenure, which is almost exactly three years plus, six or seven days. You all know the qualifications that Nana brings to the job -his experience. So, I am so excited to be able to turn my job over to Nana. I think that he will help lead this department and the City to the next steps as Mesa continues to grow and be redeveloped. So I just wanted to make that official announcement. Thank you for all the work that you've done.

Thank you, Christine.

Staffmember Sean Pesek presented case ZON21-00467:

The request is a site plan review and pre plat review for an industrial development. The location is east of Sossaman Road north of Elliot Road. Proposing eight industrial buildings approximately 329,000 square feet of ground floor area, primary access is provided with an east-west Boulevard Drive with an entrance gateway and then secondary access at the north and south ends of the site for trucks. Buildings one and eight are oriented towards Sossaman road. the primary building entrances are facing the street. The applicants also proposed an eight ft perimeter screen wall around along the northeast and south property lines to screen visibility of the loading areas and truck bays. the request also includes a pre plat. the applicant is proposing eight, eight lots within this site. this case, has an associated design review application and that was discussed at the October 12 work session. the Design Review Board recommended minor changes to the building and landscape design--those changes and the case was approved in November--the applicant notified all property owners within 1000 feet, as well as HOA fees and registered neighborhoods within one mile. One response was received from an individual who resides outside of the notification boundary, which was included in the citizen participation report. There were some concerns with noise from trucks dust control, and the applicant worked with that resident to reassure her with all the permits and applications that are required as far as construction.

Staff finds that the request complies with the 2040 Mesa general plan, the Gateway Strategic Development Plan criteria in chapter 69 for site plan review and criteria in Section 962 for a pre-flight and staff recommendation is approval with conditions.

Staffmember Kellie Rorex presented case ZON21-00451:

This site is located west of Sossaman Road on the south side of Hampton Avenue within a five-lot center called Sossaman Center. The site is within the mixed-use activity district and the goal of the mixed-use activity district is to provide large scale community and regional activity areas with significant retail and commercial uses--two out of the five Sossaman

Center parcels are developed this is one of the three remaining vacant lots. the request is for our major site plan modification to allow for parking lot expansion from Costco onto the subject site. The zoning is LCP-PAD and parking in our zoning ordinance is permitted on a contiguous lot that is incorporated into the development site. This site has cross access agreements with Costco and shares that internal drive so they are contiguous lot that is incorporating into the site. The applicants are proposing 87 new parking stalls. perimeter and interior parking lot landscaping that matches both what was approved was Sossaman Center, and the Costco shopping center. With the new 87 parking stalls the site the Costco site will be over parked so they do have to request an administrative use permit for that extra parking and have done so that that request is under review. the applicants did the required notifications, sent letters to property owners within 500 feet aways and registered neighborhoods and no response was received. the request complies with the 2014 Mesa general plan, and it meets the criteria in chapter 69 per site plan review, and Staff recommends approval with conditions.

Boardmember Crockett inquired:

There is a strip of land that goes out to Sossaman Road. That's not additional access for parking is that right?

Staff Member Kellie Rorex stated:

That's correct. there's some configuration with their request this was originally approved to be there drives that they're going to have to reconfigure, this lot must match up with what they're proposing for the new access point that comes in here. There is not a road here currently, I do not believe

Boardmember Crockett inquired about the access road and maintenance of a portion of land.

Staff Member Kellie Rorex clarified:

The road is just being changed from going straight down to coming around to this corner and meeting up with this existing road. A person can't come out of the parking lot to go north but you'll have to go around. The road will be maintained by the property owner. I believe Costco will be purchasing this lot from Sossaman Center. The landscaping will match

Staff Member Sean Pesek presented case ZON21-00458:

initial site plan review for an industrial development consisting of five buildings. The location is within the railroad commerce center Northwest industrial subdivisions. East power road and north of railroad. The property was zoned with a planned Area Development overlay because the industrial subdivision has private streets per Title Nine subdivisions with private streets. must have a planned Area Development overlay. the underlying zoning li provides areas for limited manufacturing, processing, wholesaling, and distribution the proposed use complies with the underlying zoning. The general plan, character area designation is mixed use activity and district employment. this calls for regional activity areas with a wide range of employment opportunities, and the subject request conforms to the purpose and intent of that character area. The applicants proposing five industrial buildings approximately 195,000 square feet of building area, six access drives, so two from 71st Avenue to from East Sieber

