

- 4-a ZON21-01271 District 4.** Within the 600 block of West University Drive (south side), within the 300 block of North Hosick (east side), and within the 300 block of North Date (west side). Located west of Country Club Drive on the south side of University Drive (1.5± acres). Rezone from Limited Commercial (LC) and Single Residence 6 (RS-6) to Multiple Residence 4 with a Planned Area Development Overlay (RM-4-PAD) and Site Plan Review. This request will allow for a multiple residence development. Tim Boyle, Tim Boyle Design, applicant; QCC Promotion and Marketing, LLC, owner.

Planner: Cassidy Welch

Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions

Summary:

Staffmember Cassidy Welch presented case ZON21-01271:

This is a request to rezone a property from LC and RS-6 to RM-4 with a Planned Area Development overlay, and Site Plan Review to allow for development of a multiple residence. The site is located on the south side of West University Drive and west of Country Club Drive. The General Plan designation for the properties Neighborhood. The site is also located within the West Main Street Area Plan. The zoning request before you today is a rezone to Multiple Residence-4 with a Planned Area Development Overlay and multiple residence is a permitted use in the RM Zoning District. On the site there is currently one single residence building with the remainder of the site, as vacant. So, the site plan is for 28 multiple residence units, varying from two stories to three stories, with a centralized amenity, as well as an amenity area located at the southeast area of the site, and nine visitor parking spaces located on the southern border of the site. The site will be exclusively accessed from University Drive with unit spacing both Hosick and Date. As a part of the PAD request, there are certain deviations from development standards that are being proposed. Those include reductions to the minimum building and landscape setbacks along Date - Hosick, as well as the rear southern property line, modifications to the building separation requirements, open space, setback of cross drive aisles, and interior parking lot landscaping, and then finally modifications to the building entrance requirements, the setback of attached garages, and the maximum fence heights along both Date and Hosick streets.

The applicant did attend a Design Review Board work session on March 8 of this year. The Design Review Board expressed concerns with the proposed design and compatibility of the use, and design with the surrounding development and recommended minor changes to be more consistent with the surrounding existing single residence subdivision. The applicant did conduct a citizen participation process, which included letters to property owners within 1000 feet, as well as HOAs, and registered neighborhoods. They held one virtual meeting in April of this year, there were no attendees to that virtual meeting. We did receive two attendees at the March Design Review Board session in opposition of the case, as well as one additional letter of opposition that was submitted for that Design Review Board, after the fact, and then one letter in support of the proposed development. In summary, we find that the proposed development complies with the 2040 Mesa General Plan, as well as the criteria for a PAD Overlay and Site Plan Review, and staff is recommending approval with conditions.

Applicant Dave Zelner, 6368 South Foothills Drive, Gold Canyon, Arizona spoke:

I work with Tim Boyle Design. I think at this time since staff has kind of recommended approval, it may be just that we want to hear the comments and then kind of respond to those.

Chair Crockett opened the public hearing.

Mike Wright, 629 West Cabellero Circle spoke:

My address is right behind the Wright house, which is my business and property. We are directly across the street from this project, and we highly recommend it. We're kind of excited, frankly, about the improvement to the neighborhood that it would make. The current status of that property is a little bit sad. Half of it is in just open vacant property with weeds and dirt. And so, we look forward to having a project of this quality to see and for our customers to see as they come into the area. So, we do support it and hope that you'll approve it. Do you have any questions?

Stuart Quist, 451 North Cherry, Mesa spoke:

I hope to take, if I had more time, I would take more time, but three I will try to do. My name is Stuart Quist. I live at 451 North Cherry Mesa in the 1000 foot radius there. I've had my address for 60 years. I have been associated with this address, where I currently live for 43 years. The comment that I have submitted online, is a brief summary of what I would like to say. I am opposed to this project for many, many reasons. One of which I remember about 35 years ago in this very chamber. The debate on what is now past the place where Mr. Michael right now resides. They wanted to put in three story heights, high-density housing there, and the developers made the claim that they would never be able to sell, they would never be able to make money if they were single family homes. And here we are now, blessed with some really good quality families there including Mr. Michael Wright. And now he is saying no, we don't need that. We can go with a high-density housing now that he's got his. Well in this neighborhood, north and south of University is single family dwelling. There are a few, two and three and four apartment complexes on University. But it would be much better for the community, for the neighborhood, to have single-family homes there, good quality, high fences along University. If there's more reasons why I'm opposed to it, the drawings here that were shown are just a tiny bit deceptive. Yes, the current property, yeah, it's in this dismay, just like 35 years ago, the property there where Mr. Michael Wright lives now. But what these pictures don't show is the power lines on the south side of University, I'm pretty sure that they are using the City of Mesa utility power lines, high voltage, probably 115 kV. And I have recommended to the architect that when we put in a bus pull out, that would make it easier to accept the plan if there was a bus pull out, so that when the traffic backs up on University, eastbound morning and night, the buses would have place to pull out in the traffic would be able to flow better. But those power lines, if you could work with the City of Mesa Utility Company, or whoever they belong to, and have them go underground just in that section, then you could do a nice bus pull out, and it would be a lot more palpable to accept the whole project. Also, I don't see in the plans here, or it's not mentioned, any plans for EV charging stations. I would highly recommend it if it's going to be, as it's advertised- modern townhouses, let's get some EV charging stations, one per parking space.

