

- 4-a ZON21-00129 District 1.** Within the 2200 to 2400 blocks of East McDowell Road (south side). Located east of North Gilbert Road on the south side of East McDowell Road (9.0± acres). Rezone from Single Residence 43 (RS-43) and Single Residence 43 with Historic Landmark Overlay (RS-43-HL) to Multiple Residence 4 with a Planned Area Development Overlay (RM-4-PAD), Site Plan Review; and Special Use Permit. This request will allow for a multiple residence development with an associated commercial use. Ryan Nelson, Sweetwater Companies, applicant; GUNNING MARK S/RON BAILLY TRUST, owner.

Planner: Cassidy Welch

Staff Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

Summary:

Staffmember Cassidy Welch presented case ZON21-00129:

This is a request to rezone a property from RS-43 and RS-43 with a Historic Landmark Overlay to RM-4 PAD, Site Plan Review and Special Use Permit. This request will allow for a multiple residence development with an accessory commercial. The site is located south of McDowell Road and east of Gilbert Road. It is on the Crismon Farm Homestead site. Here you can see an existing photo of the site it is currently vacant. The General Plan designation for the property is Neighborhood Suburban. The intent behind the Neighborhood Suburban character area is for predominantly single residence subdivisions. However, multiple residence may be approved at major arterials and intersections. The current zoning on the site is Single Residence 43. There is a Historic Landmark Overlay for the Crismon Farm Homestead. A little bit more about that Crismon Farm Homestead, that was established by Charles Crismon Senior from the second Mesa Pioneer Company, and it was used as the Crismon family homestead in 2001. That site received a Historic Landmark Overlay. However, in 2007, the structures were removed after a fire, and in June of 2021, the Historic Preservation Board voted to recommend removal of that Historic Landmark Overlay due to the demolition of those historic structures. The zoning on the site is now proposed for Multiple Residence 4. The intent behind the RM-4 zoning is to allow for a variety of housing, and multiple residences is a permitted use, and limited-service restaurants require approval of a Special Use Permit. So, per section 11-5-2, for limited-service restaurants they are permitted in the RM-4 zoning district with approval of a Special Use Permit. There are some criteria that have to be met in order to receive approval of that SUP. Those include the site being located in an intersection of an arterial and collector, a maximum gross floor area of approximately 1500 square feet, and there can be no drive-thru windows or drive thru lanes. The proposed development complies with all of those criteria. As a part of the rezone request, the applicant is requesting a Planned Area Development Overlay for deviations to development standards. Those deviations include modifications to the required fence, modifications to the parking ratio and covered parking requirements, reduced the landscape setbacks, and foundation-based requirements, as well as a modification to the landscape islands. In exchange for the proposed deviations. The applicant has provided pedestrian connections to the existing canal trail to the south and southeast, a retail component, high quality amenities, and superior elevations.

The site plan is for one multiple residence building with 222 units and a 1,499 square foot commercial suite. The site will be accessed off of an entry off of McDowell Road. So, a little bit about what's changed since October 27. In October 27, that request for an RM-5 was heard by the Planning and Zoning Board, that the board recommended denial with a vote of two to five. There were 30 comments received in opposition, and several in support. The concerns that

were outlined were due to the traffic and roundabout compatibility, density, and height. Subsequently, the applicant made some changes to the proposal request. They're now requesting a rezone to RM-4 PAD. They've also eliminated all of the three-bedroom units in exchange for two-bedroom units, which will subsequently reduce the density and number of residents in the proposed development. They've also worked extensively with ADOT and transportation to find alternative solutions to that roundabout. It was determined by both ADOT and the Transportation Department that the roundabout is the safest solution. And they have proposed modification to that roundabout curb to allow for horse trailers to override the curb or jump on the curb so that they do not tip.

The application was heard by the Design Review Board in October of 2021. There were four neighbors in attendance who had concerns over the height, the design and landscaping. So, the citizen participation that was conducted prior to the October 27 hearing included notification to property owners within 1000 feet, as well as HOAs, and registered neighborhoods. They held three neighborhood meetings and some additional secondary meetings, and had calls with specific adjacent property owners. Staff received, at that time, a number of emails and calls, as well as, a survey and a petition, both in support and opposition. The concerns that were brought up were due to the height of the proposed development, density, traffic and compatibility. We received several letters of support from adjacent property owners, specifically the owners to the south, who worked with the applicant to develop a Good Neighbor Policy, which is included as a part of the conditions of approval for this proposed development. Those standards included requirement for opaque balconies, limitations on the number of units and height, guarantee that the proposed elevations will be of a high quality, and then as well as some guarantees for landscaping and lighting. After the 2021 review of the case, the applicant reached out to several key neighbors who opposed the project to have further discussions. The City also hired a facilitator to reach out to the developer, and several of those surrounding neighbors, and discuss those concerns. The applicants also met with members of the Lehi Community Board; they conducted the required citizen participation notification to property owners within 1000 feet, as well as HOAs, and registered neighborhoods. At the time that this report was written, staff received three responses in support, and one in opposition. We have subsequently received two additional emails in support, and one in opposition for the proposed development.

In summary, we find that the proposed development complies with the 2040 Mesa General Plan, meets the criteria for a Special Use Permit, as well as the criteria for a Planned Area Development overlay, and Site Plan Review. Staff is recommending approval with conditions, and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Boardmember Allen inquired:

For clarification purposes, from the last time we saw this until today, it has been reduced one story, correct? From three story to two story, or four story to three story?

Staffmember Cassidy Welch clarified:

That was reduction that was conducted as a part of the first review in 2021.

Conversation ensued and it was determined that:

Three stories is the maximum and there are some modifications to the roundabout where it is like rolled curb, now so that a car can go up on the curb if need be.

Staffmember Cassidy Welch also clarified:

There is no reduction in the number of units, but upon further evaluation, the proposed density meets more the requirements of an RM-4 zoning versus an RM-5, and then they also eliminated the three-bedroom units in exchange for two-bedroom unit, 222 total units.

