

Planning and Zoning Board

Study Session Minutes

Virtual Platform

Date: April 28, 2021 Time: 2:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

*Chair Dane Astle
*Vice Chair Jessica Sarkissian
*Tim Boyle
*Shelly Allen
* Jeffrey Crockett
* Deanna Villanueva-Saucedo
*Ben Ayers

MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

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

STAFF PRESENT:

Nana Appiah
Tom Ellsworth
Lesley Davis
Kellie Rorex
Charlotte Bridges
Evan Balmer
Cassidy Welch
Chloe Durfee-Sherman
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 2:41 p.m.

2. Review items on the agenda for the April 28, 2021 regular Planning and Zoning Board Hearing.

Staffmember Kellie Rorex presented case ZON20-00782 to the Board. The applicant is requesting a Site Plan Review to allow for the development of a 53-unit multiple residence development. The subject site is located west of Stapley Drive on the south side of University. The General Plan Character Area is Neighborhood, and the focus of that Character Area is to provide a safe place for people to live. The character type also contains a mix of housing types which includes Multiple Residences. The site is also within the Central Main Street Area Plan, specifically within the Evolution Corridor. The goal of the Evolution Corridor is to decrease existing auto oriented development and encourage new development that enhances streetscapes and the pedestrian realm. Currently, the site is made up of nine different parcels, seven of those are zoned RM-4 and two of them are zoned RM-2. They will be combining

each of the lots into one and will keep the split zoning on the site. The existing site consists of vacant single-family homes and offices that will be demolished prior to development.

The site was recently approved for a DIP (Development Incentive Permit) through the Board of Adjustment for several development modifications. These modifications allowed the buildings to be pushed closer to University Drive to create that pedestrian realm. The deviations also allowed for more room on the site to have adequate parking and circulation, open space, and landscaping. As you can see on the site plan, there's one, two and three-story portions of the development. The three-story portion is located close to University and then wraps around south to a two-story portion of the first building. This was done to respect the single-family residence south of the site. The one-story building that faces on to Miller Street is going to be the clubhouse and leasing area.

The applicants did go to Design Review on April 13 and the board did not have any major comments, the applicants are working with staff to finalize the design. The Citizen Participation Process was quite robust for this project. The applicants sent multiple letters to property owners within 500 feet and registered neighborhoods. They also held two neighborhood meetings. From these meetings, a couple of the neighborhood concerns were the height of the buildings, overflow parking onto the public street, as well as the elevations. The applicants took their original proposal, which included three, three-story buildings throughout the site and they reduced those to the three two- and one-story buildings seen on the site plan. This took away enough units that allowed the applicants to meet the required parking on the site. The applicants also changed the design of the buildings from a more modern look to something that's more traditional that matches the existing houses in the neighborhood. Staff did hear from two different neighbors, one of them had concerns about an increase in traffic south of the site along Third Street and then the other one was supportive of the project. He was happy to see that these sites were getting redeveloped into something that will be beneficial for this neighborhood. So, overall, the site complies with the Mesa 2014 General Plan, it complies with the Central Mainstreet Area Plan, and it meets the review criteria for a Site Plan Review. Staff is recommending approval with conditions.

Boardmember Allen inquired, based on the comments that you had on the concern about increased traffic on Third Street, did you or anyone, including the applicant do a traffic study? Ms. Rorex stated I do not believe the applicant did one. I do know that instead of requesting reduced parking they made it so that the site could meet all the parking requirements. Chair Astle stated I presumed that this was reviewed by traffic through a pre-application process. Staffmember Kellie Rorex responded that is correct. They did receive comments from Transportation and complied with those comments.

Boardmember Boyle, as I'm looking through this project with pretty intensely reduced setbacks, in a lot of places on the lot, I think about how many of the projects we'll see today having pretty strongly reduced setbacks. I know many projects that I'm working on in the City also have that. Is that something that maybe we should be looking at, some sort of Ordinance change, or something, since we're getting enough requests for reduced setbacks, as I think we're moving to a more dense City in many locations, and maybe it should be a consideration. This would be a larger thing, which is to consider reducing the setbacks in a lot of situations for in-fill or in general things. Just something of note that I've seen as I was running through all of the different projects, especially here with really intense reductions in setbacks. Maybe this is something on the radar screen.

