

Planning and Zoning Board



Study Session Minutes

Mesa City Council Chambers – Lower Level, 57 East 1st Street
Date: June 8, Time: 3:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Vice Chair Deanna Villanueva-Saucedo
Shelly Allen
Jeffrey Crockett
Benjamin Ayers
Troy Peterson

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Chair Jessica Sarkissian
Tim Boyle

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

STAFF PRESENT:

Rachel Prelog
Michelle Dahlke
Lesley Davis
Cassidy Welch
Joshua Grandlienard
Jennifer Merrill
Sarah Staudinger
Pamela Williams

OTHERS PRESENT:

Call meeting to order.

Vice Chair Villanueva-Saucedo declared a quorum present, and the meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.

Review items on the agenda for the June 8th, 2022, regular Planning and Zoning Board Hearing.

Staffmember Cassidy Welch presented case ZON22-00055: This is a site plan review for a multiple residence development. The site is located south of the 202 Freeway and south of Thomas Road on the east side of Val Vista Drive. It is across the street from the Jalapeno Bucks and BNB Farms. Here you can see an existing photo of the site it is being currently used for a citrus farm. The zoning on the property is currently Multiple Residents 2 with the Planned Area Development Overlay; that zoning was established in early 2022, as a part of the Pioneer Crossing Development Area Overlay. The General Plan designation on the property is Neighborhood Village. The primary intent behind that Neighborhood Village is to serve as the focal point for the surrounding neighborhood. The site plan is for 197 Multiple

residence units. The site plan is split into a townhome type development, and then a detached green green court type development. So, there are 130 townhome units, and 67 detached green court units. The parking on the site. The applicant has provided two parking spaces, individual garages for each unit, as well as some additional guest parking located around the site for a total of 2.6 spaces per unit, which exceeds the requirement of 2.1 spaces per unit. The site will be accessed exclusively from Val Vista Drive, with the primary on the northern end of the site, and then a secondary emergency access on the southern end of the site. The site is also consistent with the Pioneer Crossing Planned Area Development Overlay. Here you can see the proposed landscape plan for the development. The Design Review, per section 11-71-2, no review by the Design Review Board is required for multiple residents under 20 dwelling units per acre. So, the proposed elevations and designs were reviewed against the RM Design Standards, in addition to the Pioneer Crossing Design guidelines, and staff finds that the proposed elevations are consistent with both of those. So, the elevations will be approved as a part of the Site Plan Review request. And here you can see some of the proposed elevations. These are for the green court unit types with the alley loaded garages. We've got single-story and double storey units. And then this is for the townhome type unit. Again, with the alley loaded garages. The applicant did conduct a citizen participation process, which included property owners within 1000 feet, as well as HOAs, and registered neighborhoods. Staff has not received any concerns about the proposed project. In summary, we find that the proposed development is consistent with the 2014 Mesa general plan meets the criteria for site plan review, as well as is consistent with the Pioneer crossing planned Area Development overlay and staff is recommending approval with conditions.

Staffmember Lesley Davis presented case ZON21-00257: The request is for Site Plan Review to allow light industrial development within the smart community. The location of the buildings that they are proposing it is south of Elliot Road on the west side of Signal Butte. To orient you a little bit, this is the Apple Facility up on the corner. So, it is directly south of that. It is also located within the Elliot Road Technology Corridor are south of the Elliot Road technology corridor and within the East mark two Technology Enterprise core that's identified in their community plan. Here's a view of the property looking west from signal view. The General Plan for the property is Mixed- Use Community. The focus of that is to develop a mixture of uses that creates a complete and identify viable community. The proposed light industrial uses fall within that category. It's also falls within the Gateway Strategic Development Plan for Mixed-Use Community. The zoning on the property is PC, Planned Community for Eastmark. It's also in the Airport Overflight Area 3. In addition to that, it falls into Development Unit 6 North, within Eastmark, as identified in the Community Plan. The land use group that they're selecting is Lug C, which is Regional Center Campus. And that allows for the use of that they're proposing with the light industrial for manufacturing, warehouse, and accessory office space. So, in addition to that, I've included a few slides just to kind of refresh you on the Eastmark framework. It's a little bit different than a standard site plan process. And that community plan sets the vision for the overall development, the processes that they have to go through the processes, land uses sets development units includes the infrastructure master plans and design guidelines. And then it goes into the development unit plans. And as I stated earlier, this is Development Unit 6 North and that Development Unit Plan was approved, went through this part of the process of Planning and Zoning Board. And it allocates the land use budget, and the intensity, identifies the permitted land use groups, and that's where their Lugs C comes out of. And then there's design guidelines that are established further, that go beyond what the Community Plan has for that specific development unit and then compatibility. Then you get to the Site

