

Mesa Council Chambers Lower Level – 57 E 1st St

Date: September 7, 2022 Time: 4:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair Alexis Wagner
Boardmember Adam Gunderson
Boardmember Chris Jones
Boardmember Heath Reed
Boardmember Ethel Hoffman
Boardmember Troy Glover

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Vice Chair Nicole Lynam

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

STAFF PRESENT:

Michelle Dahlke
Evan Balmer
Jennifer Merrill
Charlotte Bridges
Josh Grandlienard
Samantha Brannagan
Chloe Durfee Daniel
Alexis Jacobs

OTHERS PRESENT:

1 Call meeting to order.

Chair Wagner declared a quorum present and the Study Session was called to order at 5:00 p.m.

2 Staff Update: Principal Planner Evan Balmer introduced himself and the new Board Liaison and addressed some procedural changes that will be upcoming.

3 Review and discuss items listed on the Public Hearing agenda for September 7, 2022.

***3-a Staff member Chloe Durfee Daniel presented case BOA22-00501 to the Board.**

Staff member Chloe Durfee Daniel: Good evening, Board and Chair, this is BOA22-00501. This is a Special Use Permit request to exceed the height limit in the Light Industrial with the Council Use Permit zoning district to allow for the placement of a 65-foot wireless communication facility. The location is listed here on the map that you can see at 8946 East Germann Road and this is west of Ellsworth Road and north of Germann Road. The General Plan designation falls within Employment character area. This provides for a wide range of employment opportunities in high quality settings and the proposed wireless communication facility will help expand coverage to those who live and work in the area by complying with the intent of the character area and providing service to nearby populations. The zoning as we said is Light Industrial

City of Mesa - Board of Adjustment – September 7, 2022
Study Session Minutes

zoning with a Council Use Permit overlay. Telecommunication facilities are an allowed use and the maximum height in this zoning district is 40 feet, which is why they are requesting a Special Use Permit for that height increase. The height increase is permitted when meeting setback requirements from residential lots.

The design of this facility is a 65-foot-tall stealth broadleaf tree as shown here on the image. All equipment will be painted to match and they will be using antenna socks placed over each antenna to give the illusion that antennas are covered with leaves. Here's the photo simulation looking north onto the site the separation is from the wireless communication facility to another facility is over one thousand feet as required by code. And there's also a setback from residential as required by the height of the pole plus one foot. The tower will be over 430 feet from residential at minimum, and it is set back from the right of way over 100 feet. Here are the coverage maps: this one shows the before and if you'll look at the center of the map shown, it's the area that's currently shown in yellow with a pink call out title. Here's the coverage map after the fact. Per section 11-70-5.E, criteria for a Special Use Permit, the project will advance the goals and objectives of the General Plan and other city plans and our policies. The location, size, design and operating characteristics are consistent with the purposes of the district where it is located and conforms with the General Plan and any applicable city plans or policies. The project will not be injurious or detrimental to the surrounding properties, the neighborhood, or the general welfare of the city. And lastly, adequate public services public facilities and public infrastructure are available. In summary, staff finds that the project complies with the 2040 Mesa General Plan. It does meet the approval criteria listed in Section 11-70-5.E for a Special Use Permit. And it does comply with a section 11-35-5 for location design and operation requirements of wireless communication facilities. Overall, staff does recommend approval with conditions, and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Wagner: Thank you so much. Are there any questions tonight from the board?

Boardmember Reed: I do. Chloe, thank you for the presentation. I do have a couple of questions about this facility and trying to look for some of the answers within the applicant's response and documents and I wasn't able to find some of them, maybe you can help me out. Is the facility be co-locatable?

Staff member Chloe Durfee Daniel: Yes, sorry, that should be in the narrative. It does provide for co-location.

Boardmember Reed: Great. Do you know what the branch density of the tree is going to be?

Staff member Chloe Durfee Daniel: That would not be a question I know off the top of my head. Hopefully the applicant is available. I believe they said they would be attending online.

Boardmember Reed: The other question I have is about putting bark on the tree.