Planning Director Nana Appiah stated when we do look at a case, we look at them on a case-by-case basis. We recognize that when there is an Infill Development, we need to evaluate the impact of the development on adjacent neighborhoods and also see how that project can be fruitful. So, basically, we did evaluate this project, and we believe that the reductions justify the development. So instead of having a blanket process, we do assess them on a case-by-case basis.

Chair Astle stated, thank you very much. Yeah, on this one it is also nice as we have the chance to address the street a little better and put some distance between the other parcels.

Boardmember Villanueva-Saucedo stated she has no questions. Just a comment that she appreciates staff really making these Citizen Participation Reports robust so that we can see exactly what the concerns were and more importantly, what the exchange has been between the developer and residents. It's one thing to have just the list of complaints, but how things were resolved, how it fits into the overall plan, and several of them today were just really stellar and well done. So just wanted to thank you guys for that.

Boardmember Allen stated I had one other question; I didn't see anything in the staff report relating to Economic Development. Because I know there are some offices that are going to be demolished and then this multi housing project is going to take its place. Do you have any position from economic Development on this transition? Dr. Appiah stated when we do receive development applications, we do have a development team that includes Economic Development, and they review every project and give us comments. Typically, for this type of project they don't comment on it unless less they are in opposition. They reviewed it and I can tell you, they do not have any position.

Ms. Allen stated thank you. Is there some way we can get an economic development section in the staff report? Recently you put in a section about Mesa Public Schools in the staff report because that kept coming up over and over and over again, but is there a way we can write what the Economic Development comments are in them? That way if they do not have any concerns, it would alleviate our concerns about Economic Development. I think that would be beneficial. Dr. Appiah responded we can revisit that issue and make sure we're clear on Economic Developments stand and see their level of comfort in providing such comments for staff reports. Thank you.

Staffmember Charlotte Bridges presented case ZON20-00820 to the Board. This is a request for Site Plan Review for the redevelopment of a restaurant. The location of the project is east of Stapley Road at the northwest corner of Main Street and Hunt Drive. The General Plan designation for this property is Neighborhood and is also in the Transit Corridor Station Subtype, and within the Central Main Street Sub Area Plan. The primary use for the neighborhood character area is single family, but it does allow for commercial uses, especially along the arterial frontage. The proposed request is in compliance with the General Plan Neighborhood Character Area, the Transit Corridor Stations Sub-type and the Central Main Station. This project is providing pedestrian connections to the sidewalk which then lead to the light rail stations and it is providing streetscape along the street frontage. The Zoning District for this property is GC (General Commercial), which permits a full-service restaurant.

These are two pictures of the project. The photo on the left is looking from the south side of Main Street towards the property. And you can see that the site is currently vacant although it does have site improvements like the parking area. There was a building on this site and last

February that building was destroyed by a fire and has been removed. The photo on the right is looking from the east side of Hunt Drive towards the property and that gives you a little more idea of the existing site improvements at the site.

The site plan shows the footprint of a 5,630 square foot building. It provides perimeter, parking lot and foundation based landscape. It provides a six-foot high masonry wall along the north property line and is 52 parking spaces. In early April, the Board of Adjustment approved a SCIP (Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit) to modify the development standards of this site to help the building be redeveloped. As a part of that SCIP, the Board of Adjustment approved a reduction of the setback adjacent to the west property line for the building. And then it reduced the landscape areas adjacent to the west, to the north and to the east property lines. It also reduced the number of required parking spaces based on the size of the building. The required number of parking spaces is 73 parking and the site shows 52 parking spaces. The Design Review reviewed the building on April 13, and they did not recommended any changes to the building. They did recommend changes to the landscape plan that were very minor and included two recommendations. One is to move the shrubs from the base of the retention basin to the slopes and put the trees in the bottom of the retention basin, which would allow the trees to grow and the shrubs to survive when there is runoff in the basin. The second recommendation was to the decomposed granite that was proposed as ground cover. The landscape architect on the Design Review Board recommended that the size of that aggregate be increased to a two and a half to three quarter inch screened to material. The landscape plan included in your packet reflects the changes recommended by the Design Review board.

