



Planning and Zoning Board

Meeting Minutes

Mesa City Council Chambers – Upper Level, 57 East 1st Street

Date: June 22, 2022 Time: 4:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Tim Boyle
Shelly Allen*
Jeffrey Crockett
Benjamin Ayers
Troy Peterson

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Chair Jessica Sarkissian
Vice Chair Deanna Villanueva- Saucedo

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

STAFF PRESENT:

Rachel Prelog
Michelle Dahlke
Lesley Davis
Charlotte Bridges
Joshua Grandlienard
Jennifer Merrill
Robert Mansolillo
Sarah Staudinger
Pamela Williams

OTHERS PRESENT:

Call Meeting to Order.

Boardmember Crockett declared a quorum present and the meeting was called to order at 4:25 p.m.

1. Take action on all consent agenda items.

Items on the Consent Agenda

* * * * *

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

2. Approval of minutes from previous meetings.

Approval of minutes: Consider the minutes from the June 8, 2022 study session and regular hearing.

Boardmember Ayers motioned to approve the minutes from the June 8, 2022 study session and regular meeting. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Allen.

Vote: 5-0 (Chair Sarkissian and Vice Chair Villanueva-Saucedo, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Boyle, Allen, Crockett, Ayers, and Peterson

NAYS – None

Boardmember Ayers motioned to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Allen.

Zoning cases: ZON22-00338, ZON22-00023, ZON22-00260, ZON22-00293 and Preliminary Plat ZON22-00292.

Vote: 5-0 (Chair Sarkissian and Vice Chair Villanueva-Saucedo, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Boyle, Allen, Crockett, Ayers, and Peterson

NAYS – None

* * * * *

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

3 Take action on the following zoning cases:

***3-a**

ZON22-00338 District 6. Within the 10120 to 10200 blocks of East Williams Field Road (south side). Located east of Crismon Road on the south side of Williams Field Road. (20± acres). Special Use Permit and Site Plan Review. This request will allow for the development of a multiple residence project. Gammage & Burnham for Toll Brothers Apartment Living, applicant; Pacific Proving LLC, owner.

Planner: Joshua Grandlienard

Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions

Summary: This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed separate individual item.

Boardmember Ayers motioned to approve the case ZON22-00338. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Allen.

That: The Board recommends the approval of case ZON22-00338 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the final site plan submitted.
2. Compliance with Ordinance Number 5523 and the adopted Avalon Crossing Community Plan.
3. Compliance with the Avalon Crossing Development Unit 1 – Development Unit Plan dated April 13, 2022.
4. Compliance with all requirements of DRB22-00541.
5. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.

Vote: 5-0 (Chair Sarkissian and Vice Chair Villanueva-Saucedo, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Boyle, Allen, Crockett, Ayers, and Peterson

NAYS – None

* * * * *

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

Discuss and make a recommendation to the City Council on the following zoning cases:

4-a

ZON21-00792 District 6. Within the 7300 to 7600 blocks of South Hawes Road (east side), the 8400 block of East Germann Road (north side) and the 7300 to 7500 blocks of South 85th Place (west side). Located north of Germann Road and east of Hawes Road. (34± acres). Rezone from Light Industrial with a Bonus Intensity Zone overlay (LI-BIZ) and Office Commercial with a Bonus Intensity Zone overlay (OC-BIZ) to Light Industrial with a Planned Area Development overlay (LI-PAD) and Office Commercial with a Planned Area Development overlay (OC-PAD) and Site Plan Review. This request will allow for an industrial development. This request will allow for an industrial development. Dennis Newcombe, Gammage & Burnham P.L.C., applicant; HAWES OZ FUND LLC, owner. **(Companion case to preliminary plat "Hawes Commerce Center", associated with item *5-b)**

Planner: Jennifer Merrill

Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions

Summary:

Staffmember Jennifer Merrill presented case ZON21-00792: The request is to rezone from Light Industrial and Office Commercial with a BIZ overlay, to Light Industrial and Office Commercial with a PAD overlay, site plan review, and consideration of a preliminary plat. The purpose of the request is to allow for an industrial development. The location is on the north side of Germann Road, on the east side of Hawes Road alignment. Here's a view of the site looking north from Germann Road. And here's the view of the site looking southwest across the site from at 5th Place. The General Plan character area for the site is Employment. And the purpose of the Employment character area is to provide a wide range of employment opportunities with high quality settings. And the uses that are anticipated are office, warehouse, research, and development, and the request complies with the General Plan. The existing zoning for this site is Limited Industrial, with a BIZ overlay and Office Commercial with a BIZ overlay. Those zoning districts were approved in 2009, as part of a request for a movie production studio. The BIZ overlay was attached to a Site Plan for the movie production studio. The current proposal is for an Industrial Park, and there are some modifications to the standard code requirements that are being requested, and therefore the Planned Area Development overlay is being requested. So, the proposed rezoning is to LI PAD and OC PAD. And the industrial uses that are proposed are our industrial uses that are permitted in the LI zoning district. The PAD request includes a variety of modifications to the code requirements. The standard maximum building height in the Light Industrial zoning district is 40 feet, and the proposal is to is for a maximum of 46 feet building height. There are also some requests to modify the development standards for the buildings including not requiring some parapet detailing, and not requiring the maximum of each facade being covered with one material, limiting it to 50%. The proposed buildings are concrete tilt up buildings, and so they are going to be covered with more than 50% one material. The roof mounted equipment standard screening requirements include providing a screening element that is at least as high as the rooftop mechanical units. That is what code requires. The proposal is to provide line of sight screening. So instead of having a screening element that is at the same height or higher than those rooftop units, the view of the rooftop units would be proposed to be blocked (or masked) by the parapet as seen from pedestrian walking at the ground level, rather than at eye level with the parapet. The parking area screen walls are required to be setback from

parking areas at least five feet, and the proposal is for them to be setback by just two feet. The request also includes a modification to the standard parking requirements. And the proposal includes just a flat parking ratio of one parking space per 600 square feet of building area. The foundation base is proposed to be reduced in width from 15 feet to 12 feet along exterior walls with public entrances. And then the entry plazas for the buildings are proposed to be reduced in size to have a minimum dimension of 16 feet, when 20 feet is required. The justification for the PAD request is that the landscape area along the east side of the site is 83 feet in width. The standard code requirement for landscape along that 85th Place is only 20 feet, so they are expanding that landscape buffer substantially. The site plan shows the three proposed industrial buildings, they total almost 550,000 square feet and there are some screened loading areas either behind the buildings, or in between the buildings. The access to the site is from Germann and Hawes Roads, and there are 931 parking spaces proposed. These are the elevations for the build, and they were discussed at the Design Review Board. Last week the Design Review Board had some comments on the elevations and the landscaping, and staff has working with the applicant to address those. Here are the renderings from 85th Place.

The applicant completed a citizen participation process. They mailed letters to property owners within 1000 feet, and HOAs, and registered neighborhoods. They had an in-person neighborhood meeting in October of last year. And they did complete the public notification process for this hearing, as well as for the Design Review Board meeting last week. Staff did not receive any inquiries from neighbors. Today we did receive some blue cards. In summary, the request complies with the Mesa 2040 General Plan. It also meets the criteria for a PAD overlay outlined in Chapter 22 of the Zoning Ordinance, and it also meets the criteria for Site Plan Review outlined in Chapter 69 of the Zoning Ordinance. Staff recommendation is approval with conditions. However, there are a couple of additional conditions.

Boardmember Crockett read the additional stipulations: These additional stipulations came about as a result of discussions that we had in the study session prior to this public hearing. The first addresses a question by board member Peterson about whether the appropriate consents had been worked out for the site plan with regard to the right of ways owned by, or controlled by the Queen Creek Irrigation District. So, the additional stipulation proposed to address that question is this: prior to submitting an application for any permit on the property submit a letter of approval from the Queen Creek Irrigation District and the Bureau of Reclamation for the site design shown on the grading and drainage plan, and site plan. And if a letter of approval is not submitted, submit a revised site plan for review and approval through City Site Plan review process. So that's the first. And then there are two other stipulations that have been proposed and worked out between the applicant and some of the residents in the area. The first is this: truck court screen wall and gate along east side between buildings Two and Three shall be 10 feet tall. And then screen wall along at 5th place shall vary in height between six and eight feet. Are those consistent with your notes?

Staffmember Jennifer Merrill confirmed.

Boardmember Corckett added: And are there any other stipulations that you're aware of at this time to be added to the proposal?

Staffmember Jennifer Merrill confirmed that there are not.

Boardmember Crockett invited the applicant to speak.

