

# Planning and Zoning Board



## *Study Session Minutes*

Mesa City Council Chambers – Lower Level, 57 East 1<sup>st</sup> Street  
Date: August 24, Time: 3:00 p.m.

### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Jeff Crockett  
Benjamin Ayers\*  
Jessica Sarkissian\*  
Troy Peterson  
Jeff Pitcher

### **MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Shelly Allen

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

### **STAFF PRESENT:**

Rachel Prelog  
Michelle Dahlke  
Evan Balmer  
Lesley Davis  
Cassidy Welch  
Charlotte Bridges  
Jennifer Merrill  
Sean Pesek  
Joshua Grandlienard  
Sarah Staudinger  
Pamela Williams

### **OTHERS PRESENT:**

\* \* \* \* \*

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

## **Call meeting to order.**

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

### **1 Review items on the agenda for the August 24, 2022, regular Planning and Zoning Board Hearing.**

#### **Staffmember Sean Pesek presented case ZON21-01115:**

This is a Site Plan Review to allow for multiple residents development. The location is the northeast corner of Hawes Crossing. So, it's the west side of Hawes Road and south of Elliot Road, as shown on the map. This is a site photo looking west towards the site from Hawes Road. You can see the existing homestead. So, the current zoning is RM-5 PAD, and that PAD is the Hawes Crossing PAD overlay. So multiple residence is allowed in the RM-5 district, but we looked at the development standards and the PAD, the development agreement and the MZO when reviewing new projects. So, the General Plan character area designation is Mixed Use Activity and Employment. So, it's geared towards employment opportunities, mainly commercial, but it does allow for multiple residential, specifically as a secondary use in conjunction with greater commercial development, and the property to the north is zoned mixed use. So, there is going to be commercial there, eventually, as Hawes Crossing builds out. It's also within the Gateway Strategic Development Plan and the Inner Loop District. So, there's some building form guidelines in that document, talks about having a strong street presence and bringing buildings as close as possible to this to the right of way, and having a pedestrian orientation So looking at the site plan, you can see the buildings are pushed as close as they can to that avenue and the parking is not in front of the building. It's located to the sides along Hawes Road. There is a drainage easement and that kind of prevents the buildings from being up to that building setback line. So, they are pushed about 30 feet back from the east property line. But overall, the buildings engaged both of those streets. 492 parking spaces are required, 234 of those are to be covered and 795 stalls are proposed, 234 covered that might be a typo. There's also a 25-foot open space buffer along the west property line and that's a requirement of the PAD. So, perimeter yards are being provided especially along the west property line. And then foundation base and parking landscaping complies with the Mesa Zoning Ordinance.

So, the Design Review Board reviewed the elevations and provided feedback and staff will work with the applicant and architect to implement those changes. The applicant also participated in the CP process and notified all property owners within 1000 feet, and no feedback was received. So overall staff finds the request complies with the General Plan and the Gateway Strategic Development Plan, the Hawes Crossing PAD and the criteria for Site Plan Review in Section 1169. And the recommendation is approval with conditions

#### **Staffmember Charlotte Bridges presented case ZON21-00966:**

This is a request to rezone the subject site from LC to RM-3 PAD. It also includes Site Plan Review to allow for the development of a multiple residence project. The location of the project is east of Recker Road on the south side of Main Street. The General Plan character area is Mixed Use Activity District. The goals of that district is to provide strong and viable centers of commercial activity, but it can include a residential component, as a secondary uses. And for residential components, looking for greater than 70% of the area established with primary commercial zoning, and uses in this in the case of for this property staff is recommending approval of the project, are completed are indicating the project is