The applicant did complete a Citizen Participation Plan that included a mailing to property owners within 1,000 feet of the site, the Homeowners Associations, and registered neighborhoods. In addition, they mailed three public hearing or public meeting notices. One for the Board of Adjustment, another for Design Review, and then the one required for Planning and Zoning Board. The required sign was also posted on the property for the Planning and Zoning Board public hearing as well.

Staff received three calls regarding this project. Two calls were in support. The third call was from a concerned property owner to the north. But essentially this property owner was just verifying that there was indeed a six-foot masonry wall that would be constructed along the north property line. She also had concerns with the plant material that that was designated to be planted in the landscaped Island islands adjacent to the north property line. She was concerned the proposed trees were too messy. This information was passed on to the applicant and the applicant revised the landscape plan to replace the proposed Mexican Bird of Paradise plant trees with Live Oak trees in the landscape islands adjacent to the north property line, essentially resolving the concern of that citizen to the north. In the Citizen Participation Report, the applicant also indicated that he received several calls from neighbors in support of the project as well.

In conclusion, staff finds that the proposed request complies with the 2014 Mesa General Plan, and that it meets the review criteria for Site Plan Review, as outlined in the Mesa Zoning Ordinance. And staff is recommending approval with conditions. I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have.

There was no discussion or questions by the Board.

Staffmember Cassidy Welch presented case ZON21-00133 to the Board. This is a request for Site Plan Review and two Special Use Permits to allow for the development of an industrial building. The subject site is located south of Ray Road, west of Hawes and east of Power on the north side of the Phoenix Mesa Gateway Airport. The General Plan designation for this area is Specialty, due to the proximity to the Phoenix Mesa Gateway Airport. The site is located within the airport subtype which encourages employment uses that are compatible with the airport. The Zoning on the site is currently LI (Light Industrial) with a PAD Overlay. Industrial, manufacturing and warehousing are permitted uses in the LI zoning. This site is a part of a larger Planned Area Development Overlay (PAD) for The Landing. It's also located within the Airflight Overlay Area. Here you can see an existing photo of the site looking towards the airport. The site plan is for an approximately 235,000 square foot industrial building. The site will be accessed through two accesses off of Ray Road as well as through cross access with the development to the west. And the truck docks and outdoor storage will be located in the rear, behind the building, adjacent to that Airport.

The applicant is requesting two Special Use Permits, one is for height. Section 11-30-3 allows for height increases in the Airfield Overlay and is subject to approval of a Special Use Permit. The maximum height for the Li zoning district is 40 feet, the applicant is requesting increase to 49 feet. They are also requesting a Special Use Permit for a parking reduction. This parking reduction is consistent with the other Landing developments within the area. They will be proposing a parking reduction from 510 spaces to 355.

The applicant attended Design Review work session on April 13. The Design Review Board had some comments regarding the south elevation - bringing increased architectural articulation to that south elevation that will be facing the airport, as well as bringing articulation into the site details.

They did conduct a Citizen Participation process, which included property owners within 1,000 feet. Staff has not received any comments from any surrounding property owners. We find that the proposed project complies with the 2040 General Plan as well as the Mesa Gateway Strategic Development Plan and meets the review criteria for Site Plan Review and Special Use Permits. We are recommending approval with conditions and I would be happy to answer any questions.

Boardmember Allen confirmed the only comment that I have was if the airport was okay with this or not. I assumed that they were, but I didn't read that anywhere in the staff report. Ms. Welch responded the airport did make comments that they had no concerns with the project.

Staffmember Cassidy Welch presented case ZON19-00832 to the Board. This is a 20 acre site that's located north of Main Street and east of Dobson road. The General Plan designation for this site is Mixed Use Activity. Within the Mixed Use Activity district, it encourages centers for commercial and residential activity. It's also located within the Station Area subtype and Transit District due to its proximity to the Sycamore Station light rail stop, as well as located within the West Main Street area plan. The zoning on the site utilizes the Form Based Code Transect Zones, which include T4N, T4NF, T5N, T5MS & T5MSF. The request before you today is a modification to the Sycamore Stations Smart Growth Community Plan to allow for a Mixed Use Transit Oriented development.

The Smart Growth Plan, as outlined in Chapter 63 requires certain standards to be included as a part of the plan, including pedestrian sheds, transect, zones, thoroughfare networks and

civic spaces. Final development plans will be approved through an Administrative Zoning clearance process. The request also includes modifications to the approved preliminary development plan. Those modifications include changes to the building configurations, parking standards, pedestrian and vehicular thoroughfares and building form standards.