Chair Crockett invited the applicant to speak:

Adam Baugh, 2525, East Arizona Biltmore Circle spoke:

You've seen this before. But I think for the benefit of Jeff Pitcher, who hasn't seen it, I'd love to give you an abbreviated version, but still enough to give you some context for why we're doing what we're doing. A couple of things I'm going to point out, or discuss a little bit about the unique nature of this property. And secondly, the why behind some of the changes we made, and maybe the history that got us to that point. When I look at this property right here. There's some that stands out to me. Rarely, do you see a property of this shape and configuration. But if that was the only problem I had, you probably would have had development occur here much sooner. Looking at a property on an aerial view is totally different than walking the property with your feet. Once you start to walk the property you see how drastic the topography changes from the Mesa bluff to the south. It's 50 feet taller, from McDowell Road, about 20 to 30 feet, Gilbert Road about 20, 30 feet and from the freeway about 30 feet. So, we're like a bowl a basin. Those kinds of conditions make it really hard to develop. Then you have two canals that transect the property and an old road that was relocated. When you consider the totality of those situations. You have to get creative to develop property over years has been different assemblages to make this work. But finally, we're bringing forth a proposal that's going to tackle those tough challenges. And as a result, sometimes you need a little bit of ingenuity and flexibility to pull these Herculean efforts off.

Here's some views just to give an idea of what the depth perception is of this property from McDowell Road. For example, you can kind of see the hill, the bluff at the top left corner of that site. Pass through a couple of things quickly, but it's worth noting that it is consistent general plan, it is not in the Lehi Sub Area Plan. And we're proposing 39-foot-tall building, 222 units. But that is not where we started. When we began this proposal previously, we start with 320 units. And then through the course of their outreach process came down to 300, and then down to 260, and just before planning commission last fall, trimmed it down to 222. And that change significantly was the result of a significant reduction in building height from four stories, down three stories, from 50 feet down to 39 feet. But that in itself wasn't the only change. You see, we had to, I think, understand the concerns the folks the south- who were immediately adjacent to this project. And through that, many meetings in evening living rooms and follow up discussions, have about four or five different meetings with them, coming up with a list of stipulations that staff has been incorporated into this case. And that was reflected in a neighborhood agreement that was presented, I think it might be in the packet still, the neighborhood agreement was signed with those folks who lived on that perimeter edge. We committed to them to make these changes, and they committed to withdraw their opposition. But what that did is it significantly reduced the heights, the density, made sure that our operations were in a certain manner. And we did some that we haven't seen done before, but creating a Good Neighbor Policy, which then became a mechanism for the City to enforce things like, how are the back patios used- they want to make sure that laundry wasn't strung over the rear balconies, making sure that they're opaque to prevent view into the clutter that might be seen on the back of those porches. So those things were a lot of the significant effort that was created for us to get to this point today. You can see some of the views, renderings that we're hoping to create from this canal escape. This is the south side of us, that buffers the neighbors to the south to our development. By lowering that height, we kind of become now tucked in. You can see this is the view today

from the canal. And this is the view hopefully, if this were to be approved going forward. The difference is subtle. We certainly recognize though that this has created a lot of consternation.

We've been very diligent about addressing the most some of those concerns, things related to traffic, density, privacy, even some questions regarding crime and transient population. The thing that stood out most to us last time particularly, was the roundabout. And so, what we've done has been intentional about how we've addressed these things. First of all, building heights been reduced too, the main concern was height before. And I don't think I've been able to solve that. But I can tell you, we've made tremendous improvements to reduce that height. So, whereas we're at four stories, down to three densities in that cut, going from 320 today down to 222, has been tremendous. But the other key consideration here is, density doesn't mean anything unless it has an associated impact with it. But given that we don't have access to Gilbert Road, you can't say that our project will create tremendous amount of traffic on Gilbert Road. And because we're so close to the freeway, we suspect that the majority of our guests will be traveling in and out of the freeway to downtown, or Tempe, or Scottsdale, where likely the workforce is. And so, there isn't really that much of a penetration deeper into Mesa on your peak times, which is in the morning, and your peak time in the afternoon. It doesn't mean that people won't drive into Mesa for the shopping, for maybe their kids go to school, or park, those are occurring at regular hours, not the peak time intensity hours where that traffic isn't felt as an impact. It's also worth noting these buildings are about 270 feet of separation. So, any question regarding privacy is addressed, and clearly on the north side of us as a freeway. So, there's a significant distance between us anybody to the north, or the east, or the west.

What's changed? We can get into neighborhood outreach. It doesn't mean we've been able to solve the problems, but it does mean we've been able to understand concerns better and then figure out how we can address some of those concerns. And so, through that effort, we've changed the zoning from RM-5 down RM-4. You may ask, well why there was this lingering concern that we kept hearing that what if somebody came back and changed the site plan and just bumped up their density back to what the RM-5 could allow? And so, to immediately remove that concern, we changed it down to RM-4, so that way what we're showing you is what we can build. I heard some concerns that somehow a three-bedroom unit could allow two families to live in it. And that two families live in a three-bedroom unit didn't fit the character of the folks that live in the area. So, we made sure that we removed three-bedroom units, we only had nine. But now we have no more three-bedroom units. We update our traffic study to reflect the 220 units. And there's some interesting information I'll share in the next slide about the traffic. But redesigning the roundabout was something frankly, I did not understand the first time and I think that was my mistake. There's a lot of people who have lifestyles in this area. To me a roundabout is something I just drive my truck, or my little Honda Civic, but navigating a trailer or semi is a totally different experience. And hearing how these vertical curves are hard to maneuver at different times and you don't realize that the drama could create until you get to a destination. We then went forth and met with the City of Mesa, could we avoid a roundabout and just have direct access? And they said it wasn't possible. So, we went back to ADOT and City of Mesa again and revisited. Is there a different way to design the roundabout? And that's my point is, Wickenburg as an example. And so, I'll be able to share some of the things, the last thing that's changed is some significant coordination with SRP. This is an economic benefit opportunity. But it also has to provide a benefit to the community and coordinate with SRP, and some of these trailhead improvements provides that benefit. I will point out here on a traffic study, this project along Gilroy was only expected to create about 75 daily trips, it's because we have no direct access to Gilbert Road. And so, you can't say that this is going to create tremendous impact on Gilbert Road. And the roadways that surround us are designed to carry 40 to 50,000 cars a day. But presently, and even when you add in the traffic created by ours, it's

still only operating at about 37 to 46% capacity. So, there's plenty of room in this development to be served by these adjacent streets. When you look at the roundabouts, these are the curbs I think caused some issues. And we recognize that that's a that was a big issue. When we read the comments from last time, and we heard the comments that were shared the hearing, we recognize that we can make a better option here. So, working with ADOT, they talked about an apron. First of all, that apron is a little bit wider to accommodate larger trucks and horse trailers. Secondly, in addition to apron is a mountable curb, which kind of looks like this. And this has worked well in rural areas. Wickenburg is an example, if you've likely gone that direction, you've experienced it yourself. We think this goes a long way to addressing that immediate concern of the day. We've also worked closely with ADOT, you can see here the roundabout that's planned and Old Lehi Road, which is over there, I guess on the on the right side of that page. But with the roundabout coming in, and the trailhead connection, and improvements are looking to cooperate and work together with SRP. on we what we are dealing land to the City that then can be utilized by SRP to make some these improvements.