Staff member Chloe Durfee Daniel: I believe from everything that was said they are just painting equipment to match.

City of Mesa - Board of Adjustment – September 7, 2022
Study Session Minutes

Boardmember Reed: Okay. Does the City have any standards from a design standpoint of how the trunk was allowed? Because if you look at the photos, it looks like there's supposed to be some type of barking on it.

Staff member Chloe Durfee Daniel: From what I remember of the design preferences outlined in our code section 11-35-5.B, is just the preferences on what kind of facility it is. But that is something that if you would like to require, I'd be happy to include a condition of approval.

Boardmember Reed: It's not that big of a deal because of location, but it's something that I do look at. The other question I have is due to the proximity to the airport, does this tower have to be lit by FAA standards? Do we know?

Staff member Chloe Durfee Daniel: That it is not something I know at the moment. We do have conditions of approval due to its placement near the airport, but I'm not sure if it has to be lit and that is something that I would have to do further research on.

Boardmember Reed: Yeah, and that's something that the FAA would regulate not the City but that's something that I was hoping the applicant would be present to speak on.

Principal Planner Evan Balmer: Chair, Board member Reed, they are required to file with the FAA, as you mentioned, and go through that review process with the airport. If it is required, they wouldn't get building permits until the FAA has signed off so if it needs to be lit it would be lit, but it's really up to the FAA.

Staff member Chloe Durfee Daniel: Is the applicant online at the moment to answer any questions? If you want, I think they could possibly be attending later if you wanted to pull this but otherwise, I'm happy to change and conditions of approval if needed.

Boardmember Reed: Thank you.

Boardmember Hoffman: I have a question. It looks like it's on a site that's being developed. If the picture is accurate there and up to date, do you know if there's any requirement of having other trees to be planted in the area so that it kind of blends in instead of kind of being the lone soldier there?

Staff member Chloe Durfee Daniel: It should actually be part of your packet materials. There should be a landscape plan that was included as that is part of our code requirements to save as many of the surrounding trees and shrubbery in at least a four-foot area. And so, they are removing trees directly where this site is going, but they are keeping trees as close as possible. Also, there is a solid waste enclosure directly next to it and not conflicting with the site itself. But the landscape plan does include trees and shrubbery.

Board member Hoffman: Okay, thank you. Sorry, I missed that.

City of Mesa - Board of Adjustment – September 7, 2022
Study Session Minutes

Staff member Chloe Durfee Daniel: That was part of the original approval, and they're keeping that original landscape plan.

***3-b Staff member Jennifer Merrill presented case BOA22-00550 to the Board.**

Staff member Jennifer Merrill: Good afternoon, Chair, Boardmembers. This is case BOA22-00550. The request is for a Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit, a Special Use Permit and a Variance and it's to allow the remodel and expansion of an existing carwash. The location is at the southeast corner of Lindsay Road and McKellips Road. The General Plan character area for this site is split. The east part of it is Neighborhood. And the purpose of the Neighborhood character area is to provide safe places for people to live, as well as to provide a sense of place for the community. It's also within the Neighborhood Village character area and the purpose of the Neighborhood Village character area is to provide shopping and service needs for the nearby population. The existing zoning for this site is Limited Commercial or LC. And the Limited Commercial zoning district allows retail and service uses and those uses should serve residents within a 10-mile radius. It also allows for carwashes with the approval of a Special Use Permit.

Here's a photo looking southwest towards the site from McKellips Road. The immediate area that you're looking at is the expansion area of the carwash. This slide shows the overall site plan, and it has the site plan oriented with north towards the top of the screen. When we get into the details of the site, I'll be showing you site plans that are larger, but those site plans will be oriented with north facing the right side of the screen, but this shows the whole thing. You can see the carwash in the center and the existing retail building on the west side of the site. And on the east side you can see the area that's already paved, but they're proposing to expand that as the carwash use for the vacuum canopies. So, this site plan shows the Western parcel of the site with the existing commercial building, which contains the Vito's restaurant and then another office. This site plan shows the middle parcel and the eastern parcel. North is oriented to the right of the screen. It shows the existing carwash with the canopies, and the parking and at the bottom of the of the image there you see the vacuum spaces and the parking area.