Staff finds that the proposed modifications comply with the General Plan as well as the West Main Street Sub Area Plan and meet the criteria in Chapter 63 for Smart Growth Community Plans. The developer has to show pedestrian sheds, which Transect Zones they would be applying to the site, a thoroughfare network for both vehicular thoroughfare and pedestrian and then identify the locations and types of civic spaces in the development. As a part of that they are required to submit a preliminary development plan which will identify the locations of those civic spaces, thoroughfares, networks and pedestrian sheds with final development plans, which will drill down into the specific building size locations and design to be approved through a zoning clearance similar to how the Form Based Code developments are approved. So the best way I like to think of it is a Smart Growth Community Plan is kind of comparable to a PAD. And then the preliminary development plan acts like a conceptual site plan, with final site plan to be developed as a part of the final development plan. As a part of the request, they are proposing to modify their preliminary development plan. The modifications they are proposing are to modify parcel configurations. Previously, parcel D1 as identified in this exhibit was split into parcels D1 and D2. They're also proposing to modify parking standards, the pedestrian and vehicular thoroughfare locations and types, as well as modify building form standards from the Form Based Code Transects.

In summary, we find that the proposed development complies with the Mesa General Plan, as well as the Mesa West Main Street Area Plan and complies with the criteria for Smart Growth Community Plan as established in Chapter 63. And we are recommending approval with conditions and I would be happy to answer any questions.

Boardmember Boyle stated he has a question. I know that the neighborhood group that I'm a part of plans to speak about this one. Is there a blue card that was received for this project? Staffmember Rebecca Gorton stated we have received a comment card from Tyler Montague.

Planning Director Nana Appiah stated he is requesting this item to be removed of the consent agenda because prior to the meeting, we got a response from the applicant wanting to modify one of the conditions of approval. It just came in right before the meeting. So we are working with our Legal Department to finalize a condition. So, as of right now, we are not ready, and will be able to fine tune it and present that at the public hearing.

Chair Astle asked Rebecca to confirm we have received one other blue card today for case ZON21-00050. Ms. Gorton read the request is to have her comment to be read the meeting.

Mr. Astle stated to Boardmember Boyle this one is going to be removed and discussed at the meeting. Any other questions prior to moving on, considering we're going to discuss and receive a little bit more information regarding this case.

Staffmember Wahid Alam presented case ZON20-00872 to the Board. The request is a PAD modification for approximately 42 acres. and is located on Power Road and Elliott. The applicant is requesting a PAD Modification, rezoning from GI-PAD to LI-PAD and Site Plan Review of 39 of the 42 acres. The purpose of this request is to allow for the development of an industrial park at this location. The General Plan is Mixed Use activity which usually provides

for a wide range of employment opportunity with high quality settings, large manufacturing facilities, warehouse business parks, all inside a building. The zoning request is to make the whole 42 acres area LI-PAD and the purpose of the LI zoning district is to accommodate wholesale manufacturing and distribution within enclosed building. Office and indoor warehouse and storage are permitted use.

Currently this site is vacant. This request is for the approval of 4 of the 5 sites. Site 5 will come before this Board in the future for site plan review. This development site has access from Power Road with circulation for trucks around the building and has cross access. The applicant is requesting changes to the maximum building height for building 2 and 4 from the required 40' to 52'; reduction in parking from the required 1 space per 900 sf to 1 space per 1,010 sf; change in the foundation base with no additional entry plazas are required and the landscape from 15' to 5' along the east property line of "Site 5".

This case already went in front of the Design Review Board on April 13 and received positive comments. Staff is working with the applicant to address the minor suggestions that they had. The applicant conducted a Citizen Participation and informed everyone within 1,000 feet, HOA's and registered neighborhoods. Staff has not received any concerns from the neighbors. The applicant has received a few inquiries about what the proposal contains. Staff findings show that the proposal complies with the 2040 General Plan, and it meets the review criteria for Site Plan Review outlined in Section 11-69-5 of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance. Staff recommendation is approval with conditions.

