

Planning and Zoning Board

Study Session Minutes

Virtual Platform

Date: October 14, 2020 Time: 2:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

*Chair Dane Astle
*Vice Chair Jessica Sarkissian (Vice Chair Sarkissian in attendance until 3:00 pm)
*Tim Boyle
*Shelly Allen
Jeffrey Crockett
*Deanna Villanueva-Saucedo

MEMBERS ABSENT

Ben Ayers

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

STAFF PRESENT:

Nana Appiah
Tom Ellsworth
Lesley Davis
*Wahid Alam
Kellie Rorex
Charlotte McDermott
Rebecca Gorton

OTHERS PRESENT:

None

1. Call meeting to order.

Chair Astle declared a quorum present and the meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m.

2. Review items on the agenda for the October 14, 2020 regular Planning and Zoning Board Hearing.

Staffmember Kellie Rorex presented case ZON20-00488 to the board. Ms. Rorex explained this request before you this afternoon is for a site plan review to allow for the development of a medical and dental office building. The site is located west of Dobson Road on the south side of Broadway. The General Plan Character Area is Neighborhood, and the focus of that character area is to provide safe places for people to live. She explained commercial areas are an allowed use along the border of the Neighborhood Character Area. The zoning on the site is LC (Limited Commercial) and the purpose of the LC zoning district is to provide areas for service oriented businesses that serve the surrounding residential, and medical and dental offices are permitted uses in the LC district. Currently, the site is vacant with an existing convenience store. Ms. Rorex showed a photo of the site looking south along Broadway Road.

She explained the applicants are proposing to utilize the existing building and build two new additions, one to the north side of the building and the other to the west side. They are proposing a new foundation base area in the front of the building which will allow for them to provide a patient drop off area. There will be landscaping and seating for patients with a model train. The applicants have also proposed to exceed the parking requirements and they have submitted an AUP (Administrative Use Permit) to allow them to exceed the parking spaces required. Their justification for the extra parking spaces is that they have other similar developments of the same size where they require the extra parking spaces for the number of people that are working at the site at one time. Staff is in support of the increase in parking spaces.

Ms. Rorex said the site was recently approved for a SCIP (Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit) through the Board of Adjustment to allow a 10-foot landscape setback along Broadway. The requirements are for 15 feet but the applicant requested this SCIP to facilitate the redevelopment of the site. The site did go to the Design Review Board (DRB) last night. There were no major issues at the DRB meeting. The Board only had some concerns about the color palette, but the applicant is working with staff to make those minor changes.

The applicant did complete the required citizen participation process and mailed notification letters to property owners within 1000 feet and as always, to the registered neighborhoods. Staff has had no neighbors reach out and there was no major concerns with their project. Overall, the site does comply with the 2040 Mesa General Plan and it meets the criteria for site plan review outlined in Section 11-69 of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance. Staff recommends approval with conditions.

Boardmember Crockett inquired if this is a chain of Medical and Dental offices and if there are other facilities with the same type of business plan. Ms. Rorex responded that she believes they have locations in Oklahoma and Texas.

Chair Aslte stated the model train shown looks interesting as well and must be fun for the kids proposed play area. Ms. Rorex stated they have a Santa Fe train depot theme. The applicant will also be going to the Board of Adjustment for a Comprehensive Sign Plan that includes some 3D objects like a water tower, another train crossing arm.

Staffmember Wahid Alam presented preliminary plat "Eastridge Manor" to the board. Mr. Alam stated this is to allow for the development of a 32-lot single residence detached subdivision at Eastridge Road south of Guadalupe Road. The General Plan Character is Neighborhood, and the subdivision is allowed in the Character Area with the zoning. The zoning is RM2-PAD. The proposal complies with the 2040 General Plan and meets the review criteria for preliminary plat as outlined in Section 962 of the Mesa Subdivision Regulations. Staff recommends approval with conditions. There were no questions by the Board.

3. Receive and discuss a presentation on Open Meetings Law and Conflict of Interest.

Charlotte McDermott, Assistant City Attorney for the City of Mesa gave the presentation on Open Meeting Law and Conflict of Interest. Ms. McDermott began by stating the Open Meeting Law is not unique to Arizona, every state has a form of Open Meeting Law. Sometimes they are referred to as the Sunshine Law. The purpose of these laws is to make sure that all of the business of a public body is conducted out in the public and that there is no closed door dealings.