The first request type is the Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit. And the purpose of the SCIP is to allow a site to be redeveloped and to comply substantially with the current code requirements. The carwash was approved a couple of decades ago, with some Variances that allowed some reductions to landscaping and reductions to setbacks. Those were along the north, west and south edges of the site. They're asking to continue those reductions for the eastern parcel. You can see in red and in orange, the reductions to the front setback and to the rear setback, and those extend onto that eastern parcel. They're also asking for some landscape reductions in the vacuum area for the carwash. And with the original Special Use Permit for the carwash, there were also reductions to landscaping. So, that's a continuation and it's considered as part of the SCIP request. Specifically, they're asking for zero trees to be provided in the vacuum area and the code requires, in addition to the standard landscaping, an additional 10% landscaped area for carwash facilities. And so, they're proposing zero trees and they're proposing to not add that additional 10% of landscaped area. There was a landscape plan provided for the eastern parcel, and it shows mostly existing landscaping on the site, but they are adding 44 new shrubs on the site, but no trees within the vacuum spaces.

City of Mesa - Board of Adjustment – September 7, 2022
Study Session Minutes

The requested Special Use Permit is for the eastern parcel. And you can see it outlined in red here. The carwash was permitted in the LC district with approval of the Special Use Permit for the area outlined in orange and the proposed area is in red. Finally, they're requesting a variance to the eastern edge of the property. The code requires a minimum 15-foot landscape setback adjacent to other properties that are not part of this development. The existing paving on that eastern parcel has an 11-foot setback and a five-foot two-inch setback adjacent to that east property line. The applicant is requesting permission to maintain those existing setbacks because of the existing paving on that property. There are some nearby examples of other sites that have similar minimal landscaping. The top photo is from the site and directly across the street. And the bottom photo is of the site directly next door and they both show pretty minimal landscaping.

For the SCIP, there are four criteria that need to be met in order to approve a SCIP. Significant alterations to the site would need to occur to bring the site into full conformance with current standards of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance. And that's true in this case, there would need to be some demolition of structures. Also, full compliance would discourage redevelopment of the site. This SCIP request does not include any new non-conforming conditions. And the proposed request is compatible with the adjacent properties and the neighborhood.

The Special Use Permit also has some review criteria. And those include the consistency with a General Plan. And this is consistent with the General Plan because it provides a sense of place and allows those existing buildings and businesses to be maintained there. Redevelopment and expansion of the carwash also conforms with the Neighborhood character area and the Limited Commercial zoning district. It will not be injurious or detrimental to the surrounding area and the site is already served by public services facilities and infrastructure.

The variance approval criteria are also met. The special circumstances that apply for this variance are that this site is located in an older area, and it fits in with its surroundings. There are special circumstances and they are pre-existing, strict compliance with the zoning ordinance would deprive the property of privileges enjoyed by the surrounding properties. And approval will not grant special privileges. In summary, the request complies with the General Plan. And it also complies with the criteria for a SCIP with a Special Use Permit and with a variance. Staff is recommending approval with conditions. And I'm happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

Chair Wagner: Thank you so much. Are there any questions from the Board?

Boardmember Hoffman: The area just east of the request for expansion; what is there currently?

Staff member Jennifer Merrill: Thank you Chair, Board member Hoffman. Next door to this site is also zoned Limited Commercial and it is a commercial use.

Boardmember Hoffman: Okay. I'm very familiar with this location. It's very close to where I live, and it's a very, very congested area already. I'm very concerned about making it even more congested by the

City of Mesa - Board of Adjustment – September 7, 2022
Study Session Minutes

expansion that's being asked for here. The new section where the variance is being requested to the east; how is that currently being used?

Staff member Jennifer Merrill: The Eastern parcel is currently being used by the carwash as parking. And the northern part of it is parking for the carwash and the southern part of it is parking for the restaurant and the office.

