

# Planning and Zoning Board



## *Study Session Minutes*

Mesa City Council Chambers – Lower Level, 57 East 1<sup>st</sup> Street  
Date: September 14, Time: 3:00 p.m.

### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Jeff Crockett  
Shelly Allen \*  
Jessica Sarkissian  
Troy Peterson  
Jeff Pitcher  
Genesee Montes

### **MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Benjamin Ayers

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

### **STAFF PRESENT:**

Rachel Prelog  
Michelle Dahlke  
Evan Balmer  
Cassidy Welch  
Sean Pesek  
Joshua Grandlienard  
Sarah Staudinger  
Pamela Williams

### **OTHERS PRESENT:**

\* \* \* \* \*

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](http://www.mesaaz.gov)

**Call meeting to order.**

- 1 Chair Crockett declared a quorum present, and the meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m.**
- 2 Review items on the agenda for the September 14, 2022, regular Planning and Zoning Board Hearing.**

**Staffmember Cassidy Welch presented case ZON22-00431:**

This is a request to rezone the property from PEP-PAD with the Council Use Permit to RM- 5 PAD and Site Plan Review to allow for a multiple residence development. The site is currently located on the north side of Baseline Road on the west side of Sunview and west of Power Road. The General Plan designation for this property is Specialty with a Medical Campus subtype. So, the intent behind the Specialty Medical Campus character area designation is to provide large areas oriented around a single use. In this case it's for a medical educational campus. The General Plan also has an overarching goal to preserve prime employment land uses. When you look at the specifics for the Medical Campus subtype, there are primary and secondary zoning and land uses within the Medical Campus subtype. The primary land uses and zonings should be maintained at a minimum 80% of the total area. And the intent is to encourage development that's consistent with the goals, or the intent of that medical campus subtype. So, for this area, hospitals, medical offices, clinics, and hotels are all primary land uses, as well as zonings of NC, LC, GC, which are the primary commercial zoning districts and then PEP and light industrial, there are employment districts. Those are all intended to be under the primary classification. Once the minimum 80% of primary land uses and zoning has been developed, then the remaining 20% can be developed for secondary land uses and zonings. Those are supportive commercial and retail and then multiple residents. The zoning district that's permitted in the secondary classification is RM, for this request is specifically for an RM-5, so it's not one of the secondary land uses and zoning classifications per the Specialty Medical Campus character area.

When you look at the site overall, the Specialty character area accounts for approximately 254 acres, 71 acres of which is currently built and developed for those primary land use classifications. So, in staffs review, that minimum 80% has not been met, and therefore, in conjunction with RM-5 not being identified as a secondary land use, or zoning district, staff is unable to support the request. We did receive comments from Economic Development, those are included in the staff report provided to the board, they are also not in support. When you look at Chapter 5 of the General Plan, which is for creating and maintaining a stable job base, the primary goal is to preserve designated commercial and industrial areas for future job growth. And how the General Plan identifies that preservation is through the improvement of the job to housing ratio. So, when the Mesa 2040 General Plan was established in 2014, that job to housing ratio was .03, and while we've seen some significant growth in our commercial and industrial areas, we still want to make sure that we're continuing to preserve and maintain those areas for future growth. We can make sure that we're competitive with the surrounding cities and entities. And then it was found that, Multiple Residences identified as a primary land use in the Neighborhood General Plan designation, which accounts for approximately 75% of the total land area of the City of Mesa. And we found that there are other viable locations for this type of

development, that are also consistent with the surrounding area as well as the designated character General Plan character areas. This specific request is for a Multiple Residents 5 zoning district, the intent is to provide for areas of for a variety of housing. However, as I've stated that zoning is not consistent with the General Plan, nor is it compatible with the surrounding area.

The site it is currently vacant. As a part of this request, the applicant is requesting a Planned Area Development Overlay for certain modifications to the RM-5 development standards. Those include an increase to the maximum building height, an increase to the required setbacks, and then some modifications to the landscape yards, a modification to the parking ratio, and then a modification to the drive aisle setback. Staff has particular concerns with the reduction to the landscape setback so for multiple residence development adjacent to another non-single residence development, there's a requirement to have a 15-foot landscape setback. As a part of this proposed development, the applicant is requesting a reduction to 10 feet. And staff feels that the proposed reduction is going to lead to some incompatibility between uses, especially when you consider it in conjunction with consistency with the surrounding compatibility of the area and the General Plan designation, as well as a reduction to the parking ratio, which we've had conversations about before. Staff has concerns about reductions to parking area or parking ratios, particularly for multiple residence. And in this area, there's no proximity or connection to a bus, rapid transit line, or light rail station to support a reduction in that parking ratio. However, the applicant has provided a parking study that finds that their proposed parking ratio is consistent with their development.