Here's some conceptual renderings from an aerial view. And that might be changed by their Design Committee. But this is kind of the imagery that we're hoping to accomplish. I don't unfortunately, get to choose how they design it. But at a minimum, I can provide the opportunity for it to exist by donating this land to them so that way, they can complete the improvements and provide a greater community benefit which allows joggers, runners, cyclists and horse equestrian uses. The other thing we've heard is to make sure that the planting types along the canal are horse friendly, apparently, again, not as a horse person. But as I understand it, there's certain plants are toxic to them. And so, work with our landscape architect and helping that influence landscape design along that to make sure we remove some of those things. So, it still becomes equestrian friendly but, beautify at the same time. At the end of the day, there's tremendous benefits this development, it will struggle to find new users. The fact that you don't have an access point to give a road, is another strict limitation on the site that's likely handcuffed over the years from creating any other type of meaningful development, like a commercial or office use. But if you could design a site that actually was lower than the height of the hill to the south, if you could design a site that optimized the proximity next to it, if you could design a site that took into consideration that feedback to before, then you can create a community that works. It doesn't mean though, that people just still aren't opposed to multifamily. But I think many of those concerns they've heard about multifamily are heard repeatedly, but rarely are born to be truthful. And at the end of the day when you're designing something like this, and the rents that are required based on the high premium that you're paying for land, the quality of tenant here is hyper increased versus any other circumstance that you might associate with apartments, at the end of the day. We believe it's consistent with the General Plan. We think that's why staff supports it. We think we've gone a long way to make changes, but I know that it I haven't been able to address every concern, but I can say at a minimum, we've worked hard to be responsive to that. And so, for those reasons, we hope that you'll be able to support the case. And I'd be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

Chair Crockett invited members of the public to speak:

Michelle McCroskey, 3021 North Chestnut Circle spoke:

That is a neighborhood northeast quadrant of Gilbert Road and McDowell. So, we're a neighbor. I bought our property in 1995. When it was just two lanes, Gilbert Road and two lanes with a stop sign on McDowell. I am a 4H horse leader. I've done that for over 10 years. I'm an advisory board member for the Lehi Community Improvement Association. I'm the Chair of the Lehi Horse Advisory Committee, and I share all that with you to tell you three things. Number one, I

know horses. Number two, I know horse trails. And number three, I've worked on a number of projects with the City for our neighborhood. So, I am all about development in our community. But I am only up for developments that build and support our community. The trail that runs near Gilbert Road and McDowell, I worked on that project on the with the City, the Gilbert Road Project, when McDowell told us that we didn't need a horse trail, nobody was going to ride up there. Anyway, I worked on that project. And I worked on the 202 Freeway, when ADOT told us that we didn't deserve any noise mitigation. It really wasn't that bad after all. And in both of those incidences, the City of Mesa rescued us. They made them put on a horse trail because they recognized our community. And the same thing with noise mitigation, though to freeway. So last October, we gave you 156 signatures from people that were opposed to this project. And since that time, yes, I was one of the ones that the attorneys met with and the even the person hired by the community. So, I won't reiterate some of the other concerns, but I will nail down the one that is the most concerning. And if it's possible for you to put up that roundabout, we've showed you that picture. I fortunately just got that Monday night at 10 o'clock at night, had not had a chance to look at that before. But in that trail design of the roundabout is extremely concerning. If those of you weren't here in October, that interchange that we're talking about was the most complicated interchange with the 202 Freeway. That's why you have one entrance and exit on the west side of Gilbert Road, and the other one on the north side of McDowell. That's why, and so to introduce, and it's actually the roundabout, I wanted you to show this in his presentation. So, I can have a few more minutes. While he calls that up. If you look at that new roundabout design, I can appreciate that as to Wickenburg roundabout, I get that. But that's not the only problem with that design. Okay, go. So, my big thing with that is it's unsafe. It just is I know that ADOT said that if you were going to put 400 cars on this property, that this would be the only way that you could accommodate it. And that's true. The idea that you could never use Gilbert Road, well, that's true. If you exceed the density that that property was signed for when they bought it. They bought it for R43. With no promise that you would ever change that zoning. Okay, so this project hurts our community. It doesn't help them support it, and it creates severe traffic problems and safety issues with that roundabout, and I have to ask that you decline it.

Robin Fenn, 3035 North Gilbert Road spoke:

I was under the impression that when this zoning back in October was recommended for the keeping the one acre per house, that it was a done deal. And here we are addressing the same problem, no reduction in housing, nothing else. I didn't even think about the roundabout, no lighting available for it. You know, our daughters, and sons, ride horses, they cross these roads to get to the trail because there's no trail dedicated across the freeway to these trails from our neighborhood. I know that Tom Spensive brought up some of the problems that existed with the roundabout and stuff. And unfortunately, he's passed away. So, he can't defend, but you can go back to the records and look what he talked about. I'm totally opposed to this, I believe that there is a market for single family homes, for horse properties in that area. And I believe that a truck can be forced to allow him to get in and off of on Gilbert Road, as they are now because that's a lighted intersection. To get people in and out, I understand that, you know, when you're going to put 229 units there that you're going to have close to 1000 people that could be potential drivers. And now they brought up the part of having two and three families living in these places. So that would increase the number of people even more. And I could understand why he would say no, you can't use our intersection here. But there's quite a problem with the reservation, with the different districts that have the lighting responsibilities here at McDowell and Gilbert. I mean, when something happens, and you call in to report it, I get transferred to this operator to that operator to that operator, because they don't know who has jurisdiction on foot there. But anyways, I'm totally opposed to this. I would wish that you would keep the

original determination back in October, that it's our 43, one house per acre. And keep it as it is. Thank you.