Avenue and then two from Ray Road. Approximately 242 parking spaces are required per Mesa zoning ordinance and the applicant is providing 253 onsite spaces. Each building has loading area and truck docks internal to the site and screened from public view with a masonry wall. The applicant is also providing freestanding patio areas as an open space and employee amenity which is also a requirement for Mesa zoning ordinance. Design Review Board reviewed this reviewed the design of the application at the December 14 work session citizen participation a letter was mailed to all property owners no comments received as of today.-staff finds the request complies with the 2040 Mesa general plan, the gateway strategic development plan and chapter 69 for site plan review, and the recommendation is approval with conditions.

Staff member Jennifer Gniffke presented case ZON21-00786:

The request is for a site plan review and a special use permit to allow for a multi-tenant retail building with a dental office and restaurant. There are two restaurant suites and both have an outdoor seating area and one of them has a drive thru. The location is on the north side of McKellips Road just east of Stapley Drive. The general plan land use designation is neighborhood as well as mixed use activity which promotes safe places to live and unique shopping experiences. The existing zoning for the site is neighborhood commercial for the southern part and office commercial for the northern part of the lot. Locally oriented retail service and office uses are permitted, and a special use permit is required for outdoor seating and for drive thru uses in the neighborhood commercial zoning district. The landscape plan features desert Museum and live oak trees and a variety of shrubs. The design review board discussed this request at their November 9 meeting. And it's still in review. The applicant conducted a citizen participation plan, and they notified property owners within 1000 feet as well as HOA s and registered neighborhoods. offered a neighborhood meeting on September 2nd.

The request meets the Mesa 2040 General Plan. It meets the criteria for site plan review, as well as the criteria for special use permits. And staff recommendation is approval with conditions.

Boardmember Peterson inquired:

Regarding the driveway and access from the parking lot to the western side of the food retail area- Would a person have to cross the queue for the driveway to get to all those? The route seems pretty circuitous. What was the process to the ended up with this?

Staff member Jennifer Gniffke stated:

This site has undergone quite a few modifications during the review process. Staff has worked with the applicant to provide the most pedestrian friendly design for this site. The circuitous drive thru is designed that way to allow for pedestrian access from the building itself, as directly as possible to the parking area on the north side of the building. The building fronts onto McKellips and so the front entrances to the suites are actually on McKellips. The drive thru crosses one pedestrian path, but it is just likely to be used by the employees accessing the solid waste

Boardmember Peterson inquired:

So the idea is the customer entry will primarily be offered off of McKellips Rd?

Staffmember Jennifer Gniffke confirmed.

Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard presented ZON21-00886:

This is for CCS headquarters. It is for an office use. Review for a 36,000 square foot approximately. Office Building is located north of Bass Pro drive. It is located south of the Hyatt within Mesa Riverview, and it is located west of Alma School. Per the general plan is designated as mixed-use activity. The intent of the district is to provide community regional activity centers, as in those uses often include office, residential and entertainment uses as well. The zoning on the site is currently zoned PID, the PID overlay requires maintain design consistency with the existing hotel, verified through Design Review Board last night and through staff review. They have consistent with the design elements, so they meet the intent of that PID-most of the site plan outside of the pad itself was when it was originally developed as part of Mesa review as part of that height. Citizen participation property owners within 500 feet were notified and H ways and neighborhoods within a quarter half mile were notified. There were no comments on this project. Per staff findings complies with the 2040 general plan and meets chapter 60 Dinah the MCO. Therefore, staff is recommending approval with conditions

Staffmember Jennifer Gniffke presented case ZON21-00923:

The request is for site plan review and a special use permit for a parking reduction and the purpose is to allow for conversion of medical offices into multiple residential the location is on the north side of brown road west of Country Club drive. The general plan character area is employment. Chapter 16 states that it is the zoning ordinance that establishes the permitted land uses so even though the character area is employment, the existing RM four zoning district does allow for the multi residential use as well. Chapter Four of the General Plan encourages infill with neighborhood appropriate development. And this proposal meets that that criterion as well. The zoning district is multiple residential for RM four and apartments are permitted use in the RM four zoning The site plan shows the existing four-story building in the center of the site, which is proposed to remain with some modifications, and be redeveloped as apartments. The new three-story building is located south of that closer to Brown Road. There's new landscaping, new amenities, new multi-use paths. And then 217 spaces are required for the proposed uses. And 159 are proposed as part of the requested special use permit for the parking reduction. The landscape plans-show new landscape areas and paths along the southwest and north property lines. There's also new landscaping and the foundation base areas and the amenity areas. brown road on the left side of the landscape plan and then there's the multiuse path that connects brown road along the front of the site along the west side. there's a proposed gate to connect with a canal the crosscut canal path behind it. The design review board discussed this request at their work session, the building elevations- will be what the building is proposed to be modified to appear. The applicant did conduct a citizen participation process and notified owners within 500 feet as well as HOA fees and registered neighborhoods. Staff has spoken with one of the neighbors and they

expressed concerns about a traffic increase as well as the impact on local schools. One letter was included with the packet materials and that was the person that I spoke with on the phone. There have since been additional letters that were submitted. And those were input into the record as part of the comment cards. In summary, the request meets the requirements of the mesa 2040 General Plan. It meets the criteria for site plan review, as well as the criteria for special use permits for the parking reduction and staff recommendation is approval with conditions.

Chair Sarkissian and Dr. Appiah agreed to read the submitted comments during the planning and zoning meeting while the case remains on the consent agenda.

Staffmember Jennifer Gniffke presented case ZON21-00288:

The request is for a site plan review and special use permit to allow for a large-scale commercial Recreation Center. The location is east of Greenfield Road on the north side of Main Street. The general plan land use designation is neighborhood with a transit corridor overlay and the intent of which is to provide safe places to live as well as pedestrian-oriented development along the future transit route. The existing zoning has general commercial and retail and related service-oriented businesses as well as large scale commercial recreation are all permitted uses in the zoning district. There are 21 pickleball courts proposed for the north end of the site. And there's an existing dog park which is proposed to remain around along the west side of the site. There's cross access proposed with the Mesa regal RV park to the northwest, as well as with the tower point RV park to the northeast. And the connection with Mesa Regal is existing, the connection with PowerPoint is proposed. The parking reduction is requested to be 162 spaces total proposed. And 242 would be required if the site were parked per the standard parking calculations of the code. Those calculations are based on a fitness center that is open to the public. This fitness center is going to be utilized by the residents, the residents who reside within a half mile of the fitness center and so they're requesting the parking reduction for that reason. The applicant conducted a citizen participation process they notified property owners within 1000 feet, HOA is and registered neighborhoods. They held a neighborhood meeting on May 6. And there were no members of the public who attended that meeting. The request meets the Mesa 24 2040 General Plan. It meets the criteria of the site plan review, as well as the criteria for a special use permit for a parking reduction and we recommend approval with conditions and I'm happy to answer your questions-

Staff member Sean Pesek Presented case ZON21-00588:

The request is a rezone from light industrial with the planning area development overlay, to light industrial with the planned Area Development overlay and a bonus intensity zone overlay site plan review and council use to allow for the development of a four-story hotel. The location is within the 6600 block of S Sossaman Road on the east side located north of east Pecos Road. The property is also subject to the airport overflight area two and per section 11-7-3 in the Mesa zoning ordinance. hotels on property zoned LIS that are subject to the AOA to require approval of council use permit. The general plan character area designation has specialty and that's intended for large areas with a single use. Hotel is a support Use as called out in that chapter. The property is also subject to the Gateway

strategic development plan and specifically the airport district. And this is envisioned as a mixed-use district with airport related uses. The proposed use conforms to the goal of the airport district by providing a service for airport travelers. the bonus intensity zone overlay is to increase the maximum building height. per chapter seven the maximum in Li is 40 feet and the proposed height to the top of parapet walls 55 feet six inches. There is also a landscaping requirement with retention basins and the applicant is not proposing landscaping within the proposed retention basin the intent is to not landscape currently. Design Review Application was discussed on October 12, was approved on November 16. All property owners within 1000 feet as well as registered neighborhoods were notified no response as of today. this request complies with the 2040 Mesa general plan the gateway Strategic Development Plan criteria in chapter 69. For initial site plan review criteria in chapter 21. For a bonus intensity zone overlay and criteria in Section 1176 of the mesa zoning ordinance for council use permanent and staff recommendation is approval with conditions.