So, in Arizona, the law specifically states that all meetings of any public body shall be public meetings, and all persons so desiring shall be permitted to attend and listen to the deliberations and proceedings. With regards to the Open Meeting Law, it applies to anytime there is a meeting and Ms. McDermott discussed what constitutes a meeting. Anytime there is a meeting of a public body, to comply with the Open Meeting Law, there are certain rules that apply. She listed some of those rules on the slide presentation which include: 1) the meetings have to be properly noticed; 2) an agenda has to be posted; and 3) there has to be minutes of the meeting.

In certain circumstances and limited circumstances, there can be closed meetings called Executive Sessions, and I'll be talking about those today. The first thing she discussed was what constitutes a public body. The statute specifically outlines what is a public body and has listed it on the slide. Ms. McDermott wanted to highlight two of them. One of them applies to boards and commissions of the City and the Planning and Zoning Board is a board of the City so the Open Meeting Law does apply to this board. Sometimes boards and commissions with the City of Mesa has subcommittees. If the Planning and Zoning Board were to ever have a subcommittee, then that subcommittee would also have to comply with the Open Meeting Law requirements.

The Open Meeting Law does not extend to staff meetings and committees that are appointed by staff and that advise staff. So, what constitutes a meeting is if anytime a quorum of the public body discusses proposes or takes legal action and a quorum is anytime there is a majority of the board. The Planning and Zoning Board has seven members, and a quorum would be four or more members. If you are getting together and you're talking about an item that may come before this board that is foreseeable, to come before the board, then that would constitute a meeting. Meetings can be traditional meetings, like we used to have before COVID, where we met in person, or they can be electronic meetings. Since COVID-19 we have seen that it can be via Zoom, Microsoft Teams, it can be emails or letters.

A meeting can also occur if it is prior to a meeting. If you're gathering together and prior to your regular meeting, and you're talking to the different board members and seeing how things are going and all of a sudden that conversation starts to go into what's on the agenda for that evening's meeting, and there's four or more of you talking about it, that would constitute a meeting. So those discussions can't take place unless it's out in the open and you comply with the Open Meeting Law requirements.

One of the questions that is often asked is what about social events. With social events, our practice has been in the past that we will post those social events by identifying the date, time, location and the purpose of that social event, and that there will be no legal action taken. Ms. McDermott wanted to highlight that if you're at a social event, whether it be a holiday party or an event down in downtown Mesa, and there's four or more board members that happened to get together and you start having a conversation, just make sure that conversation has nothing to do with anything that could foreseeably come before this board because if you do start talking about an item that would come before this board, that would constitute a meeting. This would require that we comply with all the Open Meeting Law requirements.

Oftentimes, with Open Meetings, you will hear the term "serial meetings" or "splintering the quorum". A meeting does not have to occur at one time or place, it can happen when it is a series of gatherings of less than a quorum of the board that met that may constitute a meeting

if it then becomes a quorum. So as an example, if after a meeting a board member decides to talk to other board members about an item that may come before the board, and then after that discussion, that board member at a later period of time decides to call another board member to talk about the same issue. Now there is a board member that has talked to two board members after the meeting. That becomes three member that have discussed it and then they have a phone call with another becomes a quorum with four members speaking about the same item and would constitute a meeting.

And because it was not conducted in public, that would be a violation of the Open Meeting Law. So with the Open Meeting Law, the two things you need to remember is: is there a quorum of four or more board members that I'm talking to, and ask yourself if you are talking to them about something that is foreseeable or likely that it will come before the planning and zoning board.

Ms. McDermott stated that sending emails is an easy way to create a meeting. When you use email to conduct city business, it's important to remember do not send an email to three or more board members. And it is important if you receive an email from someone about a Planning and Zoning case, do not forward that email to the other board members and do not hit "reply to all". It is also good practice for staff to send an email to all of the board members that they either do it individually, or blind copy the entire board. That way, if somebody does need to respond, they can hit "Reply All" and it doesn't go to the entire board members.

Another question that is often asked is, what about social media? It is an emerging area of the law and the Open Meeting Law has not been modified to specifically address social media. We have looked at some Attorney General opinions and the statute which does provide some guidance when it comes to social media. And again, the purpose of the Open Meeting laws is to make sure that the business of a public body is conducted out in the open. If you are talking to the media and commenting on an item that may come before the board, and that article is something that happens to be seen by a quarter of the board, that is not a violation of the Open Meeting Law. Because again, you're making a comment out to the public, and it's to the public and it is not directed to anyone but the public. If you start to direct your comments, whether it be through Facebook or Twitter, Instagram, any other type of social media, and you're directing your comments to another board member, that's where it would constitute 18 a meeting.