Boardmember Hoffman: Okay because I was just at this location within the week. And that area was being used for overflow parking for the restaurant. So, I don't know if they were leasing space from the carwash in the interim for that purpose. But it's very, very congested. That's a very busy intersection. And the drive going into the carwash coming off Lindsay Road, going east, it's immediately to your right. And it's very prone to accidents there. So, I'm little bit, I would like to hear from the, I don't know if the owners are going to participate. But I I'd like to know what assurances are being made to deal with that. Because currently there's not enough parking as it is in that area and traffic coming into the restaurant and into the carwash both are like butting heads already. And so, this seems to me to be making an already bad situation worse.

Boardmember Gunderson: Follow up question. Does the site already currently meet the parking requirements for the existing businesses that are there?

Staff member Jennifer Merrill: Chair and Board member Gunderson, this site, as calculated on the site plan, does meet the requirements. I also should add to address Board member Hoffman's concern, staff did ask the applicant for a reciprocal parking a shared parking agreement, and that was provided. So, it's going to be recorded.

Boardmember Hoffman: And were the businesses in the area asked for input into this potential change?

Staff member Jennifer Merrill: Chair, Board member Hoffman, the three parcels are owned by the same entity. The carwash and the restaurant, I haven't heard directly from the office owner, but my understanding is that those businesses are working together, if those are the businesses that you're referring to.

Boardmember Hoffman: Yeah, there's a State Farm Agency and that is part of that complex. There are some smaller businesses in there that are right across from the restaurant, all of which are to the immediate west of the carwash but like I said, it's always very congested in there and it's kind of hard to tell in the parking from where the restaurant parking ends and the carwash parking begins. And now, like I said, the carwash seems to be allowing spillover restaurant parking on their property, which I assume will go away now with this plan.

Staff member Jennifer Merrill: Chair, Board member Hoffman, that's actually not proposed to go away. The southern portion of that eastern parcel is to remain as shared parking with the restaurant.

Boardmember Hoffman: Okay, thank you for that.

City of Mesa - Board of Adjustment – September 7, 2022
Study Session Minutes

Chair Wagner: I see that 20 feet of the existing right away is also being deeded over in this, does that to help with the congestion area?

Staff member Jennifer Merrill: Chair, the northern 20 feet of the eastern parcel is required to be dedicated as right-of-way as part of the development of this parcel. This parcel has not been formally developed in the past. So that right-of-way had not been dedicated yet.

***3-c Staff member Charlotte Bridges presented case BOA22-00584 to the Board**

Staff member Charlotte Bridges: Chair, Boardmembers. This is case, BOA22-00584. It is a request for a Development Incentive Permit to allow for certain deviations from the development standards to construct a three-unit, multiple residents project. The site is located west of Country Club and north of Rio Salado on the south side of Eighth Place. The General Plan designation for site is Neighborhood character area, and the purpose of the Neighborhood character area is to provide safe places for people to live, feel secure in their surroundings and enjoy their neighborhood. It also allows for a variety of housing types. The zoning on the property is RM-3, Multiple Residence 3. This district allows a maximum density of 20 dwelling units per acre. The site is subject to the development standards for the RM-3 district. This project is proposing three dwelling units with a density of 12 dwelling units per acre, which would be permitted in the RM-3 district.

This is a photo of the site looking south across Eighth Place. You can see that there's multiple residence projects to the west and east, but directly to the south is a single-family residence. This Development Incentive Permit is requesting several deviations from code, including a reduced setback adjacent to the front property line, which is required to be 20 feet, and they're requesting eight feet. Also, a reduced setback along the east property line, which is required to be 30 feet, and they are requesting a little over 11 feet. Also, a reduced separation between the building itself and the canopy. Our code requires a 20-foot separation between the parking canopy and the building and they're essentially attaching it to the building in this case. Also, a minor reduction for the common open area that's located in the southeast corner of the property from 15 feet to just 14 feet-six inches. Then, a reduced parking lot island width for the one parking island in the site. They're normally required to be eight feet wide. And this one's about six feet eight inches wide. There's also a request to reduce the required landscape area width adjacent to the west property line. The width of this landscape yard varies. I can't remember the width at the top of the drive but it narrows down to about two foot six inches. Normally, this required landscape area would be 15 foot wide. Then, there's a similar request adjacent to the south property line. They're requesting the elimination this particular landscape yard and since the adjacent property is a single-family residence, the required landscape yard width is normally 20 feet and the request is for zero.