consistent with the General Plan because of the overabundance of commercial in that area. And we feel that there needs to be a residential component, more residential components in that area. It's also part of the Transit Corridor, and the Transit Corridor has to do with the pedestrian connections and pedestrian activity in the area. And so, it's primarily looking at the engagement of the project with more of a pedestrian oriented developments in the area. The zoning again is requested for Multiple Residence; it is actually with the U designation that is in compliance with that Transit Area District. It's proposing 18.7 dwelling units per acre and the proposed use is permitted in the RM-3U PAD District. This is a photo of the existing site looking south from across Main Street. And the site plan shows six units, with all the units have a double car garage. They have private patios, there's an amenity area located in the center of the project, also a smaller amenity area along the south side of the project and access is provided to Main Street. The Planned Area Development requests for deviations from the code include smaller ground floor open space area, the minimum dimension is required to be 10 feet. In this case the applicant is requesting five feet. For the attached garages, the code has a requirement, but those attached garages that are above the first story, be set back or be projected, let's say recessed at least three feet from the upper story facade. And in this case, the applicants, those garages are pretty much flush with the facade above. And for the exterior foundation adjacent to the drive aisles, the maximum five feet, a minimum five feet foundation base shall be provided. And in this case, there's only about two feet of that foundation area on the sides of the garage door so the garage doors are leading directly to the drive aisles and then, I'll call them the wing walls that are between the garage doors, there's only about a two-foot-wide foundation base in front of those wing walls.

The landscape plan shows perimeter landscape yards around all the edges of the property and foundation bases provided adjacent to the drive aisles in some areas. And then there's that landscaping throughout the amenity areas. The Design Review reviewed this earlier in the month, and they had minor recommendations. As far as the project, they recommended that they incorporate more of a third material into the building elevations. Specifically, they asked the applicant to look at more metal to use on the elevations, or more of a brown material, like some type of wood look material in the soffit areas. They also wanted to make sure there was plenty of lighting provided at the entryways to the doors on that, round the edges of the perimeter of the site, and then to provide an additional crosswalk from that south parking area across the street. As far as citizen participation, the applicant completed the citizen participation plan, they held a neighborhood meeting earlier in the year and sent out the required letters from notification. Planning staff has not received any comments or emails about this project.

As far as the school analysis, the school sent back information that there's probably a capacity in the area for this project. So, in summary, staff finds that the request complies with the 2040 Mesa General Plan. It complies with the review criteria, Chapter 22 for a Planned Area Development overlay, and it meets the review criteria for Site Plan Review. And staff is recommending approval with conditions.

**Principal Planner Evan Balmer presented case ZON22-0005:**

This request for Site Plan Modification to allow the development of a new restaurant, which would be a Texas Roadhouse directly adjacent to the existing Texas Roadhouse. You can see the subject site cross hatched on the map here, is the southeast corner of Stapley and the US 60. Here's some site photos. The first one is looking towards the existing Texas Roadhouse from Stapley. The second image is looking west from within the Mesa Grande Center, to kind of give you a better idea of where the

restaurant would be constructed. The General Plan designation is Mixed Use Activity, this is generally reserved for large scale areas 25 acres or larger that provide unique shopping, entertainment experiences, and generally provide a mixture of uses. The zoning is Light Industrial with a Council Use Permit in place. The CUP was approved in 1998. That's what allows large commercial development in zoning district. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the underlying zoning. So, as I mentioned, Texas Roadhouse would like to build a larger restaurant and they're looking at doing that directly to the east side of the existing restaurant. The new building is approximately 9200 square feet. They are providing 66 parking stalls with this request. I did want to mention that there is a shared parking agreement for the overall Mesa Grande Center, that was in place when the center was developed. When the new building is constructed, the plan for the existing building is to remove it and to landscape that area adjacent to Stapley, once the new building is constructed. Here you can see the landscape plan. The plant palette is generally mesquites, we have a few fan palms and some red yuccas. That would be in the area where the existing Texas Roadhouse is currently located once it's removed. I have a few elevations of the site.