Board member Crockett inquired:

What happens when in a situation where a developer wants to build on the retention basin property in the future? Does new retention basin that gets built with enough capacity for both projects?

Staffmember Sean Pesek clarified:

And that's part of the permit that we're currently reviewing

Boardmember Crockett inquired:

What's the quality that supports the biz overlay?

Staff Member Sean Pesek replied:

The applicant has to meet criteria. To qualify for a bonus intensity zone overlay. The criteria involves: superior design. The applicant provided a mixture of materials on the front facade and stone veneer, metal paneling, brick CMU. We felt that in combination of other site announcements, vanpool, parking, carpool parking spaces. enhanced landscape design along the south property line gaming walls that we typically don't see with hotel developments. all of that combined, we felt the applicant met the criteria for a bonus intensity zone.

Staff member Joshua Grandlienard presented case ZON21-00597

This is a rezone from Li P ad and LCPD to LI PAD to LCPD is a reduction of the LC area in this area and a change of the PAD itself. It also includes polarity plant as well as site plan review, this is a multi-phase project phase one will be the industrial component and it will be nine industrial buildings. All phases two and three will be office and commercial respectively. The intent of these districts is to provide a wide range of job opportunities as well as high quality settings for those jobs and provide a community and regional activity center. It is currently zoned li PD and LCD that reduction is to reduce the amount of LC area to facilitate more industrial development in the area. For the PhD at Qwest, this has been updated as per the memo. And the specific update is the addition of building three within the first PID request of building height. And the required building height standard for Li is 40. With the request for 44 feet for buildings one through five and seven through nine. Building three has been moved

actually from that first section to with building six for a request of 49 feet due to the needs of the end user, they require a clear height of 36 feet and due to the meeting the conditions of design review, they do have to have that increased parapet height, which will increase it above that 44 foot height limit and then building and then within phase three, building height limit of 66 feet and then poor the PID request for parking lot landscaping. They have expanded the exceptions from do not applies to vehicle equipment storage or lots or vehicles and equipment sale lots to also include truck loading areas and parking within those truck loading areas, as well as a foundation base PID request--additional foundation pays for a minimum of four entries per building unless there are four less than four entries at anyone building. a plaza area shall have a minimum depth of at least 20 feet with a minimum area of 900 feet. And this would apply to buildings 147 and nine. The citizen participation was reached out for property owners within 1000 feet. He weighs in registered neighborhoods within half a mile. And then neighborhood meeting was held July 27, 2020. And there was one attendee staff finds that the project complies with the 2040 Mesa general plan as well as the Mesa Gateway Strategic Development Plan, chapter 69 of the site plan review, chapter 22 for planned Area Development, and section nine dash six dash two for approval of preliminary plat established recommending approval with conditions.

Board member Crockett inquired:

Regarding the future phases, the phase to the west and then the retail phase. We're not approving anything today on either of those is correct. That just conceptual. Could you just speak for a minute to the quality of the development that's proposed here?

Staff Member Joshua Grandlienard responded:

Sure. Yeah. So typically, in terms of development, it was not designed in such a way to be industrial park. they have provided enhanced landscape entry at design review last night, this one forward and they didn't have any issues. They did request I believe some small planning changes, but overall is consistent what they look like.

Dr. Nana Appiah stated:

This went through several review boards. We are planning their economic development because of the issue that you brought up, because it's really a sensitive area, they want to make sure that it really becomes an appealing is compatible with all the plan uses that are across the street and the whole vicinity. A lot of discussions have taken place before we're able to get to where we are today.

Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard presented case ZON21-00651:

Known as Eastpointe, this is a rezone. There's an associated annexation case with this as well, because it is currently within the Maricopa County's jurisdiction. The rezone would be from AG agricultural to residential small lot, which was RS4/ RSL 4 and the purpose is to allow for a 53 single residence lot development. For the general plan, the destination is neighborhood and per the destination the intent is for safe places for people to live. Primarily single residents as well as supportive uses include schools, parks, etc. The zoning is currently zoned are you 43 within Maricopa County ANX21- 00649 is the companion

annexation case. The AG is the comparable zoning that the city would have for that the Ru 43 And then the request is from would follow that initial comparable rezoning from that request of ag to RSL 4.0. Participation was reached out to property owners within 2000 feet, HOA fees and registered neighborhoods within half a mile. There was a neighborhood meeting that took place August 31, 2021. There were overall concerns and opposition to the project just in general because this is the third attempt for development on the site. There was opposition to the density. I have received 20 letters. I have received 12 in opposition, 11 of those are citizens of within Maricopa County, and then one within city limits. And then also I received eight letters between citizens within the city of Mesa itself, in support of this project. I've also received a 15-page petition that has a number of signatures. I believe about 60. They have also provided a BAP which I have also included. Staff finds that the project complies with the 2014 general plan, as well as the criteria of chapter 69 of the MZO. And the conditions for preliminary plat of Section 9-6-2. And based off that staff is recommending approval with conditions.

Chair Sarkissian inquired about the main reason for opposition and conversation ensued in which Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard clarified the main concerns about the lot size, and a desire to maintain one acre lots in that area consistent with what they have in the county.

Chair Sarkissian and Staffmember Joshua Granlienard also identified on a map the location of individuals who signed the petition in relationship to the proposed project as well as roads that were located on maps to be developed.

Boardmember Peterson inquired:

From reading the citizen participation, the original neighborhood meeting, there were some questions on drainage or drainage issues. Have those issues been addressed?

Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard stated:

Evan Balmer was the case planner at the initial meeting. But certainly, I've worked with him as well as through our development services planning group, and we've come to agreement on making sure on street flows condition than they currently are. there's a major drainage issue in that area. And as part of that, water is being conveyed in a historic pattern, but also in a more improved pattern in order to reduce those impacts that are currently out there.

Staffmember Sean Pesek presented case ZON21-00693:

This request is a rezone from limited commercial to multiple residents four with a planned Area Development overlay. The purpose is to allow for the development of a for multiple residence buildings. the location is on the east side of North 56th Street, the west side of North 57th Street, the south side of East Amani Street in north of main and west of Recker Road the existing zoning is limited commercial, and the applicant is requesting to rezone from LC to multiple residents for with the planned Area Development overlay and if approved, the PID overlay will modify certain development standards. The general planning character area designation is neighborhood and it's intended to provide safe places for people to live and includes a variety of housing types including multiple residents. the proposed use is in compliance with the purpose and intents of the General Plan character area. The applicants proposing for two story buildings 36 units total there's two primary access points from 56 and