The comments that I have submitted online, you have. We want to attract high quality families.

Chair Crockett stated:

I do have a letter of support here from DJ and Sarah Stapley, which will be part of the record on this case.

Vice Chair Ayers read the public comments that were submitted.

Esther Vreeland, 536 West 3rd Place, is opposed:

Roughly 45 years ago, Mr. Bernard Davis and others successfully petitioned the Zoning Board to change the zoning in the area to avoid having multi-level buildings. This area consists of single level homes and single level small businesses. So, the current zonings, LLC and RS-6 is very appropriate for the area. Mr. Boyle is trying to change the zoning to build what we didn't want all those years ago. This is a suburb not a city. We live here to get away from exactly what Mr. Boyle proposes. Many homes in a small footprint are very profitable, but it needs to be an appropriate area.

Delaney Cato, 660 West 2nd Place, is opposed:

The addition of the multifamily housing results in increased traffic and street parking and potentially decreased property values of current homes. Increase traffic during the proposed development because backups on University and additional traffic negatively impacts the safety of kids walking to school. Parking is a concern as residents often use garages for storage and park on the street, which negatively impacts existing neighborhood residents. The limited parking will also force visitors to park on the street. This proposal is inconsistent with the existing SFR neighborhood.

Damien Carpenter, three 322 North Hosick, is in support:

We have a housing crisis here in Arizona. 300 people are moving here daily and according to ADOH, we are 270,000 units housing unit short to meet our housing demand. This project will bring needed workforce housing to Arizona teachers, police officers, and families. I moved to the condo neighborhood a little over five years ago. This location for the proposed project has been an eyesore. It currently has one single family home and is surrounded by adjacent unkept dirt lots. I like the modern design of these proposed units and the added landscaping the units will bring to the neighborhood. Please pass.

Chair Crockett closed the public hearing.

Applicant, Dave Zelner spoke:

Thank you Chair, members of the Board, Dave Zelner. Do want to kind of highlight that the proposal for this project is attached, basically single family and so it's not what you would typically talk about in multifamily, where it's two bedrooms on top of three bedrooms on top of, you know. So, we think that, you know, these will be more stable tenants, because they have garages and amenities that will keep them there, and won't be kind of subject to the short term tendency that sometimes walkups have, I believe. Can we pull the zoning picture back up from the case?

The area, I think it this time, this property, the north, probably two thirds of it is actually zoned LC. So, it's not currently zoned for single family. There are two single family lots. So, I guess the belief that this would become single family. I don't know that that would be supported within this area for a variety of reasons, especially being on University. And so, we think that this offers a "middle housing option," and a form that is not as dense as it possibly could be. And so, we think that hopefully it will be supported. For that EV charging stations will probably come about at some point. And, that's something I think that the market should determine. We do have a bus stop being put here, and we are in compliance with the requests that transportation has made for this property. So, they did not ask us for a bus pull out. They did ask for a bus stop covered area and we have provided that. So I think a lot of things historically happened. And eventually things change so, I've noticed something might have happened 35 years ago, I'm not sure the circumstances are exactly the same now, in regards to the demand for housing, the need for housing and those kinds of things. So, we would just appreciate your support and the development.

Board Member Pitcher inquired:

Just a quick question, Are these going to be for rent? Or are these can be for purchase?

Applicant, Dave Zelner responded:

That's to be determined at this point. So

Vice Chair Ayers inquired:

Are they are they being metered separately?

Applicant, Dave Zelner responded:

I don't know that we've gotten that far in the design process for the construction permit. So, I think that's kind of also being worked out.

Boardmember Allen stated:

I guess my thoughts on this are, the way I'm leaning, I believe that this location because it faces University is more conducive to multifamily, than it is to a single family. So, for that reason, I would support this development.

Boardmember Allen motioned to approve case ZON21-01271. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Sarkissian.

That: The Board recommends approve the case ZON21-01271 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the final site plan submitted.
2. Compliance with all requirements of Design Review Case No. DRB21-01270.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, obtain approval of and record a final subdivision plat for the subject site.
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. All off-site improvements and street frontage landscaping to be installed in the first phase of construction.
6. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations, except the modification to the development standards as approved with this PAD overlay as shown in the following table:

<u>Access, Circulation and Parking –</u> <i>MZO Section 11-5-5</i> - Attached Garages	Two-Story Units: In multi-story buildings that include livable floor area, garage doors located below upper story living space shall be recessed at least 2 feet from the upper story façade.
<u>Maximum Fence Height –</u> <i>MZO Section 11-30-4</i> - Required Street Side Yards	No fence or freestanding wall within or along the exterior boundary of the required front yard shall exceed a height of 4 feet

Vote: 7-0

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Crockett, Ayers, Allen, Sarkissian, Peterson, Pitcher, Montes

NAYS – None