Wendy Fenn, 3035 North Gilbert Road spoke:

I'm so opposed to these apartments. You can't believe it. I'm just anyway, my grandparents, my great grandparents, my mom, their families, they all help settle Lehi. If you look up the name Johnson, Crismon Hawes, Jones, you'll find them all there. My mom just passed away in February. She's 99. She lived and died in born and died in Lehi. Robert and I have lived in our house for 45 years. It's a single residence, an excellent place to raise our family. I could see crime just skyrocketing once, maybe not the first few years with it, passes with the apartments but later on as time goes on, you're going to get less... what do I want to say desirable people in there you're going, your crime is going to go up all kinds of crimes are going to go up. He says, well, it's not developed, it needs to be developed. Why does that need to be developed? We can turn that into a dog park or a children's park or a horse park. There's just so many things we can do with it other than apartments. Anyway, I'm so opposed to this. I hope you can see to it that this does not go through for the apartments. Thank you.

Jamie Pierce, 2306 East North Street spoke:

I live just to the south of the project across the canals. I spoke in October last year that I was opposed to it for a variety of reasons, and I basically came today because I wanted to see what they thought that they had changed. I can see that they're going to do a little bit of modifications to the roundabout. But I still think that many of the people that pull horse trailers in that area are very opposed to that. I think that that intersection to the east Lehi Road that comes off of McDowell, prior to that roundabout is not very far. So, is there going to be a stoplight there still? I mean, how much confusion is that going to cause for that intersection for that area? I also wanted to talk about, I was part of many of the conversations in the very beginning about this project. And when it was four stories, and how we were against the density and all that. And he has a Good Neighbor Letter from three people that I was very involved in, all of those conversations. And those three people basically felt like they're going to get it anyway, so if we don't go with the three stories, then we're going to get four. So that's very frustrating, because I don't think that those people are really for this project. So, it's frustrating. I don't think there's been a lot of determination on what the water usage is going to be in that area. And also, no talk about what happens for that area, when it floods, when it rains. So, I'm very opposed to this. And I don't think that since October, I have not been contacted until a week before this meeting. And I do live within the 500 feet. So, I think a lot of people didn't even know that this was going on. And that's very frustrating for a lot of people. And pretty hard for people to come up here and speak to you guys and tell you how we really feel and you're probably going to vote for it at some point. They're going to keep trying. There'll be back in six months, if you guys vote it down today. So maybe we just need to go before the council. So that's my spiel. Thank you.

Marilyn Crosby, 2516 North Horne in Mesa spoke:

Which is in the heart of Lehi. I would like to tell you that this project is absolutely not equestrian friendly and it's also 100% not consistent with the Mesa General Plan, which I have read over to cover a few times after extensive community input or where it attests the importance of maintaining the sense of place of surrounding neighborhoods. Their surrounding neighborhoods are single family residences, which embrace open spaces, not multi dwellings. I am opposed of reclassification from RS-43 zoning, opposed to the modified roundabout, the posted traffic increase. RS-43 properties never cease to be in high demand. I should know this because I've been in real estate for over 15 years, the area has been severely encroached on, being taken one piece at a time never adding additional RS-43 lots when others are taken. It should be seen as an opportunity to fulfill the need for residences and homebuyers for more RS-43 instead of

forcing more items upon residents that are not conducive to the location, or surrounding areas. Neither the roundabout, the project, nor the gross increase in traffic is a good idea. As you've heard from others, roundabouts specifically are not trailer or emergency vehicle friendly. Understand that they've changed the curbing. But that does not change the fact that when I'm pulling a 43-and-a-half-foot long trailer, I will merge into both lanes. And there will be a driver who is not familiar with pulling a trailer, and every single time they will try to get in the gap of my trailer and the second lane, not realizing that my trailer is about to occur exactly where their vehicle is, is a dangerous situation. It happens all the time. I don't care if they have roundabouts in Wickenburg, I haul through Wickenburg all the time too, and it's not fun. So that's not an excuse even though Wickenburg has a propensity for equestrian activities. Research also indicates that roundabouts are not safe for cyclists, that increases congestion, and the list goes on about the negativities around about this area, as you've heard was the complex design issue on the 202 Freeway. I'm sure you're familiar with that Michelle McCroskey already mentioned it, so bypass and save your time. The area already services hundreds of trailers being hauled to the Salt River landfill, semi-trucks, sanitation trucks, residents, and add transit weekend and holiday mountain goers headed north with trailers late and boats you get the point. The issues expressed by the community today are legitimate and they're real, and they're best solved by one thing, maintaining current zoning embracing the sense of place in the community which the General Plan requires, and not trying to morph it into something that the residents never wanted to live by our homes, may not be what you choose to live in yourself. But the homes are what we chose to live in. We wanted to live in RS 43 neighborhoods by RS 43 neighborhoods, and consistent with the lifestyle that RS-43 neighborhood provides. You will find that there is an outreach of neighbors all over in every direction, that are opposed to this project, not because we hate development, but we believe that they should occur in locations where there are consistent with that, they're around. And that is not the consistency of this project whatsoever. I yield my time and respect for others. Thank you.

Kim Clark, 3007 North Gilbert Road Mesa, spoke:

My family's been a resident of the Lehi Community for three years. I spoke at the last hearing in October about the historical significance of the Crismon property to the Lehi Community. I also presented to you community feedback opposing the proposed development. And at the hearing last October City staff recommended approval of a three story, 222-unit apartment complex with 400 plus parking spaces, which the board did not approve. Today City staff is recommending approval of essentially the same proposal, approval of essentially the same proposal a three story 222-unit apartment complex with 400 Plus parking spaces. The plan has not made significant changes that resolve the concerns voiced by the community, including excessive population density, a transient rental population, potential for increased crime. The three-story buildings, three story building elevation's adverse impact affects our property values and increased traffic. Status report also did not mention certain community feedback previously submitted including a petition opposing the development that had actually 156 signatures, and the results of a survey conducted were 59 of 61 respondents that respondents did not approve the development. The staff report concluded that the proposed development conforms to City standards. This is a generalized standard of conformance that does not address the unique character of the area. By any reasonable measure this development is not compatible with the character of the area. Furthermore, the buffer zones do not address the fact that the apartments directly connect to the surrounding neighborhoods through planned access points to the paths along the canal and equestrian trails. Before a decision is made that will irreversibly transform this community. Please consider that this is a long-established suburban ranch family community characterized by its history acre, plus enhanced horse and livestock privileges and equestrian trails. The Lehi Sub Area Plan on record, with of Mesa intentionally outlined objectives to preserve the historic rural character of the area. After the October hearing, I

received feedback from several people. They were very proud that the City of Mesa actually listened to their concerns and did not approve the zoning change. Please stay with this decision. The proposed development has not changed substantially in concerns voiced by the community, have not been resolved. Thus, the developers duplicative request should not warrant approval. One final thought before there was ever a City of Mesa there was Lehi.