Our recommendation is that you should not post or comment on any other board members Facebook pages, Instagram or Twitter if it pertains to something that is in regards to city business, and you shouldn't have any groups that is for a group of board members to discuss board agenda items.

The Open Meeting Law does not prevent board members from communicating with staff. They can ask staff questions about a case outside of a public meeting and the staff can provide them with factual information about the case. What you cannot do as a board member is sidestep the Open Meeting Law process. As an example, if a board member were to contact a staff member about a zoning case, they cannot provide their opinion on that case, or try to get the opinion of other board members. And, if they asked a staff member to reach out to the other board members and get back to them, either, with their opinions or sharing that board members opinion with other board members, that would be a violation of the Open Meeting Law.

Before and during the meeting there are certain rules that have to be followed, and staff does a lot of behind the scenes work in order to prepare for a meeting. And, in order to have a meeting, it has to be properly noticed with an agenda posted 24 hours in advance with backup materials available as well. The agenda must include the date, time, and place of the meeting and a description of the matters to be discussed or decided. And again, staff puts a lot of thought into the description of the agenda items, because those agenda items have to reasonably inform the public of the issues that are going to be discussed. The agenda items has to have enough specificity that someone would know if their property is affected and how. So, a lot of thought goes into that those agenda items.

It is required that the agenda has to have the time of the meeting. If the meeting says it is going to start at 3:30, then you cannot start the meeting at 3:29. And if the meeting is posted to start at 2:30, but you decide that you do not need that amount of time, and it is going to start the meeting at 3:00, it is ok to start later. In those instances, you'll see that staff will either post a notice on the door when they're in person meetings, or with the virtual meetings, someone will be watching for calls so that the public doesn't think that the meeting was canceled, or they have the wrong misinformation. Staff can let them know that the meeting is going to start later.

The board can only discuss or take legal action on those items that are specifically listed on the agenda and all discussions must be reasonably related to those items. Sometimes, if there's a discussion at a meeting, you might hear Nana or I interrupt and say that the discussion is getting off topic. That is because we feel that the discussion is not really related to an agenda item and because of the Open Meeting Law, staff will steer the conversation back towards the agenda item. Certain times an agenda item does allow for reports on current events, the Open Meeting Law allows that item to be on the agenda, but there can be no discussion from the board.

The Open Meeting Law gives the public the right to attend a meeting and to listen to deliberations. But it does not give them the right to speak. There is an exception to that. And that exception is with zoning ordinances. The statute requires that a public hearing is required at the Planning Commission for any zoning ordinances. Ms. McDermott took a minute to talk about when there's discussions at the study session, and the discussion at the public hearing. Sometimes during a study session, Nana might interrupt the board to ask that you preserve those comments for the public hearing. The reason we do that is because the public hearing is the place where you will be voting on an agenda item and if you are making any comments in the study session that apply to the merits of the case and how you are going to vote, this is not the place to do so. That discussion should occur in the public hearing where you will be voting on that matter. This study session is where you can ask the staff and the applicant questions if you have any questions about the case. Any discussion about opinions or the merits of the case should be at the hearing. So sometimes, we may ask that you hold those comments until the actual hearing.

Some agendas might have an item from citizens present or a call to the public. And again, as mentioned that the Open Meeting Law does not give the public the right to speak. But if there is an items from citizens present on the agenda, then the citizens can speak on any item that is within the jurisdiction of the city, but the board cannot have any discussion on those items, unless it was specifically on the agenda. The only exception to that is if the item that is presented by the citizen is related to any criticism towards the board or to a specific board member on the board, then that board member could respond to that criticism. Or you can also

ask staff to review the matter or ask that they put that matter on a future agenda.

As mentioned earlier, there are certain times when a public body may meet in person, and that's called an Executive Session. The statute defines when you can go into an Executive Session. There are limited circumstances when you can go into an Executive Session, which is a closed-door meeting. Ms. McDermott stated one that she sees that might come up with Planning and Zoning is if you need to obtain legal advice. So, if we feel that you might need to obtain legal advice on an item, then we would put an Executive Session item on the agenda. And with Executive Sessions, they do have to be posted and agendized. There is specific language that is to be used to go into an Executive Session, and majority of the board would have to vote to convene into an Executive Session. Only those board members and individuals that are necessary for that conversation can be included in that discussion and they are for discussion only, there can be no legal action taken.