So, the site plan is for 394 multiple residences units on four-story buildings. The site will be primarily accessed from Baseline Road with a secondary access off of Inverness to the north. And the applicant has provided a centralized amenity area with ground floor tandem, garage and covered parking stalls. The applicant just went to the Design Review Board yesterday evening for the proposed development. The Design Review Board was made aware of staffs concerns with the proposed development. But the purview of the Design Review Board is to look at the architectural design and the landscape design, and the design review board did not have any comments on the proposed elevations.

So, citizen participation, the applicant conducted a citizen participation process which included notification to property owners within 1000 feet, as well as HOAs, and registered neighborhoods. They held two neighborhood meetings with only one attendee. After the staff report was written, we did receive a letter of support from the AT Still University to the northeast, that has been included in your packet. So, in summary, we find that the proposed development does not comply with the 2040 Mesa General Plan Character Area designation of Specialty with the Medical Campus subtype. Nor does it meet the criteria for Chapter 22 for Planned Area Development overlay, and 69 for Site Plan Review, and therefore staff is recommending denial. And I'd be happy to answer any questions.

**Boardmember Sarkissian inquired:**

I was just wondering, because you were mentioning a couple of different things. Regarding the overall site, together are you seeing development? Are you seeing any applications or anything coming in for in this area? I mean, I'm just wondering, because I know, we've talked about projects on the east side of the north-south road there. But as far as like along here, are you seeing it because I know that that

was the one of the things you're talking about. It's not meeting the 71%. So, I was wondering, like, what kind of development are we seeing?

**Staffmember Cassidy Welch responded:**

There's a current request that's actually on the Planning and Zoning Board agenda this afternoon, but it has been continued to the September 28 hearing, for industrial development that will encompass approximately 54 acres to the north across Inverness.

**Boardmember Sarkissian inquired:**

And then, on the other side of Inverness, I can't tell is that the storage facility?

**Staffmember Cassidy Welch clarified:**

That is a UPS distribution facility.

**Conversation ensued and Staffmember Cassidy Welch clarified the location of adjacent sites.**

**Boardmember Sarkissian commented:**

I was just wondering if there was any comments from because I know we've been doing a lot of industrial stuff and a lot of employment. I was just wondering about saturation rates and stuff like that. If they had any comments about that, if they still feel that there's enough demand to fill this area kind of thing. I was just wondering. I don't know, I mean because it's at 28% right now, but there's obviously a lot left to be built. I was just wondering, because I know this area, I'm just saying this because over the past five years or whatever this area along by AT Still has felt like it has needed a lot of push. It's been a little difficult to get off the ground. You know, even it wasn't even AT Still originally. I don't believe that, or maybe it was but like this whole area has needed a lot more push. And I'm not sure. I'm kind of wondering about when that saturation of 71% would take hold.

**Assistant Director Rachel Prelog commented:**

Chair and board members Sarkissian. I don't know if I can really completely answer that question. But I will say in the staff report, there was a comment from Economic Development, and I'm not privy to the exact location of this, but they do mention that they see the potential for more healthcare and life science related sectors moving into the area because of a recent purchase by Stewart Health Care west of the site. And that's where, I'm not sure exactly where that site is, but they are seeing that there are more healthcare sort of uses going in that needs some supportive.

**Boardmember Sarkissian commented:**

Okay. Yeah. Being close to the 60.

**Board Member Peterson inquired:**

There's the land use issue that we've been talking about here a little bit, that's part of the staff denial recommendation, and then also site plan wise. The landscape buffer on the west side, right. Independent of land use, site plan, other than that issue, did staff have other significant issues on the site plan? The parking, maybe talk through those just so we know if they're two separate things, or if there's a lot of issues on both items.

**Staffmember Cassidy Welch responded:**

Chair, Boardmember Peterson, I think it's important to consider these together. So, the multiple residence land uses is really the primary concern from staff. And that's not what we're finding is consistent with the General Plan Character Area designation. And the surrounding area, as a part of the review, staff did work with the applicant to get to a site plan, to the best degree that we will be comfortable with, but our overarching concerns are with the strictly the use of multiple residence.

**Chair Crockett inquired:**

Cassidy, when I got a call from the applicant, they mentioned that there are some deed restrictions on the property that limit the types of uses that can be put on the property. Did staff look at that in connection with this application?

**Staffmember Cassidy Welch responded:**

So, the current zoning on the property is Planned Employment Park with a PAD overlay? And as a part of that there were some limitations on the land use. However, with this rezone, it would take it out of that previous PAD that was established in 2008.