Lindsay Shuby spoke: With the law firm of Gammage and Burnham, 40, North Central Phoenix, Arizona 85004. I have a presentation, but it looks a lot like the one you've just heard from Jennifer. So I'd like to thank you guys, boardmember Peterson for bringing the irrigation district up, we're hoping to have that result before we get to Council, in terms of site plan so that we can deal with that stipulation. I understand and appreciate raising that, at this point to make sure that we deal with that, and it doesn't cause problems. We've done a lot of work with the neighbors. Chair Crockett in terms of your question of line of sight, that was result of the request to lower the building height on the side across from the neighbors. So yeah, we're happy that we were able to all compromise a bit, and we had a fruitful discussion before the hearing that led to those two additional stipulations. The undulation of the of the height of the six-foot wall is to intend, where the residential subdivisions exit, to make sure that we've got eight feet there, but to have some type of, you know, architectural and aesthetic interest in that wall. So, it's not just a big eight-foot block wall, but there's some interest there. So, we'll work with staff on that approval, but unless you have any questions for me, I don't want to bore you with another presentation, I mean, I know board member Boyle wants more presentations because it's his last night. So, and I would be remiss to say, board member Boyle, we will miss you up here. So, I'm sure we will see you in and around Mesa but thank you also for your service on the P&Z.

Boardmember Crockett spoke:

Thank you for being sensitive to our time. Just quickly, the additional stipulations that I read, is the applicant. supportive of those?

The applicant confirmed.

Boardmember Crockett continued: Okay. We'll take some public comment. It sounds like maybe some of this has been resolved. We'll find out. I have two people that I want to ask about. The first is Craig Merkley. Okay, so he's given me the thumbs up sign. And then the other is oh, they're both Craig Merkley.

Conversation ensued and Craig Merkley was invited to speak.

Boardmember Crockett added: Why don't you step to the microphone I'll go ahead and have you provide your name and your address for the record and then I'm going to ask if you're satisfied with the stipulations that we've read into the record today.

Craig Merkley, 8559 East woodland Avenue, Mesa, Arizona, 85212 spoke: Council members grateful to be here. I am the neighbor down the street, just a little bit from this project.

Boardmember Crockett spoke: And we read a couple of stipulations regarding the height of screen walls. Does that address your concerns?

Craig Merkley responded: Yes.

Boardmember Allen motioned to approve the case ZON21-00792 with additional stipulations. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Ayers.

That: The Board recommends the approval of case ZON21-00792 with additional stipulations, conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the final site plan submitted.
2. Compliance with the Preliminary Plat submitted.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations.
4. Compliance with all requirements of Design Review Case No. DRB21-00926.
5. Any future changes to the approved site plans that include any portion of the 150-foot buffer zone shall be processed through the Planning and Zoning Board and City Council public hearing process.
6. All street improvements and street frontage landscaping shall be part of the first phase of construction.
7. 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.
8. Compliance with all requirements of Chapter 19 of the Zoning Ordinance including:
 - a. Owner shall execute and record the City’s standard Avigation Easement and Release for Phoenix Mesa Gateway Airport prior to the issuance of a building permit.
 - b. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, provide documentation that a registered professional engineer or registered professional architect has certified that noise attenuation measures have been incorporated into the design and construction of the buildings to achieve a noise level reduction to 45 decibels as specified in Section 11-19-5 of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance.
 - c. Provide written notice to future property owners that the project is within 1 mile of Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport.
 - d. Any proposed permanent or temporary structure is subject to an FAA filing for review in conformance with CFR Title 14 Part 77 (Form 7460) to determine any effect to navigable airspace and air navigation facilities. An FAA determination notice of no hazard to air navigation shall accompany any building permit application for the property.
 - e. All final subdivision plats and sales and leasing offices shall include a disclosure notice in accordance with Section 11-19-5(C) of the Zoning Ordinance which shall state in part: “This property, due to its proximity to Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport, will experience aircraft overflights, which are expected to generate noise levels that may be of concern to some individuals.”
9. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations, except the modifications to the development standards as approved with this PAD and shown in the following table:

| Development Standard | Approved |
|---|---|
| <u>Maximum Building Height –</u> <i>MZO Section 11-7-3(A)</i> | 46 feet |
| <u>Massing and Scale –</u> <i>MZO Section 11-7-3(B)(2)(c)(iii)</i> -Parapet detailing | Detailing such as cornices, moldings, trim, or variations in brick coursing is not required on any building parapets. |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><u>Materials and Colors</u> – MZO Section 11-7-3(B)(5)(b)</p> | <p>All buildings may be constructed of a single material</p> |
| <p><u>Roof-mounted Equipment Screening</u> – MZO Section 11-30-9(A)(1)</p> | <p>The height of the screening element shall be of sufficient height to screen the structure’s tallest piece of installed equipment from the public rights-of-way via line-of-sight studies reviewed and approved by the City</p> |
| <p><u>Parking Area Screening</u> – MZO Section 11-30-9(H)(6)</p> | <p>When using a screen wall there shall be a landscaped setback of at least 2 feet between the screen wall and the edge of the parking area.</p> |
| <p><u>Parking Spaces Required</u> – MZO Section 11-32-3(A) -Shell industrial buildings</p> | <p>1 parking space per 600 square feet of building area</p> |
| <p><u>Foundation Base</u> – MZO Section 11-33-5(A)(1) - Exterior walls with public entrances - Typical Building Entrances for buildings larger than 10,000 square feet</p> | <p>A 12-foot-wide foundation base, measured from face of building to face of curb along the entire length of the exterior wall. For buildings with corner entries, both adjacent walls require a 15-foot-wide foundation base. Entry plazas provided with minimum depth of 16 feet.</p> |

Vote: 5-0 (Chair Sarkissian and Vice Chair Villanueva-Saucedo, absent)
Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:
AYES – Boyle, Allen, Crockett, Ayers, and Peterson
NAYS – None

* * * * *

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

4-b

ZON21-00966 District 2. Within the 6100 block of East Main Street (south side). Located east of Recker Road on the south side of Main Street. (4.5± acres). Rezone from Limited Commercial (LC) to Multiple Residence 3 with a 'U' designation and a Planned Area Development overlay (RM-3U-PAD) and Site Plan Review. This request will allow for a multiple residence development. Benjamin Tate, Withey Morris, applicant; Valencia Heights LLC, owner.

Planner: Charlotte Bridges

Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions

Summary:

Planning Director Rachel Prelog: Board, since this wasn't pulled off of the consent agenda by someone from the public, would you like another presentation or did you just want to discuss this as a board?

Boardmember Crockett responded: I think we'll just go right to the discussion of this item. Charlotte will be prepared to answer any questions the board members may have, but board member Boyle I'll turn it over to you since you are the one that raised a couple of questions on this item in our study session.

Boardmember Boyle spoke: Okay, on the zoning front, I know that when something is LC along Main Street, and I know that long ago the City had tried to reserve the first 200 feet along Main Street as an LC designation. anytime I've done anything on Main Street, we've tried to be very sensitive to that. So, losing that LC for a full RM project right here gives me some concern. Like everyone else, I want to see the City develop, and I want to see it happen. But anytime we're switching from LC, especially on Main Street, it seems like, in my experience has always been raised to a much higher category, had a much higher standard, had a much higher requirement for that. And that's where I start wondering about the quality of this project. It seems to me to have quite a you know... it seems to break a lot of the rules that other developments that I've seen, come to have to obey. And that gives me a lot of concern. One of them being the 12 garages in a row. If that's the new standard, and here's where I'm kind of conflicted, I don't think you need to make the drive aisles, beautiful. You're driving on them for less than 30 seconds. It's the owners driving on them. We spend, you know, there's a lot of regulations that say, well, the garage side has to have this, and this, and this, and this, and this, and I'm like but you're only in it for like 30 seconds. You should make the drive aisles just functional, more like a parking garage, which you don't have to beautify the inside of a parking garage, and the fanciest places in Scottsdale have parking garages. And so, we're spending a bunch of time and effort and space on the drive aisles in Mesa, that I think should be allowed to be plain and simple. And you just get in there in your car, and you get out. Again, it's even putting a garage on it. It's already taken at levels, above a parking garage, which we make richer and fancier people than us deal with in Scottsdale. So that's a conversation that I'm willing to say, hey go ahead and do 12 in a row; go ahead and not have them stagger. I don't even think you need to make some of the walls a little bit thicker to you know, sort of try to pretend that this is abiding by the code, which says it has to be a major architectural feature like an entryway. That's a bit of a conversation, I think we could have here. The LC the RM, I give again, it gives me a lot of pause, as I've looked into a little deeper. One of the other