So if you were to enter into an Executive Session for legal advice on something that was coming before Planning and Zoning, you could go into the Executive Session to receive that legal advice. But then, if there was any action that needed to be taken, then you would convene back into a regular open meeting, and you could then take action on that item. Any discussions in Executive Session are confidential, you cannot share them with anybody and all of the minutes from those meetings are confidential as well. After the meeting the minutes must be taken from those meetings, and those become the official record of the meetings.

There is also a lot of things that have to be included in those minutes. The date, time and place of the meeting, who is present at the meeting, the description of what was discussed. the legal action that was taken, and the votes of how each member voted. If anyone from the public speaks is also noted in the minutes. This is why when the public comes up to speak at a meeting, we ask for their name and their address so that it can be properly put into the minutes. Those draft minutes are needed to be available within three working days. And then once the Planning and Zoning board approves the minutes, they go on to Council for review and acknowledgement.

The final item that Ms. McDermott talked about is what happens if there's an Open Meeting Law violation. If there is a meeting of the Planning and Zoning board where the board is taking action on a case, and that meeting has not been properly agendized or noticed, than any of those actions from that meeting would be null and void. The board would have to reconsider all of those items and take action on those items again. And then, in certain instances, other cities when they Attorney General's Office has investigated if they have found that there's an Open Meeting Law violation, they can impose civil penalties, require training of the board, and they can start reviewing emails and conduct of the board. It just depends on the severity and the circumstances.

Boardmember Crockett asked about the discussion on splintering and if after they have finished a meeting, can a board member call the other board members to talk about a vote that has already been taken in the public meeting. He stated that he noticed that they cannot communicate in numbers which would constitute a quorum on business that will come before the board. But can the Board talk to fellow board members individually about something that had previously been voted on.

Ms. McDermott responded that if it's something that's been previously voted on, and it's not going to come back before that board, then they can discuss it. If it is something that you have

provided a recommendation on and will come back for a vote, then it cannot be discussed. For example, on a text amendment that you have provided some direction to staff, but staff is going to come back with the actual ordinance for approval.

The second part of the presentation is Conflict of Interest. The purpose of the conflict of interest laws is to preserve the public trust and ensure fair dealings. In Arizona, the conflict of interest law states that any public officer who has or whose relative has a substantial interest in any issue that is coming before the board shall declare a conflict and refrain from participating in any manner in that decision. Even if you think you can be objective, if you have a conflict of interest, you need to declare that conflict of interest and refrain from participating.

Aside from the statute, Mesa's ethics handbook for elected officials and advisory board members as well as the Mesa City Charter has language that talks about conflict of interest and enforcement of conflict of interest. The ethics handbook and the language in there is broader than the statute. It says that an elected official or an advisory board member should avoid even the appearance of impropriety. If you are wondering if you have a conflict of interest, you need to remember the statute and also the handbook and the charter when it comes to conflicts of interest.

Conflict of interest applies to not only you, but it also applies to your relatives including spouse, your children, your parents, your in-laws, grandparents, grandchildren, brothers, sisters, brother-in-law. Ms. McDermott stated that if a board member ever has a question about who it applies to, they are always welcome to give the office a call and they will discuss with you.

Ms. McDermott asked how "do they know if you or a relative has a conflict of interest in an agenda item and need to declare a conflict". The statute says if you have a substantial interest in a matter that is coming before the board, that you need to declare a conflict unless that interest is what is considered remote. The statute lists some items that they deem to be remote. The first question to ask to determine if it is deemed remote is "do I have a substantial interest" and a substantial interest is any financial or ownership interest in an issue that is coming before the board. She stated they should ask, "do you have anything to gain or lose value from the decision". If the answer is yes, then the question becomes, has a statute said that it's a remote interest they should consider recuse themselves.

She spoke about a few situations where conflict of interest could come up with this board. The first is proximity to my property. Sometimes the zoning case may be located in close proximity to the property that you own, and you would wonder if you have a conflict of interest. The state statute does not have any direct line tests when you should declare a conflict. Our office recommends we use the 300-foot rule and is based on the statutory notice requirements. We suggest that if there is a zoning case that is within 300 feet of a property that you own, and you think that that case could affect your property then we suggest that you declare a conflict of interest due to proximity.