Morgan Porter, 2449 North Mesa Drive spoke:

Right at the intersection of Mesa Drive and Lehi Road, just north of it my family has lived and also founded Lehi for the past 125 years and actually farther than that, rezoning for 200 plus apartment complexes and a restaurant, or any type of eatery or social thing like that would be a decision that would result in many detrimental things, including the following: home values would be reduced as a general eyesore of an apartment complex, a roundabout creates traffic that would become a practical impossibility for trailers of any kind, and neighborhood traffic would most likely also cause more accidents involving children and persons. Commercial property is known to drive more traffic to a location, they will come from all sides, even if there's only one way in one way out. Trailers take such a wide turn radius that at roundabouts such as the one on Brown Road, I have personally been in and seen trailers almost takeout and crushed small cars that think they know what they're doing. But they don't. Also, to think of the small possibility of accidents that currently happened in my neighborhood have a possibility of being multiplied by 400 plus cars. It's heartbreaking knowing it could result in me, my horses, or my loved ones being killed or severely injured due to people not having knowledge of the area. People move to RS-43 communities to get away from apartments due to drugs, gangs, traffic and other crimes involving those items. Seeing in real estate, hundreds of people look for RS-43 property to have horses or other animals on. If there's a property shortage of something, then it is a horrible and poor decision to rezone it to something that can be put somewhere else. There are plenty of empty lots that are zoned otherwise, in Mesa, there are many letters of concern and disapproval. But there's not even half as many as support, as a turn of safety of animals, children. And overall, the people the community, please not allow this to proceed. It doesn't apply anything to the Mesa General Plan. I get that they have been trying to discover something and make something of the property. But it does not just mesh with the area. It would be horrible. I can't even say improvement, this improvement to the area. Thank you for your time.

Randy Hatch, 2505 East Lehi Road, house number 11:

So, I live in a neighborhood there's 19 homes. Our neighborhood grew up in Denver, I moved here 11 years ago, my wife's originally from this area. And I get the fact that we'd like to have things different or leave things the way they are. Quite frankly, I think this is an eyesore for people coming into the Mesa area off the Beeline. I mean, it's just it's just sitting there. Granted in the past, it was perhaps a horse property, it's divided by Gilbert Road, as I drive in or out, to me, it just strikes is an eyesore. And there's a lot of people that grew up in the area that would love to stay in the area, meaning younger people and apartments kind of fits that mold for them. With the modifications that I've seen, and the houses much like our neighborhood, that looks directly into this area. I would much prefer to see this kind of a change versus, we've had homeless people in there. We've seen a lot of trash, we've seen kids on motorcycles running around, and I just see more risk in leaving things the way they are. As stated earlier, that bowl is tough, it'll be a tough animal to fit something else in. So, I think we might be waiting a long time if we don't approve something like this. And I think they've got come a long way to try to modify it and work with committee, and I'm very pro, aren't very supportive of what they're doing.

Chair Crockett read the comment cards received:

Connor Crosby, who is opposed to this item: I have been a resident of Lehi for 46 years. Our family attraction to the community is due to the unique atmosphere of the rural ranch lifestyle, agricultural, large lots, custom homes, and equestrian lifestyle. All of my friends and neighbors who reside in Lehi live here for the same, if not similar reasons. I am opposed to the rezoning the subject property from RS-43, one-acre single family homes to multiple residence, high density development. The rezoning is not consistent with our community, the City of Mesa General Plan, preserving the natural environment, recreation and culture of Lehi.

Brent Priests is opposed to this item: A person who hauls large trailers on a regular basis through the intersection of Gilbert and McDowell Roads, I strongly oppose the rezoning and addition of a roundabout. Roundabouts are not meant for large vehicles especially when it is a busy intersection. Gilbert is a traffic area for large trucks, semis, and vehicles hauling trailers and the general public entering and leaving the valley. Apartments will block current residents' views and potentially increased crime in the area rezoning will not benefit the surrounding community.

Todd Jules is opposed to the item.

Chair Crockett read emails that were received.

Tom Stapley, 2547 East Milton Street Mesa: Which is next to the proposed homestead project on McDowell and Gilbert Road. This vacant area has become an eyesore with homeless people camping and trash being dumped there. I strongly support the developers plan for high quality development and appreciate their willingness to work with neighbors to lower the density and improve the aesthetics. I especially appreciate their efforts to partner with the City to improve the canal trail system that runs by their property. I hope staff the Planning Commission and the City Council will support this case when it is heard. Thank you, Tom Stapley,

Frankie Breinholt, 1725 East Lockwood Street: And I live near the proposed homestead development project under Design Review in the empty basin and at Loop 202 and Gilbert Road. My address is 1725 East Lockwood Street. I have lived here for 12 years and grew up just down the street. I drive by the site many times a day. I am also a contractor developer but have no direct affiliation whatsoever with this project. I would love to see this area developed, it has been a bit of an eyesore and dust bowl for some time. I understand this basin has some significant site challenges, which has made new development difficult. So, I support the developer trying to tackle these tough development issues in the creation of this new development plan. I think it will be a benefit for our area and I hope you will share my support to City Staff, the Planning Commission and the City Council. Thank you, Frankie Breinholt.

Susan Jarvie: thank you for responding to my email, I understand your position. But I'm 85% sure that sign was never posted. I exit the freeway at that point many times a week and look right at the property. Because of my concern over this proposed development. I would have seen the sign. A neighbor told me about the letter they received and that is the only reason I know anything about the meeting. I do hope the board members reread the minutes from the October meeting. I think more than 120 people were opposed and wrote and made some great comments. That little pocket of land would sure make a nice office, retail, restaurant, and park project with a beautification of the canals like Scottsdale did. There are literally hundreds of new apartment buildings being built today from this proposed development east to Greenfield. It is ridiculous and should be a crime that the freeway was forced to be built around the historic orchards, which are now being torn down for development where the owners get a greater profit. I can only imagine the burden of all that population will add to our schools and traffic. It's

too much, not to mention the State's lack of water and the disregard to the rural history of Lehi. It's all very sad. Thanks for reading to this point.