The applicant completed the citizen participation, which is property owners within 1000 feet of the site, HOAs, and registered neighborhoods within a mile. They did complete a neighborhood meeting via Zoom in February. They did have one attendee, which is the property owner to the south, which is Charleston's I believe. Who had concerns about questions, and concerns about parking for the overall center. Staff does find that this complies with the General Plan, and the criteria from Chapter 69 for Site Plan Review, and I'm happy to answer any questions the board might have.

**Boardmember Pitcher inquired:**

One question. Now on this, it looks like when they take down this building, they're going to put a whole bunch of landscaping right there. Would they consider putting parking there to alleviate Charleston's issue?

**Principal Planner Evan Balmer responded:**

Thank you, Chair, Board Member Pitcher. That's a great question. And generally, the way staff looks at that, we tried to encourage buildings to be as close to the street frontage as possible, which is where the existing Texas Roadhouse and where Charleston's kind of all is down Stapley. Those buildings are directly adjacent. We have code requirements that prohibit parking from being in front of commercial buildings like that. So, kind of what we came up with was, to soften that with landscaping. It's a bit of a strange scenario, because there's a building that we're currently into, so we're going to end up with some vacant land in front of that. So as opposed to putting parking in front of that, staff felt that landscaping would be better geared towards meeting our code requirements for getting those buildings as close to the street, and keeping the parking to the sides in the rear.

**Boardmember Pitcher added:**

Well, yeah, I was in that Texas Roadhouse Saturday and parking there is terrible. And I can see why Charleston's has an issue. I mean...

**Principal Planner Evan Balmer responded:**

Chair, Boardmember Pitcher, the thought process behind locating that there, was this parking field just to the east the new Texas Roadhouse is a bit underutilized currently. So, I think the thought process is that with the building shifting farther to the east, more patrons from Texas Roadhouse would utilize that directly adjacent parking to the east of the new Texas Roadhouse building.

**Boardmember Ayers inquired:**

Just another kind of similar question along those lines, I know, potentially out of our purview a little bit, but with them doing construction simultaneously to kind of keeping the existing restaurant operating, it will impact the rest of the site. I'm kind of curious if staff has kind of worked with them understanding what their setup will be on site, as far as impacting parking. So, their site is going to be larger than that from a construction standpoint. They'll be taking up a significant portion of that parking lot somewhere during construction, for all of the contractor setup and everything. And I'm wondering if that's been discussed with the proposed team as well.

**Principal Planner Evan Balmer responded:**

Thank you Chair, Boardmember Ayers. We've not gotten to that level of detail, as far as the construction goes. It's definitely something that we can work with the applicant to set up you know, their storage yard for materials and things like that, in a manner that impacts Charleston's as least as possible.

**Boardmember Ayers added:**

I would highly recommend them working with their contractor, understand because it will be a significant part of that parking area that will be impacted during construction with that kind of simultaneous operation. So, I would highly recommend having that discussion and getting them to kind of show what their plans are for that.

**Chair Crockett inquired:**

And do we know how long the construction process will take?

**Principal Planner Evan Balmer responded:**

Chair, I am not aware of how long the construction process will take. I know Texas Roadhouse wants to move as quickly as possible. So, my thought would be is as fast as they can, what that translates to as far as months, I don't have an answer for that. The applicant is here I can speak with him at the break and follow up with you.

**Chair Crockett added:**

Okay, I you know, I don't know if this is a candidate but the thought came to mind that maybe the applicant would be willing to work on a Good Neighbor Agreement with the other restaurants? There's Backyard Taco there and Charleston's. I am sympathetic to concerns about parking because I eat over there a fair amount too and I know, there's a lot of parking to the east if you want to hike a little ways. And so that gives me some hope that this is going to work itself out. But it is a concern about the impact on the existing businesses. I love Texas Roadhouse, happy that they're expanding, this is terrific. But I

also want to make sure that it's done in a way that doesn't negatively impact the other restaurants that are in that same parking lot.