57th street that goes east west through the development site. The applicant proposing 3500 square feet for dock Park and playground and then a 3600 square foot pool area with two remodels in seating. For Mesa zoning ordinance 76 parking stalls are required 36 of which 36 have to be covered the applicants providing a two-car garage for each unit. 72 covered spaces on site and as will be discussed a deviation to provide offsite parking along Albany Street. I'll go through each request a deviation so the first is required on-site parking to play one spaces per unit. 76 spaces total 72 on site spaces are proposed. Each unit has a two-car garage, bicycle parking that's one space per 20 onsite vehicle spaces that comes to seven bike stalls. The applicants proposing one bike rack with three spaces. The minimum residential garage dimensions for a two-car garage it's 20 feet wide by 22 feet long. The applicants requesting production to 20 feet eight inches wide by 20 feet long. There's also a parking setback from property lines of budding streets that's 50 feet in the applicants requesting a reduction to three feet for building setbacks. The front property line that's adjacent to Albany Street MCL requires 25 feet the applicant is requesting a reduction to eight feet on the street side that's 56th street again 25 feet and the reduction is zero feet so no setback adjacent to 56 Street on the other side on adjacent to 57th Street requirement is 25 feet, and the request is 14 feet nine inches. And then the rear building setback that's from the south property line 30 feet because it's a two-story building and the applicants requesting a reduction to 13 feet three inches. There's also a minimum building separation requirement and that's 30 feet because it's a two-story structure. The applicants requesting a reduction to 24 feet for landscape yard with its 25 feet along Albany. There won't be a landscape yard, but the applicant is proposing landscaping with the county right of way as part of the landscape plan along 56th Street again 20- to 25-foot-wide landscape yard. there won't be a landscape yard on site within the property line. But landscaping trees shrubs will be proposed implanted within the right of way. And then along the rear property line 15-foot-wide landscape yard applicants requesting a reduction to five feet. Then for tree and shrub quantities 25 trees and 145 shrubs are required within that front landscape yard because there is no landscape yard there won't be any trees and shrubs on site. But the applicant has done his best to provide equal amounts within the right of way. Same with the street side on 56th Street. Private open space dimensions the minimum dimension is 10 feet per Mesa zoning ordinance and the applicants requesting a reduction to four feet one inch. And then for private open space coverage, the minimum is 30% and the applicants requesting a reduction at 10%.

The designs were discussed, and the board recommended minor changes to the building design and landscape design. A letter was mailed to all property owners within 1000 feet and HOA fees and registered neighborhoods within one mile. A neighborhood meeting was held on May 18 of this year, there were six to 10 attendees and questions about drainage parking. Staff has not been reached out to directly with any concerns or questions. staff finds that the request complies with the 2014 Mesa general plan criteria in chapter 69 for site plan review and criterion chapter 22 for a PID, and staff recommendation is approval with conditions.

Boardmember Peterson inquired:

On 56th Street, the setback is zero, but it looks like they're still about the same amount of landscape. Is there still enough room for landscaping?

Staffmember Sean Pesek presented ZON21-00788:

This request is initial site plan review to allow for the development of three multiple residence buildings. The location is located west of Greenfield Road, east of Val Vista Drive and is on the south side of East University Drive. The zoning is multiple residents for there's no PID overlays. So multiple residents is a permitted use provided the site complies with all development standards in the Mesa zoning ordinance. There are some aspects of the site that don't conform to Mesa zoning ordinance. The applicant had to apply for a development incentive permit and that was approved by Mesa Board of Adjustment on December 1. The general plant character area designation is a neighborhood and it's intended to provide a safe place for people to live and includes a variety of housing types including multiple residents. 26 parking stalls are required 12 of which need to be covered. The applicants providing 20 uncovered parking stalls and six covered spaces. each unit or each building will have two covered parking spaces. the landscape design meets the purpose and intent of chapter 33. We have perimeter landscaping on all sides and then landscaping in the right of way along east University. the applicants providing 19,000 square feet of landscape area 91% vegetative coverage and all landscape areas and again landscaped yards had been provided and the width are reduced through that dip, and then private open space for each unit. design review is not required because of the density. the elevations will be reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Board. After review staff determine that the elevations comply with all requirements in Section 11, five, including massing scale building entrances, mixture of materials and then some site requirements for access circulation and parking. A letter was mailed to property owners and within 1000 feet and he always within one mile. Two meetings were held one on September 7, for the site plan and then one on September 9 for the development incentive permit. There was one concern about the proximity to the adjacent mobile home subdivision and specifically their amenity space, their tennis court and basketball court really just wanted to make sure that they're aware that these developments going on so they can coordinate some of their big events. staff finds that the request complies with the 2014 as a general plan and criteria in chapter 69 for site plan, review, and recommends approval with conditions.

Staff member Joshua Grandlienard presented ZON21-00790.