The other situation is when a board member is an architect and the question is if they are an architect on the project, can they have a case coming before the board. They can question would this be a conflict of interest. The answer is that if they are serving in some capacity and are receiving financial compensation, then you should declare a conflict. You should also refrain from participation in any matter regarding the case.

The statute says that some substantial interests are so remote that you do not need to declare a conflict of interest. She mentioned two of them that would be most applicable to this board. The first is a non-salaried Officer of a nonprofit corporation. Sometimes board members serve in a volunteer position for a nonprofit at the same time serving as a board member. If that nonprofit has a zoning case that is coming before this board, then the statute says that that's a remote interest, and you would not have to declare a conflict of interest on that item.

The other one that may come up is if the benefit is not greater than the benefit received by others. For example, with a zoning ordinance text amendment that applies to all of the light industrial property or to a specific zoning district, and you have property in that zoning district, because you're not receiving any greater benefit than any other citizen, there would not be a conflict. The only time a conflict might arise is if that ordinance or change is so limited, that it is affecting only your property, then you would want to contact our office to see if this could be a conflict.

If you determine that you do have a conflict of interest, you need to always remember the statutory requirements. Yet sometimes you might think that you do not have a statutory conflict of interest, remember Mesa's ethics handbook and try to avoid even the appearance of impropriety by declaring a conflict. Once you have determined that you have a conflict of interest, then you need to refrain from any discussion on that matter whether it is before, during or after a vote of the Planning and Zoning Board. There is a disclosure form that needs to be filled out and the form needs to be submitted to the City Clerk's office. When the item comes before the board, prior to any discussion, that board member needs to recuse himself on the record and state that they have a conflict of interest and state what the conflict is.

Oftentimes a question comes up that you did not declare that conflict, can you stay seated or should you move out into the audience. It is really a personal preference. If you think you might be tempted to make a comment, then you should remove yourself and sit in the audience, but it is a personal preference and there is no requirement either way.

Boardmember Boyle stated he has a case that will be heard at the Planning and Zoning Board at the next meeting and since the meeting will be conducted through a virtual platform, should he turn off the video and the mute button. Ms. McDermott responded that Boardmember Boyle state on the record prior to any discussion and let the chair know that he will be recusing himself and state what the conflict is. At that point, Ms. McDermott suggested that Mr Boyle put his meeting on mute so that there would not be any temptation to speak. It would be a personal preference if he chooses to turn off the video as well.

The last item discussed are the violations to the conflict of interest. If a board member was reckless, negligent, did not realize that a relative had a conflict, or whether you intentionally voted on something that you knew you had a conflict on, if you accepted a benefit for a vote would be some of the violations to the law. ways to be in violation. Depending on the violation would depend on the consequences.

4. Receive and discuss a presentation on proposed text amendments to Chapters 67 and 69 of Title 11 of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance including, but not limited to, the procedures for site plan reviews including administrative approval for certain initial site plan reviews.

Planning Director Nana Appiah introduced the next agenda item and explained staff has been to the City Council twice which included a 2 hour discussion with the City Council on September 24th. There have also been follow-up discussions with the City Council this month to discuss all the proposed text amendments, and to receive specific direction from the Council. He stated Senior Planner, Rachel Prelog is going to be discussing with the Board the proposed administrative review process. Dr. Appiah stated at the last meeting staff committed to the board they would receive the draft text amendments so that they can review the documents prior to the hearing. The item will be on the agenda for recommendation for the meeting on October 28.

Ms. Prelog stated there will not be a formal presentation at this meeting, but this is more an opportunity to discuss those specifics of the text amendments. She stated she had emailed two documents for the site plan review to the board a few weeks earlier for review. One is the complete Repeal and Replace of chapter 69 and the second is the Ordinance which has some miscellaneous amendments. Some are the proposed changes to Chapters 67 and 87, which are definitions and are included in a separate Ordinance. She stated she would like to open up for discussion and see if the Board had any questions on any of the proposed text.

5. Planning Director's Updates.

- Status of on-going review of text amendments to the 2040 Mesa General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

Dr. Appiah provided the board with the status of the text amendment projects and as he stated earlier, staff has met with City Council twice to discuss all the proposed changes. There were a couple of edits or modifications that we received direction from the City Council on. One had to do with the discussions that we had that our code is very ambiguous when it comes to Residential uses in a Commercial District.