Dr. Appiah stated there is a modification to the conditions which staff received a few hours prior to the meeting. I will read them into the record Item #7 ***"All off-site improvement and street frontage landscaping for this specific site plans as approved must be installed with the first phase of construction."*** The changes, includes the word for this specific site plans as approved right after the frontage landscaping.

There was no further discussion or questions by the Board.

Staffmember Cassidy Welch presented case ZON21-00050 to the Board. The request is to rezone the property from RS-6-PAD, NC and OC to RM-4-PAD as well as Site Plan Review and preliminary plat. The request will allow for a multiple residence development. The site is located on the west side of Sossaman Road, north of Baseline Road. There is a golf course to the west, as well as an existing Circle K to the south. The General Plan designation for this site is Neighborhood. The General Plan encourages safe places to live and a variety of housing and supportive uses for that neighborhood area. The applicant is proposing to rezone to Multiple Residence 4 with a PAD Overlay. Multiple residence is a permitted use in that zoning district. As a part of the PAD Overlay, the applicant has requested deviations from some development standards, including a reduced front building and landscape setback, reduced rear setback and a reduced interior side setback, as well as modifications to parking standards and private open space standards.

The site will be accessed exclusively from Sossamon Road with parking and resident amenities located behind the building. The proposed golf course is to the west with access to the north of the proposed site and then the Circle K will have a shared access drive to the south. This request also includes a preliminary plat. Those lots that are zoned RS-6 were planned with a previous Desert Sands Subdivision. The preliminary plan is to pull those lots out of that previous subdivision and combine all of those lots into one.

The applicant is scheduled for the May 11 Design Review Board. The applicant did conduct a Citizen Participation process, which included one virtual meeting. There were three attendees for that virtual meeting. They were contacted by some residents who could not attend that virtual meeting, the concerns from them were with traffic. As a part of the improvements that are happening in this area, there is a Capital Improvement Project that is planned for Sossaman Road, which will widen that road. It is anticipated that the additional traffic that this project would bring would be handled by that CIP project. They also had concerns that the proposed development would restrict access to the golf course, access to the golf course extends on both sides of Sossaman Road and will not impede residents use of that golf course. There were also questions as to the proposed height, which is outlined in the Citizen Participation report. The applicant conducted a balloon test and put a balloon out on the site at the proposed heights of the buildings and shared those with the resident who was concerned about the height. Staff has not received any comments or concerns from adjacent property owners about the proposed request.

With that, we find it complies with the General Plan, meets the criteria for a PAD Overlay and meets the criteria for Site Plan Review. We are recommending approval with conditions and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Staff has received one comment card on this case. Chair Astle asked as it relates to pulling the case off consent due to the comment card. I don't believe this person wishes to speak only to have the comment card read. Do we typically read the comment prior to voting on this case or should do we want to pull this and discuss it in the meeting?

Dr. Appiah stated it is up to the Board. Typically, when they come in to be read, that person does not want to speak we will read that into the record. The Board will vote as part of the consent agenda.

In order to determine if the Board wishes to keep the item on the consent agenda, Staffmember Rebecca Gorton read comments from the card staff received. Ms. Gorton stated she received a comment card from Karen Servantes who resides at 7544 East Jan Avenue who wishes her comment read out loud. She states: *"I do not want this apartment complex built. I feel that it will negatively impact my neighborhood. I believe traffic and crime will rise. water pressure that is already low will become a trickle please vote no for this plan. Thank you."*

Chair Astle said as it relates to that comment we will definitely read it into the record prior to voting. I feel as though as it relates to you know, water pressures and things that will be managed by engineering, they won't be allowed to be under or below what's restricted.

There were no further questions or discussions by the Board.

Staffmember Evan Balmer presented case ZON21-00089 to the Board. This is a request for a rezoning from RS-43 to RS-15 with a Planned Development Overlay. If approved, this would allow for the development of a 108-lot single residence subdivision. The property is cross hatched on the map and located on the west side of Lehi Road north of McDowell Road. Just for some context, this is going to be directly across the street from Lehi Crossing, which is located on the east side of Lehi Road. The General Plan designation is Neighborhood and allows for a variety of housing types. It is primarily a single residence and also allows for

supportive uses to schools, parks, things along those lines. This property is currently within Maricopa County and as part of this project, the applicant has filed an Annexation request that case number ANX21-00095. The property is currently zoned RU-43 in Maricopa County, per State statute as part of the annexation process, when annexed the City of Mesa would assign a comparable zoning designation to the property and in this case it will be RS-43.