Plan stage, which is where we're at. Site Plan and subdivision is where we kind of lay out the parcels. This came through, this is on a parcel within a plat that was recently reported that this board saw as a preliminary plat. And so, the site plan identifies the actual land use group that they're going to be utilizing and provides the specific site details. So here you can see down in the bottom left, I've included the plat, and showing where this falls within that. So, it's parcel 3, within that is marked Development Units 5 and 6 plat. They're proposing six buildings on that lot fronting onto Signal Butte Road. And then there is a street along the back here Binary, which was established with that plot. It's not constructed yet. I don't know if you recall to the west, you had a project called in BCAP, a few months ago. This is just directly to the east of that, the six buildings total over 900,000 square feet of light industrial space and then they have access both to Binary and to Signal Butte Road. They have 10 common areas, within you can see them in the green throughout, to provide some open space for some of the employee's areas that are heavily landscaped and have seating, shade, and to make them a little bit more pedestrian friendly. So Eastmark has a different process for Design Review. They don't go to the City of Mesa Design Review Board. They go through the Eastmark Design Review committee process. That committee preliminarily approved the elevations and it's contingent upon City approval with the site plan. So, they've gone through that process.

As far as citizen participation, they have gone through the mailing. They mailed a letter to property owners within 1000 feet, and HOAs, and registered neighborhoods within one mile, included 458 neighbors, we've had a lot of neighborhood involvement with adjacent parcels. So, we made sure that they had a very robust plan and made sure that all of that contact happened. They had a neighborhood meeting on May 3, I was able to attend that as well. They had 11 neighbors that did attend primarily from the subdivision. Actually, Signal Butte is where most of the interest was for that meeting. The concerns that they brought up in that were property values, duration of construction, dust control, traffic patterns, ingress, egress, hours of operations, noise generation, so very standard concerns and the applicant has been dealing with the property owners on that and reaching out. At this time, we haven't heard anything from any neighbors. I haven't not gotten any comment cards for this. I've had no phone calls or emails about this at all. And the applicant is stating the same beyond their contact follow up, after the meeting. So, in summary, it's in compliance with the 2040 Mesa General Plan complies with the Smart Community Plan, Development Unit Plan for D6 North, and meets the criteria for Site Plan Review, as outlined in the Community Plan. Recommendation is for approval with conditions, and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Boardmember Crockett inquired: The question I have is on the secondary road. Does that exit either onto Elliott or out to Signal Butte?

Staffmember Lesley Davis responded: It exits to Everton Terrace, to the west and Signal Butte on the east. So, it follows here if you can see here, we have Signal Butte.

So you're going west on what's called Rubidium. There'll be there's another development parcel there. And then you're going to come north on Binary and take Mesquite out to this Everton Terrace. And then as you learned with this development to the west, it's anticipated these people are to exit right and go north.

Boardmember Crockett inquired: Go north on to Elliot Yes. Okay. Okay, and what's the timing of the construction of that? When will that road be completed out to Elliott and then out to signal Butte, will that be in connection with this project, or a future project?

Staffmember Lesley Davis responded: It's my understanding that Brookfield slash DNB are working on that roadway. I know they're in the process of getting documents together. I don't know the timeline of the construction, but it needs to be constructed with the first development in and I believe that in the hat project to the west is moving forward more quickly. So it should I go in fairly soon.

Staffmember Jennifer Merrill presented case ZON21-00793. The request is for a rezoning and Site Plan Review and it's to allow for the development of a multiple residence building. The location is west of Country Club on the north side of us 60 south side of Holmes Avenue. Here's a photo of the site is looking south from homes into the site. There's an existing office building there now. The current zoning is Limited Commercial, and the proposed rezoning is to Multiple Residents for with a Planned Area Development Overlay. The General Plan character area is Neighborhood, and the goal of that is to provide a safe place for people to live including a variety of housing types, including multiple residences. Here's the site plan. North is to your left in this slide. The two-story building includes 24 units; there are 16 studio units and eight one-bedroom units. There are 31 on-site parking stalls, 30 of them are covered. There is a barbecue pavilion, dog run, and outdoor exercise area. The vehicular access and pedestrian access is from the north edge of the site along Holmes Avenue. The PAD request includes multiple modifications to the standard code requirements, including some reductions to the interior side yard on the east side. That is a landscape reduction. The requirement is for 30 feet and propose 16. The south side again, the requirement is 30 feet, the proposed is 20. The landscaped yard width is also requested to be reduced along Holmes, proposed reduction to 10 feet. And then along the west property line, its reduction to four feet. There are some private open space modifications requested. The private open space required is required for all units. They are proposing private open space for not all of the units on the site. The dimensions for private open space on the ground floor are required to be a 10-foot minimum dimension. And they are requesting a minimum of eight feet in width, and six feet in depth for the private open space. The minimum lot area per dwelling unit is required by code to be 1452 square feet. They are requesting 1400 square feet. And that is the overall lot divided by 1400, equals the number of units. In terms of the parking, the code requires the parking not exceed 30% of the frontage of the lot. It is visible from the right of way, and they are requesting an area of parking along the front of the lot that will not exceed 56% of the frontage. Here is the landscape plan. They are proposing a landscape design that meets the intent of Chapter 33. They have 12,000 square feet of landscaped area, and they have some landscaped yards that are provided, though those landscape widths are reduced through the PAD overlay. The proposal is scheduled to be considered by the Design Review Board at their June 14 work session next week. And staff will work with the applicant to implement any changes.