**Principal Planner Evan Balmer responded:**

Understood that is something, Chair, that I think we can work with the applicant on. They do have a shared parking agreement for the overall development. So, I don't know if there's language in there that kind of indicates where specific users should utilize parking. That's something that we can look at. But the idea from the development of the center was that cross-parking agreement allowed for parking as the customer sees fit. That is definitely something that we can look at.

**Chair Crockett added:**

Okay, well, I would encourage you to work with the owner of Charleston's to make sure that they're in the loop on discussions about how the construction is going to impact their business.

**Principal Planner Evan Balmer confirmed:**

We can do that.

**Staffmember Sean Pesek presented case ZON22-00436:**

The request is a rezone from LC-PAD to RM-3 PAD-PAD, Site Plan Review. This also does include a pre-plat, to allow for the development of a multiple residence project. Location is east of Signal Butte Road, north side of Hampton Avenue, and on the west side of 105th Place, as shown on the map. This is within the Mountain Vista Marketplace. This is a site photo looking north from Hampton Avenue. It's a two-acre site. The General Plan character area designation is Mixed Use Activity. So, this district is to create eventually, large scale activity areas- primarily commercial, but multiple residence is allowed as a secondary use in conjunction with the greater commercial development. And when we look at kind of a bird's eye view of Mountain Vista Marketplace, this actually isn't included, but most of it on the periphery is zoned Commercial. So given the size, the request to rezone to multiple residence conforms with the intent of the character area. So, the proposed density is 13 dwelling units per acre, and that's allowed in the RM-3 district. The site plan shows 29 units. These are two story buildings; there's an amenity space with a pool along 105th Place. 61 parking spaces are required, 61 are provided and then 58 are covered. So, each townhome unit has a two-car garage. There are perimeter yards along all property lines. And then the townhome units actually have private yards that face Hampton Avenue and then face the shared internal roadway with the apartment development. So, the applicant is using kind of a hybrid landscape design, so there are private yards and then common open space tracks that will be maintained by the HOA. And then there's also a signage at the southeast corner and that's part of the Mountain Vista Marketplace PAD, you can see here.

So, with this request, the applicant is asking for several deviations, mainly just the building setbacks and landscape yards, but there are some other deviations to the MZO. So, reduction to build and setback from pretty much all property lines, and with that reduction in the landscape yard, they asked to increase the minimum percentage of retaining walls around retention basins from 25% to 75%. And then, a reduction in the parking setback from property lines. And similar to Charlotte's case, there's a request to reduce the requirement for a recess with the garage from the upper story façade, from three

feet to 10 feet, and then a reduction in the percentage of coverage for the private open space meaningly, the private yards out front.

So, Design Review is not required because the density does not exceed 15 dwelling units per acre. But staff reviewed the elevations against the MZO, and the design guidelines for Mountain Vista Marketplace. And the proposed elevations do comply. The materials include stucco, fiber, cement, and porcelain tile. So, the citizen participation was conducted, some letters were sent to all property owners within 1000 feet, and no comment was received from interested parties on the request. So, staff finds the proposal complies with the with the General Plan, the criteria for a PAD overlay and the Mountain Vista Marketplace Development Agreement and meets to review criteria for Site Plan Review. And the recommendation is approval with conditions.

**Boardmember Peterson inquired:**

PAD justification or the deviation justification, maybe talk through that a little bit because the list is extensive. And they're they're pretty aggressive. And I get for a small, constrained site, I can understand having more than normal in some situations, but maybe talk through what that justification is?

**Staffmember Sean Pesek responded:**

Sure. Thank you. Boardmember Peterson. Yeah. So, like you said, the site is small. It's just over two acres. So, it's hard to build a townhome project that meets our required setbacks and landscape yard with. So, when we go back to the table, the bulk of them would be the reduction to setbacks, and then the landscape yard with the retention basin, I can have the architect, he's actually present. It's just more of an aesthetic requirement and the Mesa Zoning Ordinance, we don't have any designs of the retaining walls, but they will be reviewed with building permits. And I confirmed with the civil team that there shouldn't be an issue with the retaining walls exceeding 75% of that base, and the setback of the of the drive aisles. We've seen that a lot with multiple residents. And again, it just kind of goes back to the size of the site being so small. It's hard to meet that 50-foot setback. I can't really speak on the attached garage deviation. I know that's something that some architects question as far as, does it really fit with their vision and with their overall design that they're going for? But again, the architect is here, so I can have them touch on that.