So, the request before you is a rezoning from that RS-43 to RS-15-PAD. Some of the board members may recognize the former Orange Patch Store on Lehi Road. There are a few things I wanted to point out on the site plan. On the 108 lots they are asking for a reduction in the overall lot size, but they are providing for a great variety of lot sizes, the minimum would be 9,100 square feet, up to over 20,000 square foot lots. The oversize lots are located along the Lehigh Road to really give that sense of arrival to the community. They are also providing just under nine acres of open space and private streets within the development. They are asking for a number of deviations to the RS-15 standards primarily a reduction to the minimum lot area to 9100 square feet and the minimum lot width from 110 feet to 65 feet. There are some reductions in setbacks that are related to the reduced lot width, the front setbacks, side setbacks and rear setbacks. This will also allow the applicant to provide a variety of housing types on the property. They're asking for a reduction in the maximum building coverage for two of the floor plans from 40% to 50%, for the specific plans, 2568 and 3177. They're also asking for a reduction in our standard per section 11-5-3 of the Zoning Ordinance, three car garages are only permitted on lots of 75 feet wide or greater. Due to the reduction in the lot width to 65 feet, they're also requesting to allow three car garages on lot 65 feet wide. The maximum wall height is eight feet that allows them to build a sound wall along the 202 to kind of mitigate some of those potential impacts from the freeway. They are providing private streets and they are also requesting a reduction in the minimum interior dimensions for a garage from 20 feet wide by 22 feet long to 20 feet wide by 19 feet long only for three specific floor plans that are being offered on plans 2342, 2568 and 3177.

The applicant did complete a Citizen Participation Plan with the required 1,000 feet, HOA's and registered neighborhoods. They also had a very well attended neighborhood meeting back in November with 39 attendees who didn't have any major concerns with the project. There were very curious about lot sizes, home prices, the standard things that we hear at neighborhood meetings. With that this does meet the criteria for Planned Area Development from section 11-22 of the Zoning Ordinance as well as the 2014 Mesa General Plan. Staff is recommending approval with conditions and I would be happy to answer any questions the board has. Thank you.

Boardmember Boyle stated I have one concern with the elevations for the Artisan 2342. The Quality Guidelines that we passed it says garages should not be the first thing that you notice upon entering a residential subdivision. The that particular model, I mean, these are all very garage heavy and I understand that that's the way that that is what people want is more and more garages. But that particular one I think it's a little too far to the garage with the house element and I don't think we need to pull this off consent, but I would like staff to discuss that with the clients on the proposal. It is Blandford and everyone always says Blandford does follow their example but I would hope that they choose to use some architectural techniques to eliminate the garage being 80% of the front of the house in that particular model.

Principal Planner Tom Ellsworth and Staffmember Chloe Durfee-Sherman presented case ZON21-00191 to the Board. This request is for a rezoning from Agricultural (AG) and Light Industrial (LI) to Public/Semi Public (PS) zoning district. The purpose of this request would be

to allow for a public facility type use. Some background to this this property is it is owned by the City of Mesa and is a City initiated rezone. This site was the subject of a question on the ballot back in 2018 for the Parks bonds. There has been some discussion with the surrounding neighborhood regarding the design and the programming for a potential Parks and Rec facility at this location.

As a reminder this request is just about the zoning of the property. The design and the site planning for the park is approved per the purview of the Parks and Recreation Board, which will be considered at a later date. This site is located on Center Street just north of McKellips Road. The site is located a half mile between Country Club and Mesa Drive and just south of the 202 Freeway. North of the site, over the freeway, is a Police Training Facility and a Solid Waste Facility which are also operated by the City.

The General Plan for this location is Neighborhood and is located just on the fringe of the Lehi Sub Area. Public facilities and Parks and Rec facilities are listed as secondary land uses within the Neighborhood Character district. Secondary land uses can be considered within areas that are mature and developed with the primary land use. The primary land use within the Neighborhood facilities would be those residential developments surrounding the site. The zoning on the site is Agriculture and Light Industrial. The reason for this request, is because a public park and recreation facilities is not an allowed land use within the LI zoning district and the five acres zoned LI for this property would need to be rezoned. As such the City is requesting rezoning to Public Semi-Public on the entire property. You have received in the packet the conceptual plan for the park and, as stated before, it is not the purview of this Board to approve the design of the site.