The applicant completed a citizen participation process. They notified surrounding property owners within 1000 feet, as well as HOAs, and registered neighborhoods. And no responses were received as a result of those notifications. I will go over the summary, but I do want to back up to the PAD request. There was some justification that was provided to justify those PAD requests. The applicant is proposing approximately 5000 square feet of open space, which is 2000 square feet more than the

minimum required by code. The proposed amenities that I listed all contribute to a high-quality residential development. And after a review of this submitted documents, the proposed code deviations are commensurate with the building and landscape design features.

Vice Chair Villanuave Saucedo inquired: Can I ask a question while you're while you're on that really quickly? So my question is, and maybe it's just me getting confused, but as I'm looking. I think you went through the building setbacks, that was part of the PAD request, and listed there as all the streets up to Sixth Street, 57th Street, but this address is in the 450 block of West homes. So those don't line up.

Staffmember Jennifer Merrill clarified: Yes, if you go to the next slide, there are two slides of PAD requests. I think you were probably sent a previous version of the presentation. But the current version, if you look at this second slide, that's titled PAD request. Does that help clear it up?

Vice Chair Villanueva-Saucedo inquired: Yeah, I see what you're saying. So, you're talking about the open space, the eight feet? They are not asking for any deviations in the setbacks, then?

Conversation ensued and Staffmember Jennifer Merrill displayed a slide that showed the setbacks.

Staffmember Jennifer Merrill continued: So, in summary, the request complies with the 2040 Mesa General Plan. It meets the criteria in Chapter 69 for a Site Plan Review, and it meets the criteria in Chapter 22 for a PAD overlay, and staff is recommending approval with conditions and I'm happy to answer questions.

Staffmember Cassidy Welch presented case ZON22-00049: This is a request for Site Plan Review and Special Use Permit to allow for an industrial development. The site is located on the south side of Pecos Road and on the east side of Crismon Road. Here you can see a photo of the site it is currently vacant. The General Plan designation for this property is Employment. The intent behind the Employment character area designation is to provide for a wide range of employment uses in high quality settings. The site is also located within the Gateway Strategic Development Plan is consistent with that plan. The site is currently zoned General Industrial. The proposed industrial uses on the site are permitted in the GI zoning district. So, the proposed site plan is for two large scale industrial buildings totaling approximately 269,500 square feet per building. The site will be accessed from both Crismon Road and Pecos Road. As a part of this request, the applicant is requesting a Special Use Permit for a parking reduction. Per the zoning ordinance, for industrial speculative buildings a total of 1170 spaces are required, and 561 spaces are proposed. The applicant did attend a Design Review work session on May 10. The Design Review Board had minor recommendations for those elevations, and staff will work with the applicant to address those.

The applicant did conduct a citizen participation process which included property owners within 1000 feet, as well as any HOAs, and registered neighborhoods. There are no HOAs and registered neighborhoods within the proximity. Neither the staff nor the applicant has received any response from surrounding property owners. In summary, we find that the proposed development complies with the 2040 Mesa General Plan, as well as the Gateway Strategic Development Plan, and meets the criteria

for a Site Plan Review and Special Use Permit, and therefore we are recommending approval with conditions.

Boardmember Crockett inquired: My questions have to do with the parking reduction. We've been having this discussion for a few months now. And when these projects come through, it seems like quite often now, we're seeing a request to reduce the amount of parking. What happens when we approve this or we recommend approving a Special Use Permit based on the current use of the property, and there's a fairly dramatic reduction in parking from what is required in the code (more than 50%)? What happens if the use of this property in the future changes? Is there any way the City has to require additional parking in the future? If for example, this warehouse became a manufacturing facility where there was a lot more employees, can you respond to that?

Staffmember Cassidy Welch responded: Yes, so most of these industrial buildings are speculative. So, per Chapter 32, of the Zoning Ordinance, speculative industrial buildings are parked at 75% -at one to 600, and then 25%- at one to 375. Which is the standard ratio for office and retail developments. A lot of what we're seeing is that the parking ratio is not consistent with the actual uses of these large-scale industrial buildings. The ratio seems to be more like one to 900, up to one to 1300s spaces per square foot. Chapter 32 also has allotments for increases in parking demand based off of use. So, if it is within, I believe it's 5%, it is permitted to remain with the current parking. If it exceeds that 5% change, then the applicant would have to come in for a Special Use Permit to modify that. However, considering the Special Use Permit as a part of this request, I think we would already be anticipating the variety of users, and that some of the suites or buildings may be used for more in high intensity, but some of the areas might not, and kind of anticipating both of that- the variety of uses that may happen.