**Boardmember Peterson inquired:**

And then go back to the site plan, if you would, on the retention areas have the retaining wall, pretty much on three of the four sides. Right? And is there the one on Hampton to the right-hand side? So, it's pretty much just down three feet plus retaining wall, and then what fence or what railing goes on top of that retaining wall?

**Staffmember Sean Pesek responded:**

Good question. That's something that that may come with the construction documents. Nothing was provided to me with the site plan application for any railing on top or to the side of those retaining walls.

**Boardmember Peterson inquired:**

Okay, gotcha. And then one final question. So, on the guest parking, there's what, two plus one accessible space is what it is, and does that meet the code for this number a lot.

**Staffmember Sean Pesek responded:**

It does.

**Architect Dan Astle was invited to speak :**

I appreciate the time, ultimately, as it related to the garage question, Sean is right, we occasionally would rather design the building the way we feel it looks nice and not be necessarily required on every single garage to do the exact same thing. So, we do have areas, although we reduce it, that doesn't mean that we never do it, we just don't do it as often. We're required to kind of show the one minimum that we do, so that we don't have the same every time. So, we have a few that are much larger, and some that are shorter. And that's the one that we have referenced in the deviation packet. So, it's allowing us to kind of blend more than just do the same thing every time. And as it relates to the exterior fencing, we're going to have a nice view fence. So, this green area can be seen, of course, on top of the CMU wall is the intent, and that'll come through with the construction documents. So that's a six-foot view fence yet on top of the retaining.

**Principal Planner Evan Balmer presented case ZON22-00437:**

This is a request for Site Plan Review to allow an industrial development on the north side of Germann Road, east of Pecos. Subject property is crosshatched on this map. The General Plan designation is Employment, which allows for a wide range of employment uses. It's also in the Logistics and Commerce District of the Mesa Gateway Strategic Development Plan. The proposal is consistent with both of those documents. Zoning on the property is Light Industrial, LI it allows for office warehouse uses, manufacturing, all of those are permitted in the LI zoning district. The property is currently vacant, this is looking north from Germann Road. Here you can see the site plan, there's a total of six buildings shown on this site with just over 663,000 square feet of GFA, in total. They truck courts that they are proposing are screened access is from Germann Road; there are three access points on your main road. The buildings themselves range in size from about 44,000 square feet, to just over 170,000 square feet. The request did go to Design Review couple weeks ago, August 9. They did receive minor comments from the board. We are working with the applicant to address those comments as it moves forward.

They did complete a citizen participation, property owners notified within 1000 feet of the site. As of today, we've not received any feedback from residents in the area. This does comply with the Mesa 2040 General Plan, as well as the review criteria in Chapter 69 for Site Plan Review, staff is recommending approval with conditions and I am here for any questions the board might have.

**Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard presented case ZON22-00535:**

This is for a Site Plan Modification to allow for the development of industrial building. This is located north of McDowell, west to Greenfield. A little more context, just southeast of this image is where Falcon Field is, just in order to provide a little more overall location for the site. This is the view looking Northwest and the site from Norwalk itself. Overall, the General Plan designation for this site is Employment and the intent of that is to provide a wide range of employment opportunities in high