There was extensive Citizen Participation as part of the process and a report was included in your packet. This outreach was done in relation to the General Bonds projects on the ballot. The outreach efforts discussed the design potential for a park and the programming of the park with the surrounding property owners. Some of the concerns from the neighboring property owners related to the use, an increase of traffic and the ability to keep the site safe. The concerns all related to the actual design and programming of the park.

And so again, this is a rezoning request to public semi-public to allow public facility uses on the property and to allow the Parks and Recreation Board to consider the park design for the site. This request is in conformance with the 2040 General Plan, and meets the purpose for the public semi-public zoning district.

Boardmember Allen stated, I have a couple questions. One, do we have any blue cards on this item. Ms. Gorton confirmed staff has not received any comment cards for this case. Ms. Allen continued, So I guess the other comment that I had, and I think I talked to Chloe earlier today, was about the traffic study that was done. I think the comment was that this would not impact the neighborhood based on the traffic study. I talked with Curt Albright, in Engineering, who was very helpful as to how they were planning on protecting the neighborhood with a drive that would require a left turn in and right turn out only which would go up and down Center Street. But the question, or really comment I have was when I was looking at this the numbers based on the study was 2,400 per day. Now currently, that 2,400 would be the same amount when this park is underway. I do not know if anybody from Traffic Engineering is here that can answer that question for me. But I just do not believe that 2,400 per day, once this park is developed that there won't be an impact on the neighborhood. I do understand they are putting two lanes on the south, so people that are leaving the park can go south, and one lane going

north. But as far as the impact and the numbers, they just do not make any sense to me.

Dr. Appiah responded, we do not have anybody from Transportation, but I'll try and answer the question. I think Tom actually stressed on this a little bit. When we review Zoning cases, we make sure that we review them to make sure that the requested zoning is going to be compatible to the surrounding area. And in this case, we believe that the zoning will be compatible. However, when we get to the site planning stage, that is where we get a specific staff comments about the ultimate traffic capacity associated with the project and ability to accommodate the project. Also, all cases are reviewed to make sure that the proposed specific development and any mitigation needed as a result of the development is taken care of.

Ms. Allen stated I understand what you're saying from that respect. But I think too, if we are changing this to a compatible use for the neighborhood, I don't know if I necessarily agree because that would have a negative impact on the neighborhood. It could be worse, it could be housing development, it could be you know multifamily. So, I understand that there could be different uses. But still, I think that's something for us to consider if we're talking about looking at the use if it is compatible with the surrounding area. So, I just want us to be mindful of that. And I was hoping that somebody from Engineering would alleviate my concerns. That is my position where I'm at.

Dr. Appiah responded I do understand your concern, and I want to add to it that at this point, we really don't know the magnitude of the actual development that could happen at the location as well. I know there has been a site plan discussion with the community and neighborhood but the final site plan is not what we are reviewing. We did not review the rezoning request against the final site plan, with the amount of ball fields that will happen at the site.

Tom Ellsworth added, as a reminder, the majority of the site, about 20 acres of the site is zoned AG, which does allow for the land use for the design of the park. The land use consideration is on that front five acres that is currently zoned for Light Industrial uses.

3. Planning Director's Updates.

- Decisions of the City Council's April 19, 2021 land use hearings.

Planning Director Nana Appiah stated there were two major decisions on land use by the City Council on Monday, April 19. The two cases were the expansion to the CMC Steel Industrial Development. And the second case was the Waypoint project by the Riverview development which was an expansion to add a new office building and a parking structure. This case was continued a couple of times for staff to work with the applicant and the developer to improve the elevations, landscaping and other things that had come up. As well as providing a Good Neighbor Policy. The City Council voted 7-0 to approve the Waypoint project.

4. Adjournment.

Boardmember Villanueva-Saucedo motioned to adjourn the meeting at 3:56 pm. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Crockett.

Vote: 7-0 Approved

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

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

NAYS – None

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Nana K. Appiah", written over a horizontal line.

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.