Boardmember Crockett added: Do we need a different category to deal with this scenario? Because you said that there is a category for this type of industrial building. And we are seeing requests to reduce parking? Do we need a different category to address this type of building?

Staffmember Cassidy Welch responded: That's something that we could potentially look into in regard to our text amendments. It's difficult to anticipate the required parking ratios. And as business operations change, those parking ratios may not be as reflective the zoning ordinance. And this particular parking ratio was established in 2011. As we know, industrial developments have changed quite a bit in the last 12 years. So, it's something that we can look at. But we do have those other avenues for applicants to modify, such as through a PAD or through a Special Use Permit.

Boardmember Crockett inquired: So let me just ask one more, one or two more questions on this. So, with this building, it's being constructed as a spec building? So walk me through the process. If by the time the building is constructed with the existing site plan, let's say that the owner of the building is going to sell the building, or perhaps even lease the building, and it is going to have a manufacturing use instead of a like a warehousing use. And so, they're going to have a much higher number of employees. How do you address the parking at that point in the future after the Special Use Permit has been issued? Do they do they have to come back in if the proposed use is different than what is anticipated now?

Staffmember Cassidy Welch clarified: So, we are recommending approval of those 561 spaces under the anticipation that this site could be used for manufacturing, all the way to warehousing and storage. And so, staff feels comfortable that the proposed parking that's provided on the site will adequately serve any of those anticipated users that are permitted in the GI zoning district. However, if that applicant felt at a later date, that they needed additional parking to serve a specific user. There could be some avenues for a minor site plan modification, potentially to eliminate some of that trailer parking that's located on in between buildings A and B and converting some of that to additional standard vehicle parking.

Vice Chair Villanueva- Saucedo added: Following up on board member Crockett's comments on parking. There is a parking modification and what seems like a need for a code modification. So we're not going through this process every time. Right?

Assistant Director Rachel Prelog added: That that has been something that has been on our radar, and that is anticipated as a future text amendment. It is just right now kind of lower on the priority list, but we are aware of it. And we do see that.

Boardmember Peterson inquired: Is the 100 feet on the south end reserved for the rail spur? This is that Pirate Rail Spur? Is that going anywhere? Are we just going end up with a vacant strip of land 20 years from now?

Staffmember Cassidy Welch responded: I can't speak to the specifics of how planned out the Pirate Rail line is. But it's my understanding that it will be happening.

Boardmember Peterson added: So the middle, I'll call it, street slash driveway. It seems a little redundant, going right through the middle of the site? Can you share the thought behind having that go through there, as opposed to not having that road go through there?

a

Staffmember Cassidy Welch responded: That road is intended to kind of serve as a secondary access and leave people out. So, the trucks would have the option to come in on either side. So for example, if you were a trucks, and you needed to get to the loading dock, say on the far east side of Building B, you could go around all of the activity that would be happening in that loading docks areas and avoid that. And it's also intended to kind of be a separation between these two, so that there's a clear definitive line between building A and building B. These are actually two separate parcels as well Building A is on one parcel, and Building B is on a separate parcel.

Boardmember Crockett added: If I could just follow up with one more question, with regard to the road. The road will be constructed on the Crismon alignment. What's the timing for the construction of that road? Is that being done as part of this development?

Staffmember Cassidy Welch responded: They are actually already in for permits for improving Crismon Road. I would defer to the applicant on the actual timeline for finishing that, but they are in for review right now.

Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard presented case ZON22-00157: So, this one's a little bit different. This is for a PAD modification for Falcon Field Airport. Again, this is a modify the existing standards within the development for the property within Falcon Field Airport. As you can see, all the airport between East Greenfield, South McDowell, west of Higley, and North McKellips, it does exclude the RS 43 and LC sections, on accounts that are not actually part of the airport. Overall, the General Plan designation is Specialty Airport. Pretty straightforward that it is an Airport. And zoning on this is LI-PAD, the original PAD was established in about 2010. And with this, this is trying to modernize the code just to meet existing conditions as well as addressing changes to hanger design that has occurred. And based off this, any new development would be subject to these PAD standards. Overall, there is a number of changes. I've kind of just highlighted the main ones, I couldn't highlight every minor revision that it was, there is some punctuation, some changes, and definitions. But overall, we added the condition to be consistent with the FAA for their 7460 requirements, which is just more of a flight overlay environmental review through the FAA. Within zone three, this is the new section on the northwest portion. In order to create more functionality for the phased fixed base operators typically, these are the more permanent tenants that we have on the airfield. As well as defining more types of areas between A and B. A is the areas that have direct street access to pipe to City streets, while type B is only access beyond the perimeter fence, on secured property of the airport. Also, we have some modifications due to the paved surface areas, that for the ramp be consistent with overall standards required by the FAA. As well as overall site changes to the lease area types, because of operations that occur. Basically, it's hard to have a foundation base in front of a hangar door because a plane can't leave that hangar. You have to climb over a curb. So, we had to address a couple of these concerns that repeatedly came up in our admin reviews. So, this has helped to clarify kind of part of this, as part of the original PAD. All on site hangars are done through administrative review. And if it's on a major arterial, it would go to the Design Review Board for their approval as well. So, this is consistent with those current standards. Overall, we did change the parking requirements inside of the airfield areas. Previously, you were not allowed to count some of the areas that were inside the hangar as part of your parking, even though you can fit a car, as well as a plane within those sizes. So, we added the changes to allow for that. As well as overall there are some differences between the zone one, zone two and three, for lighting and fixtures. And so, this was really changed to be consistent with City Code. We have overall design standards that we added to increase the amount of design we require out of these hangars, and the Brownfield Development was deleted in its entirety, because based on discussions with airport staff, it was never utilized. So based off that this was presented to the Design Review Board on April 12. And based off that, they recommended approval to this body, as well as City Council on May 10. As part of their citizen participation.