requirements is that you have your private space outside your front yard. And typically, they say nothing smaller than 10 feet, they don't want any dimension smaller than 10 feet. What they've done here is done a five foot by 21 foot, which gives you more square footage, but I don't know what you can really do in a five foot yard. That's 21 feet long. I mean, I guess your dog can run back and forth and if you would call it that, there seems to be room to do a 10-foot yard and then just push the landscape setback back a little bit. So, I would make I would make that recommendation for staff dealing with them pushing on to make it eight feet or send something where you can actually put some furniture down in and sit in in a five-foot yard that's 21 feet long. Am I wrong here? That just seems?

It was clarified that it was the full width of the units.

Boardmember Boyle continued: Okay, so but five feet? I mean, yeah, if you put a single chair in the five-foot space, you've already kind of mess it up on that point. So those are those are the concerns I have. Typically, when I've brought projects that are similar this to this through Design Review, kind of hammers that stuff out and discusses it as a more holistic thing than we do. And I guess that's where I get the feeling maybe the smart thing to do would be have Design Review, take a look at this and give their comments before we give our official vote on it, even though I won't be able to do that. So, I'm I've already shot myself in the foot. But those are my comments having seen these things come through, and knowing how many of these are, I think coming down the pike. I mean, we have over 500 units like this in development right now. So, if this is the new standard, great, especially with the drive out thing. If we can just say that's fine now. I'm gung ho on that one. Those are my those are my concerns and thoughts about this.

Assistant Planning Director Rachel Prelog added: Boardmember Boyle, if I can address some of those concerns. So, the first one being the zoning along Main Street. So, as you know, further into downtown, we have our transect districts, and some of our Downtown Districts. There is no official policy, within just generally that along Main Street that we need to retain any front edge of commercial district, and especially along East Main Street. Staff has really recognized the need to revitalize that area and interject some population and rooftops in that area. So, both the Planning Division and Economic Development have been supportive of the rezone of some of those limited commercial properties along East Main Street, to really interject that population there. As far as creating any sort of standards, I mean, this is a PAD request that is asking for deviations from the code. So, it is not in any way creating a new standard for the City, as far as our typical zoning standards.

Boardmember Boyle added: Well, not as a new standard, but if it's a well, this project, got it. Why can't we do it? Yeah, maybe precedent? Not ordinance, not standard.

Assistant Planning Director Rachel Prelog responded: I think we as a City, and board members, we have to recognize that each site is unique, and we cannot necessarily judge them against one another. We have to look at them in context of the site, and then the total design but, I do appreciate that.

Boardmember Allen spoke: My comment, my recommendation, I like everything and tied up in a nice little bow. So, I really like to appreciate it going to DRB before it comes to us. And then I

think that that way, some of those design issues might be hammered out and they might talk about it. And yeah, I agree with Boardmember Boyle, I think that we need, you know, I guess the front yard at 50 square feet or whatever it is, that's what I kind of estimated it to be is really not a whole lot to do. You can't really do much with that. And I feel like those type of design details can be worked out with the DRB before it comes to us as a board to approve the project as a whole. So that's just where I stand on it.

Conversation ensued and it was determined that dependant upon the Design Review Boards recommendations, and suggested changes, if the site design is altered it would likely come back through the Planning and Zoning Board. But if the recommendations are more in effect to the elevations or the landscape plan, that wouldn't have any dimensional effects on the site plan, then those are usually just worked out between the applicant and staff before it gets final approval by the Planning Director.

Boardmember Boyle motioned to continue case ZON21-00966 to the July 13, 2022 Planning and Zoning Board meeting. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Allen.

That: The Board recommends to continue case ZON21-00966 to the July 13, 2022 Planning and Zoning Board meeting:

Vote: 4-1 (Chair Sarkissian and Vice Chair Villanueva-Saucedo, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Boyle, Allen, Crockett, and Ayers

NAYS – Peterson

* * * * *

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

*4-c

ZON22-00023 District 6. Within the 10100 to 10600 blocks of East Williams Field Road (south side) and within the 6100 to 6400 blocks of South 222nd Street (west side). (1.5+ acres) Located east of Crismon Road, south of Williams Field Road, and on the north side of the East 24 Gateway Freeway alignment. Major modification to the Avalon Crossing Planned Community District Community Plan; Rezone from Agriculture (AG) to Planned Community (PC). This request will allow for a single residence development. CVL Consultants, applicant; Pacific Proving LLC, owner.