For example, in a Limited Commercial or General Commercial district, which allows certain residential uses in those zoning districts, there is a minimum percentage of commercial uses that is required to be developed. However, in certain situations, we do get a request where they want to develop more residential within that zoning district that is beyond the percentage required of 40% commercial development and 60% residential. In certain situations, we get developers requesting to develop more residential than the commercial and want to exceed the required 60% of residential development. In the past, staff has processed those requests as a CUP (Council Use Permit). The code was not clear if you can use that process of a CUP and staff had struggled with clarity of interpreting the code for such requests. The amendment to the code will make this process clear and clean and will also help the development community. This will make it clear that in situations where the developer is requesting to exceed the minimum or the maximum residential, a CUP will be required because this is more of a Legislative decision.

During the discussion with Council, the directive staff received is to change or flip the percentages around so that commercial changes from 40% minimum to 60% and residential from 60% to 40% minimum. This is because in those zoning districts, specifically for commercial with residential as an accessory, the title of those uses is residential uses in Commercial District and not vice versa. Council wanted to be able to have the authority or the ability to give some latitude in terms of looking at it on a case by case basis. In some situations, it may be okay to have a greater percentage of the site as residential. With that, we are going to be making proposed changes to change that section of the code which discusses percentages. This item will come before this Board on October 28th for recommendation to Council. In the meantime, if the Board has any questions, they can reach out to him or Rachel.

The other part of the amendments coming before the Board is the change to the Administrative Site Plan Review for uses that are permitted in the zoning district. We have had extensive discussions with Council regarding this amendment as well. A couple of concerns Council members expressed are that certain uses that are permitted by right in some of the zoning districts. For example, boat and RV storage, mini storage, and assisted living facilities. So with that, we informed Council some of the text amendments is changing those uses from permitted by right to requiring a CUP (Council Use Permit) so that will fall outside the parameters of approval by the administrative staff.

Another text amendment we will be addressing is Assisted Living facilities and the location of these facilities. This was also a directive from Council to review the requirements of the Assisted Living Facilities because they had concern why they are being located at major intersections. Also, there had been various discussions from developers interested about developing the facilities and they wanted to make sure there is adequate separation between those uses so that we do not class the uses in certain areas and clarify a required distance between the uses. One of the changes is to require specific distances for the Assisted Living facilities similar to the requirements for gas stations. We will also require a setback distance separation from major arterial or roadway intersections.

The final amendment is the General Plan text amendment and Council is in support for all of the changes we are proposing. This will help clarify some of the ambiguity that has been in the General Plan with the Character designations and help both the development community but also make it clear what is intended in those character areas. Dr. Appiah stated staff is planning to schedule the General Plan Amendment for this board to consider at a special meeting scheduled for November 9, because we are required to hold two public hearings for the General Plan amendments. The second meeting will be for the final recommendation to City Council and is scheduled for November 18 at the regular meeting of this board.

The discussion for the other text amendments, will come before this board for consideration and recommendation on October 28th. The study session for this meeting will be a little longer because the text amendments will be on the agenda as well as several site plan reviews. Dr. Appiah stated they have provided the documents for the board to review. He reminded the board they can contact himself or Rachel, if you have any specific question on the text. But we also have, we will plan to have adequate time during the city session to answer any questions they may have.

Boardmember Villanueva-Saucedo stated she did not have a question, but wanted to state she appreciates the efforts of staff to get everything to them ahead of time. It is super helpful and appreciates the efforts to streamline the work that they do. Ms. Villanueva-Saucedo stated the review is not just checking off boxes. She understands this is was a laborious process and feels one that will benefit everybody in the long run.

6. Adjournment.

Boardmember Allen motioned to adjourn the meeting at 3:31 pm. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Villanueva-Saucedo.

Vote: 5-0 Approved (Vice Chair Sarkissian was absent at 3:00 pm. and Boardmember Ayers, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Astle, Boyle, Allen, Crockett and Villanueva-Saucedo

NAYS – None

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Nana K. Appiah', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Nana K. Appiah, AICP, Secretary
Planning Director

Note: Audio recordings of the Planning & Zoning Board study sessions are available in the Planning Division Office for review. The regular Planning & Zoning Board meeting is “live broadcasted” through the City of Mesa’s website at www.mesaaz.gov.