There was a neighborhood meeting that was attended on the seventh. It was more general questions just about airport facilities, uses, the complaints about the noise from airfield traffic, which we can't really modified because it is an FAA funded airport. So, we can't really stop the FAA from utilizing our airport. So, we did try to address all the concerns as best we could. But again, this is just for the design standards. Based off that staff is recommending approval condition based off, that the project complies with the 2040 Mesa General Plan, Chapter 69 for Site Plan Review, as well as great review criteria for a Planned Area Aevolpment within 11- 22.

Boardmember Crockett inquired: Do these new guidelines do they apply property the airport owns west of Greenfield Road? Or or is it only within.

Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard responded: It's only within the confines of the airport itself. That'd be correct. It'd be all anything within the secured fence of the Falcon field airport.

Boardmember Crockett inquired: Then the other question I had with regard to the first change in the design standard. There's language here that says new development must include a FAA approved environmental review prior to issuance of a building permit. Is this Is that a new requirement?

Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard responded: That is a requirement for any property that is built on federal property that's there. It's the process that they have to do as part of any kind of FAA review. I previously worked on a different municipality airport, and that was required on any one of these reviews as well.

Conversation ensued and it was clarified that even though this was not federal property. IT is Federally funded.

Falcon Field Director Corinne Nystrom spoke: I'm the airport director at Falcon field. This requirement as Josh said, is an FAA requirement that has been affected for quite some time now. And it is a requirement basically that states that if you are going to be doing any type of construction on a piece of property that is on an airport that receives federal funds for any type of capital improvements, then the requirement is to go through this environmental review process before any dirt is turned. And so what we basically have worked out with development services is to say- we have to get the green light from the FAA, the letter of approval, have no significant impact on the property, and before a building permit can be issued- otherwise, we're in non-compliance with the FAA regulations, and it puts our grants in jeopardy.

Vice Chair Villanueva-Saucedo inquired: So this is really a codification of what is already wrapped in effect. That's correct. Do you know, is the process an environmental assessment or is it a an environmental impact study?

Falcon Field Director Corinne Nystrom responded: That was a great question. Most of the documents that we are able to submit to the FAA are a categorical exclusion, which is a step below an environmental assessment. Now, we have been required by the FAA to do one environmental assessment on the property. That was because it was a very large piece of real estate that had a lot of acreage to it. And so, the main thing that these environmental reviews are looking for is obviously there is the cultural, the wildlife, the biological effects, and so forth. But really, from the FAA perspective, they're looking at what effect would this development have on the airport itself in terms of, does it have the potential of increasing aircraft operations? Does it have the potential of creating any other issues that might affect the airport's ability to continue to operate? So it does include all of the various NEPA requirements, but the FAA just wants to make sure, what environmental effect will this property have? And specifically, what effect is it going to have on aircraft operations at the airport?

In regard to property the airport owns on the west side of Greenfield. Originally, when working together with the Economic Development Department looked at leasing that property out. It's technically that property west of Greenfield, is technically considered to be part of the airport and is technically owned or operated by the airport. And therefore, if it is included on the overall airport plan. So, when we originally looked at wanting to try to develop that property, we did go to the FAA, and at that time, they did require that an environmental assessment be completed on that property as well, which we went through that process. That's in addition to the one that I mentioned earlier. However, what has happened, and we ultimately got a finding of no significant impact on that. However, in the last, about year and a half or so, the FAA regulations have changed, such that if you can demonstrate, which we have already in our previous EAA, that this property is going to be used for a non-aeronautical use. Then according to the new FAA regulations, it would not be subject to an environmental review. So, with us, continuing to work with Economic Development to get that property leased out, or at least the northern 63 acres, we are of course, are going to share with the FAA what will be anticipated on that property. That it will be non-aeronautical, and our hope will be that they will come back and say we don't have any jurisdiction over that, but we will need to at least notify them of such.

Falcon Field Director Corinne Nystrom stated that: These guidelines won't apply to any area outside of the one square mile that makes up the report.

Boardmember Crockett inquired: Did Economic Development weigh in on these guidelines?

Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard clarified: So yes, the economic development did comment on it overall just said, maintain quality design standards that we have, or quality design guidelines, and to see if we can incorporate any of those into here. But overall, they didn't have any concerns; we do have our Economic Development representative from the airport itself here as well.

Boardmember Crockett inquired: And in terms of quality of design, is that is that upping the game in terms of the quality of the design? Is that reflected in these amendments to the current guidelines?

Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard stated: Yes, certainly, I feel like this is certainly an improvement. I think we've clarified a lot of the design. Because the way the zones were set up, it kind of had specific looks for certain areas of the airport. So, we just wanted to kind of create more innovative, thoughtful design that could be utilized on this site. Because realistically, just speaking as a planner, I'm not the biggest fan of metal buildings that are just hangars. So, we want to see a little something, a little higher quality.

Boardmember Crockett inquired: In terms of the presentation, looking at some of the images in the presentation, there's a lot of World War 2 vibe in there. And I'm just wondering, that may not necessarily be what is attracting employment to the airport area. So, you talked about attracting employment and getting away from sort of the metal buildings, is there a focus on maybe making this look a little more like Gateway or something and attracting a little higher tech look and, maybe getting away from the World War 2 vibratory? Are you still trying to preserve the World War 2 vibe at the airport?

Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard stated: I think realistically, we're trying to balance both. If you look at where what used to be the Leading Edge Zone 3, that's more where you see the more modern style Gateway style developments. While overall the requirements within the PAD do require a positive aviation theme. So, we will make sure we have either updated, instead of World War 2 fighter jets, will have modern planes, things of that nature. And I think we see modernization of things of that nature. But overall, we see more of that Zone 3, which is going to be the side on Greenfield, which is more of that Gateway.

Boardmember Peterson inquired: Do you find from tenants of the airport that the signage provisions are adequate? Or is there a need to increase signage capabilities that can go here for future tenants?

Falcon Field Director Corinne Nystrom stated: We really have not received any negative pushback on the requirements that we have in the standards. So, we were they're made aware of it, and they know what they need to comply with, and we have not had any problems with them complying. Now, we do have some existing buildings that have not been subject to the PAD review process yet, because nothing's been done with them for a while, that we know would not comply with the current PAD standards. That if we look to pursue enforcing that, we would have to do that through code compliance unless they come in and are doing something that would then result in the PAD standards being implemented on their property.

Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard stated: And I will add with ease each lease update, they will be required to become into compliance with the current PAD standards.

Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard presented case ZON 22-00162, Geneva villas and the associated plat. This for site plan review. It is to allow the development of a single residence community. It is located west of Crismon Road on South side of Brown Road. I will say it is currently within Maricopa County jurisdiction, so it will be annexed as part of this request. Here's the view looking west from Crismon road. Again, this is currently zoned RU-43 as well as C-3 within Maricopa County eyes. ANX22-0016 is the companion annexation case. At the time, because of the two split zonings, it'll be given a comparable zoning of AG and then from there, it'd be AG with an RS-15 PAD. Overall, the General Plan designation in this area is for Neighborhoods. The intent is to provide a safe place to live including variety of housing types, that includes single residence. Overall, here's the site plan includes 27 lots, as well as a barbecue pavilion, dog run, as well as expanded open desert space consistent with the uplands, as within Desert Uplands requirements itself. It does have expanded open space requirements that are meant to preserve a desert natural desert feel for the uplands. and based off of that staff felt the RS-15 made the most sense in order to require those open space requirements to be consistent with the densities. and the neighborhoods around them. Overall, the PAD requests include a reduction of the minimum lot size, minimum lot width, and depth to meet the conditions. And again, there is a major easement from SRP that is does truncate the site a bit, as well as the overall building setbacks to meet the new proposed sites, sizing of the lots, as well as a facade where because of the way the buildings that are designed, they can only have a one-foot gap between the front side of the patio and the garage instead of the three foot required. Overall, here's the landscape plan. As part of the landscape plan, there was a existing document, and I believe they tried to preserve at least 47 to 49

of the existing plans, including a couple saguaros. So, we wanted to make sure that they maintain that desert feel, as well as making sure we kept all landscaping outside of the SRP easement.

Letters were mailed to neighborhoods, and HOAs within a mile, as well as property owners in 1000 ft. A neighborhood meeting was held on January 4. There were four persons, for a total of three households that had general questions about development and possible impacts. Typically, with these annexation cases that are adjacent to non-annexation parcels, they're concerned that they may be annexed as part of that. We made the applicant make clear that they will not be annexed as part of that. And I had a conversation with one gentleman yesterday who is interested in the annexation process. I had another phone call with a gentleman, just to the west, he had requested a fence along the SRP easement. But the intent of that is there are numerous illegal dumpings occurring in the SRP easement. So, we've worked with the applicant, and I believe at this time, we're going with large boulders that would be consistent with us SRP requirements in order to prevent that dumping from occurring. So certainly, they met the conditions of citizen participation. Based off that, staff finds that it complies to the 2040 Mesa General Plan, Chapter 69 of Site Plan Review, Chapter 22 for the Planned Area Development, as well as criteria from Chapter 6, Section 5 of Title 9 for the Desert Upland Development staffers. Staff is recommending approval with conditions.