To qualify for a DIP, there are several criteria that have to be met. The total area of the site may not exceed five net acres and was created by the assembly of two or more individual contiguous parcels. So, this site is currently two lots. They will combine into one lot and the total of the one lot will be a quarter of an acre. The parcel is served by existing utilities. And the developable land area within 1,200 feet of the site is not more than 25% vacant, and more than half of the total number of lots and parcels have been developed over 15 years or more. The next slide gives you an idea of the developed area within 1,200 feet of the site.

City of Mesa - Board of Adjustment – September 7, 2022
Study Session Minutes

On the left is the 2005 historical aerial, and then on the right is the 2020 aerial. Essentially 90%, and probably closer to 100%, of the parcels are developed within this 1,200-foot area of this property. The approval criteria for a DIP requires that the proposed development is consistent with the General Plan and any other applicable Council adopted plans or policies. And then, the incentives do not allow the development to be more intense than the surrounding neighborhood and are commensurate with existing development within a 1,200-foot radius of the bypassed parcel or property. And then number three, the architectural elements construction and landscape materials used in the project and other site improvements of the proposed development meet the intent of the design standards of the ordinance. In summary, staff finds that this site complies with the 2040 Mesa General Plan. It meets the development criteria of the MZO, and the requested incentives comply with the DIP approval criteria of section 11-72-3 of the MZO. Staff is recommending approval with conditions. I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have.

Chair Wagner: Thank you so much. Are there any questions from the Board?

Boardmember Reed: I have one question. Was the neighborhood outreach, or neighborhood notifications or meeting held here? I mean, I know it's residential and everything. But was there any feedback and positivity?

Staff member Charlotte Bridges: Chair, Board members, the applicant is here, and she may be able to speak more directly to that question. This site has a companion zoning case, which does require that citizen participation process so they did have a virtual neighborhood meeting. This is Victoria Snively, the applicant.

Applicant Victoria Snively: We did schedule a virtual Zoom meeting, and nobody chose to participate. Nobody showed up. I have received one phone call with the concern that it was going to be a group home that attached to the one to the east. And it's not, so she was supportive of the project. And another phone call from a woman, actually she's called twice now, concerned about additional traffic in the area. So, she votes no. But those are the only comments I've received.

Staff member Charlotte Bridges: At this point, planning staff has not had any emails or phone calls about this project.

***3-d Staff member Samantha Brannagan presented case BOA22-00697 to the Board.**

Staff member Samantha Brannagan: Good evening, Chair and Board members, this is case BOA22-00697. The request is for a variance to exceed the maximum size of an accessory dwelling unit, which is 30% of the roof area of the primary residence. The purpose of the variance request is to build a larger accessory dwelling unit behind the primary residence. The location is south of East First Street and west of North Horne Street. The General Plan for this area is Neighborhood, which allows for safe places for people to live and enjoy their surrounding community with a wide range of housing options. The zoning district is Single Residence – 6, or RS-6, and the use of a residence is consistent with the existing zoning. Here the site plan shows the existing primary residence and the proposed accessory dwelling. Section 11-30-17 indicates that

City of Mesa - Board of Adjustment – September 7, 2022
Study Session Minutes

the maximum floor area for an accessory dwelling shall not exceed 30% of the primary residence. The primary residence is currently 1,350 square feet and the proposed accessory dwelling would be 968 square feet. That would be 72% of the primary residence as opposed to the maximum 30%.