Marjorie Martin, 1102 East Lehi Road Mesa: As a horse owner in the area, the rezoning is not consistent with the surrounding area, adding additional density the now losing area creates additional noise and congestion. I am opposed to the rezoning of this area. Three story buildings will block the view of the homeowners to the south and roundabouts are difficult to navigate with trailers. The already busy intersection does not need an estimated 400 additional cars traveling this area on a consistent basis.

This is to whom it may concern this is a Embera, 2118 East Milton St. Mesa: When first becoming aware of the project on the subject parcel, my reaction was that it would be extremely dense and have a negative effect on the neighborhoods and traffic in the area. I have read the letters for, and against, the project and agree with the homeowners who oppose it. The fact that a roundabout would be necessary to move traffic in and out of a single densely populated apartment complex is troubling. I've always thought of roundabouts as a way to manage traffic in areas where more than two streets, or on off ramps to highways intersect or to improve general existing road traffic. But this is different roundabout to accommodate a congested apartment complex. Consider the traffic on McDowell, especially when all those apartment residents are limited to a single ingress/ egress driveway. Think about rush hour. The concentrated number of apartments, even with a reduction in number, does not mitigate the fact that the footprint of the project is extremely tight within the border of the plot. The existing residents in the area would be negatively impacted. Many of them have counted on the fact that the subject parcel has been, until now, zoned for single family residences. And they realize that homes could be built in the future, but never expected the City of Mesa to consider a proposal for such a radical change, a change that will negatively impact residents in terms not only of traffic, but the loss of their unobstructed view for which they paid a premium. Then there is the general proximity to parking lot lighting, and the noise of a busy dense project below them, not to mention an increased risk of crime to consider. These things affect desirability of the area and importantly home values. Having had a meeting before, we purchased a lot in the area, we wanted to be sure that the proposed 202 would be completed per the published original plan as it was. We didn't want to take a chance that the freeway would be rerouted closer to us before we began to build our home. So, we empathize with the homeowners who would be so negatively impacted by an apartment complex, something they never anticipated to change as drastically as this proposal indicates. The resulting traffic management impacts many other residents in the area, not just those who live closest to the apartments. There are better, more acceptable uses for the parcel. There are also more suitable locations to build apartments. With so much local opposition to this project. How can the City of Mesa even consider giving in to the developer and dismissing the concerns of the homeowners in the neighborhoods? Please reconsider your position and do the right thing.

Debbie Delp, 161 East Lehi Road opposed.

Lawan Barrett, 2124 East Oasis Street opposed.

Kenneth Olmstead, 2052 East mitten street opposed.

Darrell Eckhart, 3019 North Gilbert Road opposed.

Tamra Barrett, 124 East Oasis Street opposed.

Connie Osborne, 930 East Norwood Street opposed.

Laurie Owens, 2745 East Northridge circle opposed.

Ralph Clark, 3007 North Gilbert Road, is opposed: I oppose because I don't want the nature of our community changed. A high-density development at this site would further erode the culture of our community and compromise its ability to sustain a suburban ranch lifestyle that includes livestock, it will be one more step to erasing the history and culture of our community. This is not in keeping with the existing Lehi plans that were approved long ago. Outsiders will profit at the cost of our long-established neighborhoods. There are other more appropriate areas to build high density housing without damaging our historic areas.

Susan Lawrence, 25809 East Hermosa Vista Drive, is opposed: I do not support a high-density three-story apartment complex on this small piece of land with 400 plus parking spaces and changing the existing intersection to accommodate this development. This development was already opposed by the surrounding neighborhoods in October 2021.

Becky Eckhart, 3019 North Gilbert Road, is opposed: I oppose apartments being built in this area homes are supposed to be one acre or more, it needs to be kept that way the apartments will cause more traffic and noise than we are already putting up with since the 202 came into our area. Lehi is known as a community of at least one acre per household, and we need to keep it that way. We need to keep at least one part of Mesa to its old school values.

Steve McCall, 2050 East Oasis Street, is opposed: We live in close proximity to the project and strongly oppose the development. The project does not appear to have considered with forethought the increased traffic in an area that has worked to blend a more family-oriented neighborhood because of the distance between the top of the hill and the neighborhoods on the other side, there is considerable biking and walking of the children across the section of road. That is that this development will encroach creating risk. I don't believe that there were material changes to the plan to help with our concerns. We urge the commission to reject the plan.

Kimberly Van Riper, 505 East Lehi Road is opposed: This developed this type of development was not approved by this board for good reason. This piece of land is one of two pieces left defined in the Lehi Sub Area, as a quote fringe area meant to buffer non-compatible development for Lehi. We appreciate the desire for profit in the game of land acquisition, but Lehi simply must be protected, no matter how inconvenient what is lost. And Lehi happens bit by bit, so please honorable board, vote again in favor of preserving the way of life and Lehi. This development cannot be undone if approved, and Lehi absolutely needs the foresight and decision and decisive action of this board.

Emily Clark, 3007 North Gilbert Road, is opposed: Lehi is a suburban ranch area. Extra traffic will be dangerous for horses and the population density is not consistent with the character of our community. Please don't do this. It will spoil something that has always been special to us.

Oby Dunn, 501 East Linwood Street, is opposed: Once again, this group wants to build apartments that are just not compatible with this area. 222 apartments with over 400 parking spots, it would be totally out of place in this area. There is a reason this neighborhood is zoned for single family residences on one-acre parcels. This area has been zoned this way for years. It is filled with people who enjoy living in a semi-rural setting where they can enjoy having horses and other animals, where they don't have to worry about the traffic that an additional 400 cars would bring. Making it so busy around about becomes necessary just say no.

Christopher Porter, 2449 North Mesa Drive, is opposed: Rezoning this property from RS-43 to RM-4 PAD, would be detrimental to the surrounding communities for many reasons, adding apartments would increase traffic in the area exponentially. With an additional 400 plus vehicles, the crime and accident rate will skyrocket. Areas nearby, localities where accidents with children and horses are a concern. I can say from experience roundabouts like the one they are proposing are not friendly to vehicles larger, or longer than a Jeep Wrangler, which many vehicles with trailers frequently intersection going to the 202, or to the 87. This plan should not be permitted at any cost.