This is a request for a rezone from AG to LI with site plan review and special use permit. This is to allow for industrial development, known as the Confluence Phase Two. The location is north of Ray Road and west of Ellsworth Confluence phase one is located to the north and west of the site. For the general plan, the destination is employment which is the intent of providing a wide range of opportunities, as well as high quality job settings and to provide for the mixed-use activity provide a communal and regional activity center. Per the current zoning is zoned agricultural, and this request includes a rezone to light industrial. Here's a Street View from the southwest, looking from Ray Road at the corner of Ray. The request itself is for a height increase from 40 feet to 53 feet due to its location with the AOA two for the citizen participation, property owners within 1000 feet were reached out to as well as HOA fees and registered neighbors within half a mile. The neighborhood meeting occurred on October 13, and there's no attendees. Staff finds that the project complies with 2040 Mesa general plan complies with the Mesa gateway strategic development plan as well as criteria from chapters 30 to 69 and 70 of the MCO. Staff is recommending approval conditions and is willing to will answer any questions you may have. Great,

Staff member Charlotte Bridges presented case ZON21-00800. It is a request to rezone the subject property from Rs 43 Two RM to PDD includes a request for a site plan review, approval of a preliminary plat and alternative compliance. And the purpose is to allow the development of a 32-unit multiple residential residents project. The subject site is located to the east of Sossaman and to the west of 202. But it's between 82nd Street and 83rd Street and it's on the north side of the university. The general plan designate character area designation for this area, his neighborhood and neighborhood the purposes of neighborhoods is to provide a safe place for people to live incorporate a variety of housing types and it does allow higher density residential development along the mayor along arterial roads. The zoning request is for multiple residents, District Two with a planned Area Development overlay, and multiple residences are permitted in this particular zoning district. The amenity areas include a playground, pickup and pickleball court and then a more passive development or amenity area. As part of the PA D request, they are requesting some deviations from the required setbacks between the buildings and in required landscape yards. And the primary justification for this reduction is because of the configuration of the lot, if a lot lines were removed, then the site and the structures would meet the setback and landscaping area requirements. This is a photo of a landscape plan you can show you can see that there's significant landscaping along the north and along the south, and then around the buildings themselves.

This project is not required to go through the Design Review Board process because of the density is less than the 15 dwelling units per acre. In fact, it's closer to eight dwelling units per acre. because of that they're requesting alternative compliance through this board. And the primary request is for the site elevations of those buildings to on to have two materials, the stucco and the composite siding. But the composite siding is does not meet the 25% requirement of the ordinance and the primary justification from the from the applicants narrative. To request the alternative compliance is they feel the additional addition of additional composite material to the site elevations would take away from the overall design of the project and then want to keep the emphasis of the design on the front and rear elevations. The applicant did complete a citizen participation plan. They held a public meeting on October 14, there were a few members of the name or few residents from the neighborhood that attended the meeting. Their primary concerns at the meeting were water, the availability of water for this project, the buffer between this project and the properties to the north, and there's general concern about crime. engineering review this project, there's no concern about water and there's water for this for this property or for this development. As you can see from the site plan, I'll go back to landscape plan. There's a significant buffer between this project and the single and the RS 43 residences to the north. And then as far as the general comment about crime applicant did not respond. They did not believe that this is going to increase crime in the area. And crime prevention did not provide any comments that they would increase crime in the area. To continue the citizen participation plan, they did notify property owners of the public hearing that within 500 feet of the project, and we'd have received one response from a neighbor who I believe wants to address the board. In summary, the staff finds that the proposed project complies with the 2040 Mesa general plan. It meets the criteria for a planned Area Development overlay. It needs the site plan review criteria, and it meets alternative, the alternative compliance criteria and staff is recommending

approval with conditions or I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Board member inquired:

the landscape buffer that's on the property, how wide is that from the buildings to the property line?

Discussion ensued and Staffmember Charlotte Bridges clarified using maps from the presentation:

The track that's just north of the buildings, is about 49 feet wide. The buffer is that utility easements, 125 feet wide.
0928.

Chair Sarkissian stated the item would be pulled from consent.