Planner: Joshua Grandlienard

Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions

Summary: This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed separate individual item.

Boardmember Ayers motioned to approve the case ZON22-00023. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Allen.

That: The Board recommends approve the case ZON22-00023 conditioned upon:

Vote: 5-0 (Chair Sarkissian and Vice Chair Villanueva-Saucedo, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Boyle, Allen, Crockett, Ayers, and Peterson

NAYS – None

* * * * *

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

*4-d

ZON22-00260 District 5. Within the 9100 block of East University Drive (south side) and the 300 block of North Ellsworth Road (west side). Located south of University Drive and west of Ellsworth Road. (4± acres). Rezone from Multiple Residence 4 (RM-4) to Limited Commercial (LC) and Site Plan Review. This request will allow for the development of a restaurant with drive-thru. Benjamin Tate, Withey Morris, applicant; Valencia Heights LLC, owner.

Planner: Robert Mansolillo

Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions

Summary: This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed separate individual item.

Boardmember Ayers motioned to approve the case ZON22-00260. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Allen.

That: The Board recommends to approve case ZON22-00260 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the final site plan submitted.
2. Compliance with the landscape plan submitted.
3. 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.
4. Site Plan Review through the public hearing process for future development plans.
5. Recordation of a cross-access and parking agreement when and if the subject site is subdivided.
6. Compliance with all requirements of Design Review Case No. DRB22-00261.
7. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.

Vote: 5-0 (Chair Sarkissian and Vice Chair Villanueva-Saucedo, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Boyle, Allen, Crockett, Ayers, and Peterson

NAYS – None

* * * * *

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

*4-e

ZON22-00293 District 6. Within the 10100 to 10600 blocks of East Williams Field Road (south side) and within the 6100 to 6400 blocks of South 222nd Street (west side). (1.5+ acres) Located east of Crismon Road, south of Williams Field Road, and on the north side of the East 24 Gateway Freeway alignment. Major Modification to Development Unit Plan 2 of Avalon Crossing Planned Community District. This request will allow for a single residence development. Susan Demmitt, Gammage and Burnham, PLC, applicant; Pacific Proving LLC, owner. **(Companion case to Preliminary Plat ZON22-00292, associated with item *5-a)**

Planner: Joshua Grandlienard

Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions

Summary: This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed separate individual item.

Boardmember Ayers motioned to approve the case ZON22-00293. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Allen.

That: The Board recommends approval of the case ZON22-00293 conditioned upon:

Vote: 5-0 (Chair Sarkissian and Vice Chair Villanueva-Saucedo, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Boyle, Allen, Crockett, Ayers, and Peterson

NAYS – None

* * * * *

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

Discuss and take action on the following preliminary plats:

***5-a**

ZON22-00292 District 6. Within the 10100 to 10600 blocks of East Williams Field Road (south side) and within the 6100 to 6400 blocks of South 222nd Street (west side). (1.5+ acres) Located east of Crismon Road, south of Williams Field Road, and on the north side of the East 24 Gateway Freeway alignment. Preliminary Plat. Susan Demmitt, Gammage and Burnham, PLC, applicant; Pacific Proving LLC, owner. **(Companion case to ZON22-00293, associated with item *4-e)**

Planner: Joshua Grandlienard

Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions

Summary: This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed separate individual item.

Boardmember Ayers motioned to approve the Preliminary Plat ZON22-00292. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Allen.

That: The Board recommends to approve the Preliminary Plat ZON22-00292 conditioned upon:

Vote: 5-0 (Chair Sarkissian and Vice Chair Villanueva-Saucedo, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Boyle, Allen, Crockett, Ayers, and Peterson

NAYS – None

* * * * *

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

5-b

“Hawes Commerce Center” District 6. Within the 7300 to 7600 blocks of South Hawes Road (east side), the 8400 block of East Germann Road (north side) and the 7300 to 7500 blocks of South 85th Place (west side). Located north of Germann Road and east of Hawes Road. (34± acres). Preliminary Plat. Dennis Newcombe, Gammage & Burnham P.L.C., applicant; HAWES OZ FUND LLC, owner. **(Companion case to ZON21-00792, associated with item *4-a)**

Planner: Jennifer Merrill

Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions

Summary: This case was discussed with companion item 4-a ZON21-00792.