I've also provided a memo, there is a one small site plan change, which will occur on lots seven, they illustrated the pedestrian path, which took a little bit of the right away, additionally take up four feet, which reduced it there. As well as this is not within an AOA area. So, the applicant has requested the removal of the avigation easement, since that wouldn't apply to this site.

Vice Chair Villanueva-Saucedo stated: I am such a stickler for citizen participation reports and this one gets an A plus. Thank you very much for your work on this love the way that it's a consistent with Desert Uplands, and you know the dog runs always get points for me. So thank you. Any other questions?

Staffmember Charlotte Bridges presented case ZON22-00237. And this is a request for our Council Use Permit to allow for the development of a mini storage facility with outdoor RV and boat storage. The location of this project is north of north of Main Street on the west side of the Val Vista Drive. And this is looking at the site, currently vacant. The General Plan designation for this area is Neighborhood. And the purpose of neighborhoods is to provide safe places for people to live, where they can feel secure. It is also overlaid by the Main Street Transit Corridor. And the purpose of that Transit Corridor is to create more pedestrian interconnectivity between the building, and then obviously pedestrians. And then it's also in the General Plan that talks about how to create strong neighborhoods. And this project also fulfills that purpose by once again providing that connectivity from the front of the building to the adjacent street. The zoning on the project is GC for General Commercial, and its intent is to provide indoor retail and limited outdoor display, and related service-oriented businesses within a four to five mile radius. As far as the Council Use Permit for this project, in evaluating that criteria, staff finds that it is it does advance the goals and objectives of, and is consistent with the policies of the General Plan and other applicable City Plans, and policies. It's adding another use into the neighborhood to strengthen the neighborhood. And then it also provides that connectivity once again between the site and the adjacent right of way. The location size, design, and operating characteristics are consistent

with the purposes of the GC district. The proposed site will not be in injurious or detrimental to the adjacent or surrounding properties, or improvements in the neighborhood or goal, or to the general welfare of the City. And then the last requirement, adequate public services- public facilities and public infrastructure are available to serve the proposed project. The site plan shows the construction of a two-story self-storage building, and then it will have surrounding RV and covered RV and boat storage. There's two points of access to the site. The South access is both directions in and out, the North access will be exit only. And then one other thing I will point out is there is a plaza area at the entry of the building. Since it's such a large building our code requires that it have a 900 square foot plaza and the site meets that criteria as well. This is a landscape plan. And let me go on to the elevations. The elevations will be reviewed by the Design Review Board at their June 14 meeting. And staff will work with the design review board members to implement any comments they may have about the architecture. The applicant did permit did complete a citizens participation plan. They mailed letters to property owners within 1000 feet, and then to the HOAs, and registered neighborhoods. They did hold a neighborhood meeting but unfortunately, they did not have any attendance at that meeting. And neither the applicant or staff has had any outreach or comments would have received any comments from interested parties. In summary, staff finds the project complies with the 2040 General Plan. It complies with the Council Use Permit review criteria in Section 1170-6 of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance and it complies with the Site Plan Review criteria and Chapter in the Mesa Zoning Ordinance, which is chapter 69, subsection 5, and staff is recommending conditions with approval.

Boardmember Crockett inquired: In the citizen participation report, there's a section that says management to request that a wrought iron fence be added on the north side of the project between the proposed block wall from the site plan. It's unclear to see whether or not and then it says a wrought iron fence has been added to the site plan, and drawings to accommodate this request. And I so I'm thinking it's on the north end. But it's unclear from the site plan whether or not that was actually added.

Staffmember Charlotte Bridges stated: I will double check and make sure that that is in compliance.

Conversation ensued and it was discussed that the screen wall should be 8 ft.

Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard presented case ZON22-00268. This is for the Site Plan Review and Rezone. It is allowed development of an industrial business park overall. So again, like the last case that I presented, this is also within Maricopa County's jurisdiction as well. So, this will be annexed as part of that. Companion case there is located north of Pecos Road, East of Ellsworth, it is directly south of the soccer fields at Legacy Sports Park. Per the General Plan, the destination is Mixed-Use Community, which contains a mix of employment, office, retail, educational, community service, tourism, and treatment, and residential uses a sense of place within a community. With the Mesa Gateway Strategic Development Plans designates this area as the Logistics and Commerce District per the Gateway Development Plan. This is consistent with this use. Overall, the current zoning is RU-43 and IND-2; it also has AOA one and two within Maricopa County, as well as F-1, F-2. That is for ANX22-00266. Again, for clarity of staff. This will all be rezone to AG at initial intake, and then be rezone to LI-PAD. Here's the view north from Pecos. Overall, this is a phased development. So, phase one is building A and building B, phase two will come in future development for industrial uses as well. Access will be from Pecos as well as on the east side, there will be access as well. Overall, they've