Susan Jarvee, 2543 North Acacia, is opposed: I oppose because there is only one ingress, egress point for the potentially 400 plus residents creating very high traffic for the areas, roundabout challenges for trailers, increased traffic both 202 ramps east and west. Three story apartment buildings are nowhere within a five-mile radius, breaking precedent for high rise building which is not conducive with the surrounding communities. High density community is not compatible to the surrounding low-density communities. Apartment row is being built from the nursery east to Greenfield Road on 202. Too many apartments not enough water.

Michelle Wells, 343 East Linwood Lane, is opposed: The property on the southeast of Gilbert, McDowell is still part Lehi, we are community of great historical value. The standard is one house per acre. The 202 Freeway alignment was moved to preserve this property. The residents in this area of Mesa are concerned about preserving their property values by keeping the zoning in the area as a rural type of property. There are many residents in the area who enjoy riding their horses in this area. It's important to keep this property at a minimum of one house per acre. History tells us that any adjustment will be disastrous for the Lehi culture.

Mary Martin Pierce, 10102 East Lehi Road, is opposed: regretfully this plan is too similar to the plan that was submitted a short time ago for rezoning the area of McDowell and Gilbert Roads. This is an already congested area where many trailers and large vehicles travel all day long. Roundabouts did not work well with large vehicles, the two- and three-story buildings will obstruct the view of the homes in the area, as well as and the trail views. Additionally, apartments are inconsistent with the surrounding area. This is not the place for additional congestion. Again, this is too similar to the rezoning request that was denied a short time ago.

Chair Crockett closed the public hearing.

Applicant Adam Baugh responded:

And a couple of things worth point out. I'd certainly respect the history of Lehi. I think, as Kim said Lehi was here before the City of Mesa. Three things have changed though. The introduction of the 202 Freeway has significantly altered, much of Lehi, specifically here, the south side of the 202 Freeway. And this property is an island unto itself, separate and apart from the rest of Lehi. When we asked ourselves, where should apartment be located, I would say, on an arterial street, next to a freeway. The best spot for something like this, why it's got close in immediate proximity to an on ramp, and off ramp, less trips in the community. Secondly, one of the reasons why we have such unattainable housing in Arizona is the lack of supply. Nationwide rents increased 10%, in Arizona at 18.8%. While we lack the inventory, if I were to put inventory somewhere in the City of Mesa, I would put it near a freeway in your arterial street. I would put it on a property that's depressed in a basin, where its maximum height of the property is still below the height of the adjacent homes. We I heard things like views and privacy. There is no view behind us to the south that is stopped by this. But lastly, when I heard some things here, I think it's important to point out when he sold this land, they put a restriction on it. It would only allow one home to be built on that to access Gilbert Road, which means if

there was any development to occur here, it has to go to McDowell Road. And no matter I put it, I think what I heard some things like “why don't you put an office, or retail, or a park, or even a subdivision.” All those would still require a roundabout. It's not this particular development that triggers the roundabout. It's the development of the property that triggers a roundabout. And these conditions would exist. Roundabouts work, ADOT wouldn't provide a letter attesting to that, but for their proof that they've seen it time and time again. I think what I heard “is there a better, more acceptable uses of the property?” If there are better, more acceptable use of property, they certainly would have come. A lot of time has passed. I think some of the concerns I heard, when I read and I heard, some of those addresses are miles away from the property. But one thing in common is, a common bond regarding equestrian uses, and our efforts to create a mountable rolled curb with an apron goes a long way to address those concerns. But I will tell you that no matter what gets built on this property, a roundabout will occur here. It's the within ADOT jurisdiction with a dot requires. What we want to do is just provide an opportunity to build high quality housing. Premium units make meaningful use of the property with a development that can absorb the costs of significant engineering and development cost to make it work. I know it's not perfect. But I think given this weird shape of this property and the topographical conditions that it faces, I don't know if you'll achieve perfection on here. But what you can achieve is something that's meaningful, that has a tremendous economic impact.

That does not have the associated things I've heard like crime, a number of overcrowding schools, and creating a traffic problem. There's been no evidence to support that. But clearly, evidence that shows that this creates a very insignificant impact on traffic. It is lower than the heights, the mountain of the hillside next to it, that it provides housing stock that's sorely needed in this area, that creates rents that are at a premium level, and hopefully brings a better-quality people. When I think about where my daughter can grow up and live in Arizona, she's a sophomore in college, I worry if she'll be able to live near home, because the costs have gone up so much. And until supply comes into the marketplace, that worry will always exist. If I could build something here that was significantly less than what we started with, less than height less dense, less on traffic. I hope that'd be something that the committee in the commission could support. I think that's largely why staff has recommended approval. They know this is the best plan they've seen today. And there's been many years and opportunities to bring something before them today. Up until this moment. So, for the reasons that we presented to you today, the compromise solutions have been mitigated the zoning stipulations to the Good Neighbor Policy, to the changes to the roundabout to the reduction of three-bedroom units to reduction, the zoning density that puts a cap, but nothing greater can happen down the road. I know it's not perfect, but I think it's a good solution for a really troubled property. And so, for that I appreciate your support.

Boardmember Pitcher asked:

Where's the equestrian trail in this area? Because I know there's one on the north side of the 202 for a while, does it come across or? I just don't know.

Applicant Adam Baugh responded:

I think that was a comment made by one of the neighbors that Michelle might have discussed, her emphasis on trying to create the equestrian trail. These canals already exist that can be used by horses, joggers, runners, cyclists, all together. This view right here might show a little bit more about how there's a trail that goes in the underpass under Gilbert Road. And then there's another underpass under McDowell. And that is the trail. This is the trail that goes along the blue line edge of our property that goes into the underpass on Gilbert Road and continues under the underpass long McDowell

Conversation ensued and Applicant Adam Baugh stated:

It's provides a beautification along the trailhead, so those can still exist. I mean, you can kind of see in the background here, the superimposed image of a horse along this trail with the new improvements that would occur.

Gerald Truitt, with EPS added:

The one thing that we were asked to do, and that we have done is currently you can't really access from McDowell Road easily down and go underneath that underpass of McDowell Road. We've been asked and we will provide a public sidewalk access that comes off of McDowell Road, as well with our entry road into our project and then we'll make a connection over to the east to the underpass and McDowell Road. So that's one of the enhancements that will occur as part of the development of the project. You can kind of see the brown line that was shows the public access, the brown kind of squiggly line cutting through the landscaped rendered area there.

Boardmember Pitcher inquired:

One other question I heard about lighting for the parking. How are you going to address that so doesn't shine out? I mean, is it directed lighting down to them?