The approval criteria for a variance are as follows: Number one, there are no special circumstances applicable to the property, size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings. This lot was created as part of a subdivision in 1947. Surrounding lots are of the same size and shape, they're rectangular. All of them exceed the 6,000 square foot minimum size for lots in that area and are surrounded by other residences in the RS-6 zone. Number two, special circumstances are not pre-existing and would be created by the property owner. The accessory dwelling has yet to be built and based on the size of the primary residence, the applicant would still be able to have an accessory dwelling unit of 405 square feet and meet that maximum 30% requirement. Number three, the strict application of the zoning ordinance will not deprive such property of privileges enjoyed by other property owners in the same zoning district. As I mentioned before, they were created under a previous subdivision in 1947 with all rectangular lots. They are all allowed the 30% accessory dwelling unit. And then number four, approval would grant special privileges for the applicant that are inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the area. Allowing this residence to exceed that 30% is not pre-existing and would grant a special privilege to the property owner as opposed to the rest of the owners in their area. And so, in summary, staff finds that this proposal does not comply with the Mesa 2040 General Plan and does not meet the variance criteria in Section 11-80-3 of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, the staff recommendation is denial and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Wagner: Thank you so much. Are there any questions tonight?

Boardmember Glover: My question surrounds the definition of an accessory dwelling unit versus an expansion of the primary residence. What's the distinguishing factor there? This looks like it's all attached to the residence.

Staff member Samantha Brannagan: Right. There are several factors regarding an accessory residence as opposed to say a garage with a living space or a garage with a bathroom. The difference for this accessory dwelling is that their proposal would encompass three bedrooms, a living room area and a full kitchen, including an oven, which does create a separate residence as opposed to just an addition to the house. They do have an option to add on to the house as opposed to building an accessory dwelling.

Boardmember Glover: So, in order for it to qualify as an addition they would have to eliminate the kitchen component and a bedroom or two. Is that being I understanding that correctly?

Staff member Samantha Brannagan: I believe so.

Principal Planner Evan Balmer: Chair, Boardmember Glover, if I could jump in really quick. So, the zoning ordinance has a definition for an accessory dwelling unit, which is a secondary dwelling unit attached or detached from the primary dwelling located on a single-residence lot with cooking areas equipped for appliances of 220-volt electric service natural gas and may function independently of the primary dwelling.

City of Mesa - Board of Adjustment – September 7, 2022
Study Session Minutes

So, if it was attached to the house and they needed some extra living space and bedrooms, things along those lines, and additional bathrooms, that could work. It's really the way that it's proposed is designed to kind of function independently as a separate living unit.

Boardmember Glover: Feels more like a multifamily kind of scenario almost. But we're calling that an accessory dwelling unit. Correct?

Principal Planner Evan Balmer: Correct. And so that's the reason why we've got two different standards for accessory structures that are limited to 50% of the roof area like garages, workshops, that sort of thing and accessory dwellings are capped at 30% to make sure it's really an accessory use to the primary dwelling so that we don't end up in a scenario where we have two equally sized dwellings.

Boardmember Glover: Wonderful. Thank you for the clarification.

Chair Wagner: I have a quick question. If it were to be done as a home expansion versus this additional accessory dwelling, that would still be too large, even if they took out everything that doesn't make it as an accessory dwelling.

Staff member Samantha Brannagan: So, if they added on to the residence, it would still be able to meet all the setbacks for that lot and would be considered an expansion. And we do have the applicant here for any questions as well.

Chair Wagner: So, we will still be doing the public hearing afterwards where you'll be able to present. But if we have any questions that you can clarify now, then we'll let you know.

Boardmember Reed: So, Mr. Balmer, I have a question for you. Is it more specific with the zoning because we are building these next homes, specifically in PAD areas? Is that the RS or is it more of a building code issue that's really limiting the separate kitchens, separate utilities, and stuff like that.

Principal Planner Evan Balmer: Thank you Chair, Board member Reed. It's a zoning ordinance requirement, and it applies to all zoning districts that allow accessory dwelling units and all have that same 30% threshold. So, it is not specific to the RS district. It's specific to all single-residence districts. Multiple Residence districts allow single residences, but you can also do duplexes and there's density requirements with the RM districts. So those are a little bit different. But RS-6, RS-7 all the way up to RS-43, they're all treated the same with that 30% maximum.