requested a couple of PAD modifications. One increasing height from 40 to 60 feet front facing the street side setbacks from Pecos. And that's specifically due to the extended drainage channel that occurs just like on the Legacy Caprock Logistics, that we had at the last meeting. Because of the width of that, they've had to reduce the setback just because of where the right of way would be measured. But overall, there's quite a large setback, if you just take it from the edge of the curb that would naturally be occurring there. Again, this is another reduction to parking spaces. The ratios they've provided on this one is one space for 375 square feet of industrial, well one space per 1500 square feet of gross floor area. And within the interior parking lot, like the previous Legacy industrial case, they've requested not to have the landscape islands within the truck parking areas; the semi areas that would be more for movement and materials as well as truck traffic as well. In addition to that, they've had a reduction to the foundation base, in order to meet the fire code separation. Because of the aerial apparatus, they have to be within 30 feet from where they access it and because of that we've had to reduce that landscape depth to 12 feet and overall. They requested that the refuge, the solid waste enclosures not be required if it's already screened within a truck parking lot, which it would be screened from view anyways, through the screening the eight-foot walls that are required for outdoor storage. So, overall, this was presented to Design Review on May 10. There are some small minor comments about the overall entryways, the awnings, the ability on the site is to eventually convert those possibly add a mezzanine area and use those as balconies. So, just balancing the length of those in order to incorporate both uses and ensure design is consistent. Overall landscape plan is consistent with all of our requirements.

Again, citizen participation on this one notified property owners within 1000 feet, as well as HOAs and registered neighborhoods. On this one I didn't have anybody reached out to me, just due to most likely because it's all Legacy, as well as some smaller industrial properties to the south. Overall request complies with the 2040 General Plan, complies with the Gateway Strategic Development Plan, as well as Site Plan criteria outlined in 11-69-5, as well as the Plan Area requirements under Section 11- 22. the MZO. Therefore, Staff recommends approval with conditions.

Boardmember Crockett inquired: On the site plan, as you're driving along Pecos Road and you're looking north at this project, you can see all the trailers lined up. I'm wondering if you considered, or if the applicant considered flipping these buildings so that you move the crosstalk building to have the better frontage or the better view along Pecos.

Staffmember Joshua Grandlineard stated: I think the applicant will be able to explain that fully. But staff did request that initially. I asked for enhanced landscaping along that way to help screen the truck storage. From what I perceived from the applicant is that the intent of building A is to face Legacy in order to have a presentable product for everybody that is utilizing that site, as well as the overall flow for the truck movement is cleaner for their purposes, and their intended user for building B.

Applicant Dennis Newcomb, of Gammage and Burnham spoke: That's a great question. And we appreciate the question. And it was a long thought-out process and land ownership on this is improving, and they're also joint partnerships on this. And the property to the north, which is the Legacy Sports Complex. So, the sports complex, they wanted to make sure that it was visual to that sports complex, was not truck and loading docks and all these other good things. So, there was a nice symbiotic

relationship there. As Josh mentioned, to the south, we have a large drainage channel that's 60 feet wide. It's quite a distance, heavily landscaped, it's going to have nice design, aggregate design in there. It's going to be a screen walling that's been provided. We took it to the Design Review Board, they liked the way it was looking, Josh had asked for perspective, we provided those perspectives to make sure the way this is. And it's really well screened. It's far enough back, the grade drops a little bit. So you're really not getting that full exposure, if you will, that you would typically see. So, we're pleased to be in front of you today with the Design Review Board. I think with Josh's acceptance that this was a good solution with the Proving Grounds, the LISI, the ownership and a joint venture on this project and wanting to make sure Legacy Sports continues on its endeavors to be a great project. And we want to continue to do that here.

Boardmember Peterson added: And just a quick comment on, you know, we were seeing a lot of these projects now with eight-foot screen walls, which obviously isn't going to cover up a trailer. One thing I'd like maybe staff to take a look at is whether we should be looking at a little bit taller height for screen walls around facilities like this. I assume that going above eight feet requires additional engineering work, more money on the screen wall, but certainly an eight foot wall may not be sufficient for these facilities where we've got a lot of trailers parked.

What is the transition on the north end to the Legacy Sports fields, is there is not a fence on the inside plan? Is there an existing fence?

Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard clarified: I believe it's like it's chain link, just a six-foot fence to keep balls in.

Assistant Planning Director Rachel Prelog stated: that one last item, we are recommending to continue that to June 22.

Boarmember Allen stated: Can I make a recommendation? I would recommend that that Jeff be the chair for that particular meeting. Jeff, are you going to be there?

Boardmember Crockett: Yes, I will. And if that's the pleasure of the board, I'm happy to do that.

The motion was seconded by Boardmember Peterson.

Boardmember Jeff Crockett motioned to adjourn the study session.

The motion was seconded by Boardmember Peterson.

The Study Session was adjourned.