Applicant Adam Baugh stated:

Yeah, so that's addressed in our good neighbor policy in addition to the site plan. There's a photometric study is part of the case that measures lighting, make sure it's at zero-foot candles at any property line is specific to the parking lot, we can use a low level lighting, won't be an issue.

Comments were made from the audience.**Chair Crockett commented that the public hearing was closed.****Chair Crockett invited board member comments.****Boardmember Allen commented:**

I'll give it a shot. I think that the developer has done a great job with the design of the project. I never had any issues with it before. My only issue was the roundabout. That's where I had concerns. And to back up a little bit further. I grew up in that area. I grew up in the Lehi area. My family was the original pioneers that came down, settled that area. So, I have a huge... my hearts there, right. So, I understand what you guys are going through but I also understand development. It changed the whole landscape of Lehi, when that freeway went in, it changed everything. I retired from the City of Mesa, and I worked with Historic Preservation. So, I knew when it was a Crismon property, I knew when the developers bought the property, I have kind of been watching this for a long time and a lot of years. And my only concern was the roundabout. And so, at this point, I'm going to support this project because I believe that I kind of reluctantly, or cautiously I guess, support it because of you know, I travel through there all the time. My parents still live down there. So, I still go down on that McDowell all the time. And sometimes pulling a trailer, sometimes not pulling a trailer, but I think that they've really tried to design that with that rolled curb so that you could get through there. So, at this point, that's where I'm standing. It still has the opportunity to go to City Council. So, you know, if you don't like the decisions made here today, whatever it might be, you always have the opportunity to go and talk to our City Council members. But that's where I stand on it is. I'm supporting this right now.

Boardmember Peterson commented:

Thank you, Chairman. The so this a tough site for a lot of reasons and we've talked through and as our purview, as the Planning and Zoning Board, is largely technical. The design elements, the revisions that have been made, staff recommendation of support, City of Mesa on the roundabout, those weigh heavily. The element of land use, the side of demand for diverse housing products is something that as a community we face, and that we all need to address. And I do understand, I mentioned with the freeway, where it changed everything. And the comment that this parcel is to some degree, an island unto itself, that weighs heavily because of how the traffic goes directly to the freeway. And so, those are all factors that are the weigh heavily for me on this. Thanks.

Chair Crockett commented:

I was one of the two votes in favor of this application back in October, and I'm going to support it again today. I grew up in Mesa, just up the road. I grew up just off Gilbert Road. And so, I've been around this area my whole life. I do agree with the developer, the applicant, that it is a challenging piece of property to do something with and it is my opinion, the developer has listened to the concerns. I understand that the homeowners are here tonight, would rather have a different use completely there. But the developer has listened to concerns about high density, about preserving the horse access through, they're working with Salt River Project, to work on the canal bank there to beautify that to do a water feature coming off the Mesa working with on the roundabout, to further modify the design to accommodate the concerns. So, in my in my view, given the challenges of the property, an applicant that has been willing to listen and to try to address concerns that's an important factor in my mind. So, I understand that's not the wishes of the folks that are here tonight. But that's my perspective. So, if we don't have any board member comments, I will entertain a motion on this item at this point. Principal Planner

Michelle Dahlke commented:

Mr. Chairman and Board members, I would just want the audience to know that this is a recommendation of approval, and they still have an opportunity to go to City Council. Chair

Crockett commented:

Okay, thank you, Michelle, thank you for pointing that out about this going to Council. It could possibly it be introduced on August 22, with action on August 29. This is a recommendation, and the Council will consider it. So, thank you. Thank you for being here and providing your input. It is very helpful to us. Although I know the result may be is disappointing tonight.

Vice Chair Ayers motioned to approve case ZON21-00129. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Peterson.

That: The Board recommends approve the case ZON21-00129 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the final site plan submitted, including;
 - a. The total number of residential units within the development shall not exceed 222 units.
2. Compliance with Design Review Case Number DRB21-00135, including:
 - a. No building shall be taller than three-stories and shall not exceed a height of 39'-6".
 - b. The maximum finished floor level of buildings shall not exceed 1,259'-6".
 - c. Building elevations shall be four-sided architecture as reviewed and recommended by the Design Review Board (DRB) and approved by the Planning Director.
 - d. In all instances, building materials for development of the property shall be of high-

- quality, durable, and visually appealing as shown with the proposed building elevations reviewed by the DRB and approved by the Planning Director.
- e. Trees planted along the southern drive aisle as shown on the landscape plan shall be located outside the 24-foot-wide water line easement located along the southern boundary of the property.
 - f. Trees to be planted along the southern drive aisle, at a minimum, shall consist of:
 - i. 50-percent two-inch caliper canopy drought-tolerant trees
 - ii. 50-percent three-inch caliper larger canopy drought-tolerant trees.
 - g. No lit signage shall be installed on the south façade of the building.
 - h. On-site lighting shall not exceed zero-foot-candle at the development's property line.
3. Compliance with the Good Neighbor Policy dated October 12, 2021.
 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. Prior to submittal of a building permit, submit documentation to the City's Historic Preservation Office for review and approval. The documents must show interpretation strategies that communicates the site's history to residents and visitors to the site, including, but not limited to, historical photos or a plaque memorializing the site.
 6. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations, except the modifications to the development standards as approved with the PAD overlay and shown in the following table:

MZO Development Standards	Approved
<u><i>Maximum Fence Height</i></u> – MZO Section 11-30-4(B)(1)(a) -Front Yards and 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 6 feet
<u><i>Required Parking Spaces</i></u> – MZO Section 11-32-3(A)	1.8 spaces per unit (404 total spaces)
<u><i>Covered Parking Spaces</i></u> – MZO Section 11-32-3(D)(2)	0.98 spaces per unit (217 total spaces)
<u><i>Required Landscape Yard</i></u> – MZO Section 11-33-3(B)(1) -Non-single residence uses adjacent to single residence (south property line)	15 feet
<u><i>Required Foundation Base</i></u> – MZO Section 11-33-5 (A)(1) - Exterior walls with public entrance	10 feet
<u><i>Required Landscape Islands</i></u> – MZO Section 11-33-4 (B)(6)	

	Adjoining (parking) canopies shall be separated by at least an 8-foot-wide landscape island
--	---

Vote: 5-0 (Sarkissian, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Crockett, Ayers, Allen, Peterson, Pitcher

NAYS – None