Staffmember Joshua Granlienard presented ZON21-00928. This is a PAD modification for the grove at Lehigh. It is located west of Lehi Road and north of McDowell Road. It is a single residence RS-15. With a PAD of development overlay. The deviation being requested to amend the PAD is to expand the lot coverage of the single-family product from 40 to 50 feet. It was during the development process was we're going through review. And we realized that the single-family stories or exceeding the 40% coverage, and it just wasn't viable in order to reduce the quality of product. The general plan designation for this area's neighborhood for a safe place to live as well as primary single residents. The request all other deviations approved by ZON21-00089 are being maintained. The only thing being changed is the PAD request of the MCO required a 40% lock coverage to 50% only for the single story lots. The two story lots will maintain that 40% Lock coverage. Based off that notice public hearing was sent out to all property owners within 1000 feet away and neighborhood registered neighborhoods within a half mile. I did not receive any kind of comments. Staff finds that this complies with the 2040 basic general plan, I enemies the view criteria for a planned Area Development outlined within section 11-22 of the MZO. And based off that staff is recommending approval with conditions. All

Staffmember Lesley Davis ZON21-01063. It's located south of Elliot and west of Signal Butte road within the northeast quadrant of the smart community. The general plan is mixed use community which encourages a mix of employment, office, retail, and residential. This is actually a proposed plat that will accommodate primarily nonresidential uses. Although it does encompass a park area, that's part of the residential development that's along the south border. The zoning for the site is planned community. As I mentioned before, it's East markets within development units five and six, which is up in this area, the division of the property is to accommodate nonresidential uses. Looking at the plat, it's going to create several nonresidential lots, which will be likely coming before you for site plan at some point down along the south edge there reconfiguring the lot lines within the existing Eastmark disc golf course. There are also two parcels that are being created parcels five and six that will accommodate a city while site and associated equipment storage. And it does comply with the 2040 general plan the subdivision regulations, the community plans for Eastmark, and the development unit plans, and requirements for a preliminary plat and staffs recommending

approval.

Boardmember Crockett inquired:

Of the nine lots that are shown, will any of those be residential uses multifamily?

Staffmember Lesley Davis clarified:

the intent for these lots is to be a parcels 1,2,3 and 9 are intended to be non residential uses. So we've been seeing that type of development up in this area. And then you have the disc golf course, everything along that South is really the buffer area to the residential. Parcel 4, that is existing disc golf course within the smart community. nothing's different is going to happen there, along parcels four, seven, and eight. That's all part of that park area. They're just reconfiguring the lot lines, they were previously plated into the residential, they're pulling them out because they want it and replanting that portion so that they can reconfigure the lots, but it's not changing the use of it at all.

Further conversation continued regarding the buffer included in the proposal.

Vice Chair Villanueva-Saucedo motioned to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Crockett.

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

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

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

NAYS – None

Public hearing for ZON21-00878 was opened. Within the 2800 to 3100. Blocks of North Rucker road when within the 15 hour block of East Longo Parkway. Okay, North McDowell road on the west side of wrecker Road, minor general plan amendment from an unemployment to mixed use activity district. This request will offer mixed use development.

Vice Chair Villanueva-Saucedo motioned to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Crockett.

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

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

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

NAYS – None

3. Conduct a public hearing on the following General Plan Amendments:

- 3-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)**

Planner: Cassidy Welch

Staff Recommendation: Continue to January 12, 2022

Vice Chair Villanueva-Saucedo motioned to continue to January 12, 2022. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Crockett.

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

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

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

NAYS – None

4. Planning Director's Update:

Dr Nana Appiah stated:

This is last meeting for the year I really want to say thank you to the staff. I'm looking at the agenda. This is one of the longest agendas I've seen for the past three years and all the staff reports and all the work that really went into it. I'm looking at the presentation and the staff reports. And I also want to thank Charlotte and Sarah for reviewing this, there's a lot .planning and zoning board, for the great work you've done. I want to acknowledge that last night, the Design Review Board had about 18 cases. It's always been great, but they've done an amazing job.

5. Adjournment.

Vice Chair Villanueva-Saucedo motioned to adjourn the meeting at 3:50 p.m. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Crockett.

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

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

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

NAYS – None

Respectfully submitted,

Nana K. Appiah, AICP, Secretary
Planning Director

Note: Audio recordings of the Planning & Zoning Board study sessions are available in the Planning Division Office for review. The regular Planning & Zoning Board meeting is "live broadcasted" through the City of Mesa's website at.