Boardmember Allen motioned to approve the preliminary plat “Hawes Commerce Center,” with added stipulations. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Ayers.

That: The Board recommends to approve preliminary plat “Hawes Commerce Center” with added stipulations, conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the final site plan submitted.
2. Compliance with the Preliminary Plat submitted.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations.
4. Compliance with all requirements of Design Review Case No. DRB21-00926.
5. Any future changes to the approved site plans that include any portion of the 150-foot buffer zone shall be processed through the Planning and Zoning Board and City Council public hearing process.
6. All street improvements and street frontage landscaping shall be part of the first phase of construction.
7. 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.
8. Compliance with all requirements of Chapter 19 of the Zoning Ordinance including:
 - a. Owner shall execute and record the City’s standard Avigation Easement and Release for Phoenix Mesa Gateway Airport prior to the issuance of a building permit.
 - b. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, provide documentation that a registered professional engineer or registered professional architect has certified that noise attenuation measures have been incorporated into the design and construction of the buildings to achieve a noise level reduction to 45 decibels as specified in Section 11-19-5 of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance.
 - c. Provide written notice to future property owners that the project is within 1 mile of Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport.
 - d. Any proposed permanent or temporary structure is subject to an FAA filing for review in conformance with CFR Title 14 Part 77 (Form 7460) to determine any effect to navigable airspace and air navigation facilities. An FAA determination notice of no hazard to air navigation shall accompany any building permit application for the property.
 - e. All final subdivision plats and sales and leasing offices shall include a disclosure notice in accordance with Section 11-19-5(C) of the Zoning Ordinance which shall state in part: “This property, due to its proximity to Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport, will experience aircraft overflights, which are expected to generate noise levels that may be of concern to some individuals.”

9. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations, except the modifications to the development standards as approved with this PAD and shown in the following table:

| Development Standard | Approved |
|---|---|
| <u>Maximum Building Height</u> – <i>MZO Section 11-7-3(A)</i> | 46 feet |
| <u>Massing and Scale</u> – <i>MZO Section 11-7-3(B)(2)(c)(iii)</i> -Parapet detailing | Detailing such as cornices, moldings, trim, or variations in brick coursing is not required on any building parapets. |
| <u>Materials and Colors</u> – <i>MZO Section 11-7-3(B)(5)(b)</i> | All buildings may be constructed of a single material |
| <u>Roof-mounted Equipment Screening</u> – <i>MZO Section 11-30-9(A)(1)</i> | The height of the screening element shall be of sufficient height to screen the structure’s tallest piece of installed equipment from the public rights-of-way via line-of-sight studies reviewed and approved by the City |
| <u>Parking Area Screening</u> – <i>MZO Section 11-30-9(H)(6)</i> | When using a screen wall there shall be a landscaped setback of at least 2 feet between the screen wall and the edge of the parking area. |
| <u>Parking Spaces Required</u> – <i>MZO Section 11-32-3(A)</i> -Shell industrial buildings | 1 parking space per 600 square feet of building area |
| <u>Foundation Base</u> – <i>MZO Section 11-33-5(A)(1)</i> - Exterior walls with public entrances | A 12-foot-wide foundation base, measured from face of building to face of curb along the entire length of the exterior wall. For buildings with corner entries, both adjacent walls require a 15-foot-wide foundation base. Entry plazas provided with minimum depth of 16 feet. |

| | |
|---|--|
| - Typical Building Entrances for buildings larger than 10,000 square feet | |
|---|--|

Vote: 5-0 (Chair Sarkissian and Vice Chair Villanueva-Saucedo, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Boyle, Allen, Crockett, Ayers, and Peterson

NAYS – None

* * * * *

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

6 Adjournment.

Boardmember Ayers motioned to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Boyle.

Vote: 5-0 (Chair Sarkissian and Vice Chair Villanueva-Saucedo, absent)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Boyle, Allen, Crockett, Ayers, and Peterson

NAYS – None

The City of Mesa is committed to making its public meetings accessible to persons with disabilities. For special accommodations, please contact the City Manager's Office at (480) 644-3333 or AzRelay 7-1-1 at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting.

Si necesita asistencia o traducción en español, favor de llamar al menos 48 horas antes de la reunión al (480) 644-2767.

* * * * *

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