quality settings, and this helps to achieve that goal. The zoning district it is Light Industrial with a Planned Area Development overlay. The use to the south is for warehouse manufacturing uses, and that is consistent with the LI district. The overall site plan shows public access from Oasis, as well as private access for secure parking for employees and things of that nature on site off of Norwalk. The reason you're seeing it in front of you today, it has been through about five different administrative reviews and substantive reviews. And they have finally gotten over that 10%, which they are required to come forward to you, and then on to the City Council, with your recommendation. So based off of that, that's why you're seeing it today instead of their typical administrative process for these modifications. And, again, just to reiterate, the security parking on northside is just for employees for the site. Overall, again, just reiterating per the admin in 2019, the square footage was permitted at just over 6500 square feet, and the proposed is for just over a 200. And because that is over that 10%, is before you today. Overall, here's the landscape plan. General comments is that in order to meet the quality design standards and guidelines of our code, they have provided an open space as well as landscaped in that area, as well as meeting foundation base through averaging, especially within that eastern portion of the site. And they are providing for calibrators, as well as some shrubs that include red yucca, as well as some other agave, and things of that nature. It went to Design Review back on August 9, they didn't have any comments for the site plan or anything that would affect the site plan itself. It's more just for the elevations and making sure there was some returns and just more facade changes, if anything of that nature.

Acitizens participation plan was filed for this project and letters were mailed out for all property owners within 500 feet. We did receive one comment from the property owner just to the north on this site, just some general questions on drainage. To provide a little context there is a regional drainage for this area that is along the way just to the southwest of this site, it's hard to see on this image, I'll find an aerial that shows it a little better. It is this tract over here that would be that regional retention area. And that's based off of discussions with the architect, who also happens to be the architect that designed their building, he made clear that the retention has been addressed as part of that regional system.

So based off that, staff finds that the overall site plan complies with the 2040 Mesa General Plan, as well as the Site Plan Review for the PAD that already exists on site, as well as meeting the criteria for Site Plan Review. And therefore, Staff recommends approval conditions and I'm happy to answer any questions.

**Staffmember Lesley Davis presented case ZON22-00593:**

The request is for a Site Plan Review to allow an industrial office warehouse development that will have three contractor yards in the rear. It's located west of Greenfield Road, north of Baseline within an existing industrial subdivision. So, it's a vacant lot out there. Many of you are probably very familiar with the DMB. It's kind of just west across the street there from that property. The General Plan for the property is Employment, which is for a wide range of employment uses. This is a proposed industrial warehouse building which is consistent with the General Plan. The zoning on the property is LI, which allows for Office warehouse and the contractor storage yards are permitted. Here's a view of the site looking west from Valley Auto Drive. The site plan shows the single 31,000 square foot office and warehouse building access is off of Valley Auto Drive through two driveways and then you can see that there's the three contractor yards that are in the rear of the property. They're going to be going to the

Design Review Board in September, is when they're scheduled to go for that meeting. So, we're still working with the application or the applicant to finalize elevations for that meeting.

They did complete a citizen participation plan and mailed out letters within 1000 feet, and HOAs, and registered neighborhoods within a mile. They have not reported that they heard anything from any of the neighbors, they did offer to meet with anybody who was interested. Staff has also not had any response on this case. It is in compliance with the 2040 Mesa General Plan, and the criteria for Site Plan Review from the Mesa Zoning Ordinance. And we're recommending approval with conditions and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

**Boardmember Pitcher inquired:**

I do, I went out there just before the meeting on the west side, where this would be it's got a big corridor for power lines.

**Staffmember Lesley Davis responded:**

It is federal property, it's zoned Agricultural, they have actually been because it is AG, it does require them to have a landscape buffer between the two. So, they are going to be landscaping adjacent to that. But it is a separate property that they don't control to the west of this.

**Boardmember Pitcher added:**

I don't know how high their walls are there, for they've got a yard in the back, how higher are the yard walls going to be?

**Staffmember Lesley Davis responded:**

I would have to double check. That'll be a minimum of six feet, but I believe they were at eight. Typically, when you have contractor storage yards, they're gonna want that eight foot, which is allowed for the

**Chair Crockett added:**

And to follow up on that I thought I read in the staff report that the minimum was seven feet. But that seemed a little on the low side for a storage yard. That the fact that there's three yards does that suggest that this is going to be like a condominium type project, where you'd have three different users.