Boardmember Reed: Okay. Yeah, I mean, one of the reasons I was asking because I know there are some like multi-generational, those multi-family homes where you do have like a little mother-in-law suite where they do have some of those other appliances and stuff are in there.

Principal Planner Evan Balmer: And that's definitely something that you can do. It's just capped at that 30%. And sometimes when you get into the larger lots and larger homes, that 30% is a function of the primary dwelling so as the home gets bigger, that 30% for the ADU gets greater.

City of Mesa - Board of Adjustment – September 7, 2022
Study Session Minutes

Boardmember Reed: I was just trying to make sure there's the clear definition of why, you know, in certain areas or not, I just wanted to get that out. So, I appreciate it. Thank you.

***3-e Staff member Josh Grandlienard presented case BOA22-00764 to the Board.**

Staff member Josh Grandlienard: Thank you Chair, this is BOA22-00764. This is specifically for a Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit and it's for an existing business to allow for deviations to allow for the expansion of an office and personal services building. The site is located at 325 North Alma School. It's on the east side of Alma School, just south University, there is a laundry directly north of it, as well as a Jack in the Box just to the northeast. And then on the west side, you have the AT&T complex, overall, the General Plan designates this area as Neighborhood, which the intent is to not only provide for safe places live, but also to have those non-residential uses that support those residential uses. Office Commercial is the zoning for this site and allows for offices as well as personal services as an accessory, which this is in this case. Here's the current building looking west from North Alma School, you're basically at the location of the parking garage on AT&T site. So, the hatched in portion is the addition that they're proposing. The rest of the structure is existing. The existing setback on the northern property line is one foot seven inches to one foot three inches, where it's normally required to be 15 feet, the existing 10-foot setback from the Western property line where it is required to be 25 feet, and then the required parking on site, they have provided for four parking spots when typically, seven spots would be required for this use. As well as the existing foundation base is about five feet average, when 15 feet would be required for normal businesses of this size. And then landscaping of shrubs for 15 shrubs for 75 linear feet, is what you'll see on the landscape plan, which can't be seen clearly on this image, but they've been reduced just due to the awkward front edge of the existing building. The existing perimeter landscaping is only one foot three inches on the north side, because that is the only space between the neighboring property and existing building. They have provided for one tree and two shrubs per parking island when typically, one tree and three shrubs are required. So, the addition that is being proposed is for 336 square feet. As part of this SCIP, they are reconfiguring the parking area, which is currently unpaved and is just a dirt lot out there currently. And as part of this process, we're getting designated spots. I will say during the process, we they did have some normal parking spots that did meet the parking requirement, but they did not meet the two-way access requirement for driveway access. So, in order to make sure that no new nonconformities were created for that two-way access, that's why the parking has been reconfigured, and that is an existing nonconformity already on this site. Also, you'll see new pedestrian and vehicle connections, as well as that landscaping as I mentioned earlier within those parking areas. Here you can get a clearer image of those parking islands, as well as the landscaping. They certainly tried to fit as many shrubs as possible along the frontage of Alma School, but that is all the physical limitations of this site allow for without affecting the two-way access. So based off section 11-73-34, site specific requirements are needed to be met. Significant modifications to the site would need to occur to bring the site into full conformance, which would require the demolition of the existing building. Full compliance would discourage redevelopment of this site due to the nature of the existing buildings as well as the overall limitation of the size of the lot. No new non-conformities are being created by the new changes proposed on site. And the proposed request is compatible and not detrimental to the properties in the surrounding areas and neighborhood. Based off that, staff finds the proposal complies with 2040 General Plan, as well as meets the criteria within Chapter

City of Mesa - Board of Adjustment – September 7, 2022
Study Session Minutes

73 of the mesa zoning ordinance for a SCIP. The staff recommends approval conditions. I'm happy to answer any questions.

***3-f Case BOA22-00802 has been continued to October 5, 2022.**

4 Adjournment.

Boardmember Gunderson moved to adjourn the Study Session and was seconded by Boardmember Hoffman. Without objection, the Study Session was adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Evan Balmer

Evan Balmer,
On behalf of Zoning Administrator (Dr. Nana Appiah)