

**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: Site plan review, preliminary plat and alternative components. 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. Each building has four units. So, there's a total of 32, 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, a ramada and some more passive amenity areas. Part of the request is for a planned Area Development. 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. The code has different requirements for that one story product and the two-story project. 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. 5-6 of the MZO and staff is recommending approval with conditions.

Chair Sarkissian invited Applicant Reese Anderson to speak:

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.

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.

**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 (Chair Sarkissian, Boardmember Boyle and Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

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

NAYS – None