**Staffmember Lesley Davis responded:**

Chair Crockett, they will have three different users, that's kind of how they divided the building, as three possible tenants. The owner is one of those tenants at the south portion of the building, and then they do have the opportunity for some of that storage. It is screened storage, which is unusual in the contractor storage yards. Usually we don't have any plants, they are going to have trees on the west side. So that will provide additional buffer on that west side of the property from anything adjacent or from view into those storage yards.

**Chair Crockett added:**

Okay. And I, I was more concerned about the existing building on Baseline and the upper floor of that building. I don't know if it's a two or three story building, and whether people would be able to look down into the storage yards from that building.

**Staffmember Lesley Davis clarified:**

Chair Crockett, it is a two-story building, as I recall, and they will have a view into this. But since it does have the LI zoning, it is they are allowed uses within that district. There will be some landscaping down along that side though.

**Assistant Director Rachel Prelog presented the Planning Director updates:**

Regarding our General Plan, I don't know if you are aware, but we have posted the RFP for the General Plan update. So that is out there. We'll be receiving solicitations for the next couple of weeks. So, if you know of any firms that are interested, please encourage them to apply. With that, we do have several other major updates to plans occurring, the Transportation Master Plan, the Transit Master Plan, and then Water Resources has a consolidated related comprehensive master plan that they're working on as well. So, all these items are taking place at the same time. So, this next year, year and a half is going to be pretty exciting city of Mesa, I know you'll be seeing a lot of presentations from these various groups here.

So, the horizon for the General Plan is anticipated to be 2050. And I do believe that the other plans such as the Transportation Master Plan is going to be using that same horizon.

The next item I wanted to kind of share with the Board is regarding citizen participation for Boards and for City Council. When Council returns, we've been notified that they're going to be making some changes to the way that the public can participate and provide comments. So, when they returned to their session, we had been told that they are no longer going to be reading comments into the record for people that submit blue cards. So, citizens would still be able to call in, or attend in person but staff or the council will not be reading in comments that were just submitted through the blue card process. So that was shared with us. Typically, the boards kind of follow suit of City Council, but we've been told that this is kind of at the option to the Board of how they would like to proceed if they would like to continue the current process, or if they would like to follow City Council's lead. So, I'll just kind of leave that with you to consider.

If we were to have a discussion that would have to be agendaized. But this just as to inform me when we'll probably be reaching out with some key communication to the Board via email about this.

**Chair Crockett confirmed:**

Okay. But in the meantime, we continue to read will continue to read comments into the record that a received?

**Rachel**

That is correct. Yep. And then finally, it just kind of wanted to make an announcement, but this is Lesley Davis's, his last hearing with us. Lesley is retiring September 1. She's been with the City for over 30 years and has been just an outstanding public servant. We're, sad to see her go, but we're really

excited for her that she gets to retire at such a young age and go out there and enjoy her life. But I know that she's worked very closely with this board for a long, long time. So just wanted to let you know and thank her for all of her service that she's provided.

**Chair Crockett added:**

Well, Lesley, thank you. We will miss seeing you around here. You are definitely a fixture here. So, thanks for all you've done and for all you've taught me about planning and zoning. Plus, how did you get your start your job when you're nine years old? That's great.

**Boardmember Peterson motioned to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Pitcher.**

**The meeting was adjourned.**

## **2 Adjournment**

Boardmember Peterson motioned to adjourn the study session. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Pitcher.

Vote: 5-0 (Boardmember Sarkissian, absent)  
Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:  
AYES – Crockett, Ayers, Allen, Peterson, Pitcher  
NAYS – None

The Study Session was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Michelle Dahlke, Secretary  
Principal Planner

\* \* \* \* \*

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