**Chair Crockett added:**

Okay, and I'm talking though, about the actual deed that conveyed the property to the current owner. That it was represented to me that there are some limitations in the deed, for example, competing medical facilities couldn't be built on the property. If I understand that, right. Is that anything that was raised in your review of the application and discussions with the applicant, that was not a discussion? okay. And then it could you read to me again, the list of primary uses in this character designated area.

**Staffmember Cassidy Welch responded:**

So, hospitals, medical offices, clinics, supportive hotel, as well as the zoning designations of NC neighborhood commercial, LC, limited commercial, general commercial GC, planned employment park and light industrial.

**Boardmember Sarkissian inquired:**

Question. When was the original PAD?

**Staffmember Cassidy Welch responded:**

2008.

**Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard presented case ZON22-00247:**

This specifically is for Site Plan Review for a building industrial development that is located north of Germann, just west of the Haws Road alignment, that will in the future be developed. As you can see, it's approximately along that dashed line between the LI BIZ, and the AG NEO parcels. The specific General Plan designation on the site is Employment, which is for a wide variety of employment opportunities, which this development, helped to bring partners this area. The existing zoning on the site is for Limited Industrial, where office and warehouse uses are permitted. Overall, here's the site

photo looking northwest from Germann Road, as you can tell just the existing U haul facilities, just to the east, and then this parcel is currently vacant.

Overall, here's the site plan for buildings one and two, for industrial buildings, a pedestrian path that connects to German in order to provide that connectivity, as well as access Germann as well as a screen parking for the trucks space in the back. And that's consistent with buildings three and four that are located just north of buildings one and two. Since this is more of a longer parcel, rather than wider. It went to Design Review last night. I was there for that as well. Its Design Review Board was in support in general, they just had some small minor tweaks that aren't going to affect the site plan, just some minor elevation tweaks.

Based off of the citizen participation that was conducted on this property, there's some general comments about traffic, most likely just due to the influx about trucks in that area compared to what currently is, and just some general concerns with that. But based off of that staff finds that the overall project complies with the 2040 General Plan, complies with Chapter 69 of the MZO for site plan review. Staff recommends approval with conditions.

**Boardmember Pitcher inquired:**

Is there a drive? What's this drive on the right side?

**Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard responded:**

Sure. So that's the existing access for a U haul. And I believe in the initial discussions, it looks like they have a shared access. It's just not on their site specifically. There's a cross access agreement for that.

**Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard presented case ZON22-00603:**

This specifically is for a Site Plan Review to allow for industrial buildings within the Industrial Logistics Center for Eastmark. This specifically is located on the south of East Elliot, west of Everton Terrace. And as you can see, just to give you a little context, I believe you have some industrial already occurring in this area. This is the photo looking south into the site from Elliot Road. Overall, the General Plan destination for this site is Mixed Use Community, as part of this is supposed to be a mix of employment, office, retail, medical, as well as a number of other employment opportunities in order to provide a mix of uses. As part of this, this was originally developed as part of a master plan. At that time, this area was designated as industrial center, more for industrial uses. So that is consistent both with the General Plan, but also the Eastmark Plan Community Plan. Again, this is within the planned community for Eastmark. So, this is specifically within Development Unit Plan 5-6 South, and as part of this the use is permitted within that district.

Here's the overall site plan, its three buildings. There is a cross dock, but those are being shielded with two existing industrial buildings, in order to help shield kind of the industrial business and truck bays that are existing on that side, in order to kind of help shield the existing truck court or proposed court rather. And so, there'll be access from Eastmark, as well as Everton, and then as well as an initial access off of East Elliot. Overall, here's landscape plan. It's a rather large landscape plan, so I'm not going to go into too much detail. I do believe this has been read approved by the Design Review Committee for Eastmark. If not, I am in constant contact with them and will finalize that in the coming

days. As part of this, the letters were mailed out to property owners within 1000 feet of the neighborhood, and at the time of this meeting I have not received any comments of any kind of concerned citizens on this project. Based off that staff finds that the project complies with 2040 Mesa General Plan, complies with Eastmark Development Unit Plan 5-6 South, as well as the Community Plan for Eastmark, and then meets the review criteria for Site Plan Review under Section 11-F-69, and 5 of the MZO. Staff recommends approval conditions.

**Boardmember Pitcher inquired:**

You mentioned cross docking, just explain kind of what that is. I mean, when I see cross docking that limits what kind of uses these kinds of properties can be.

**Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard responded:**

Yeah, so specifically the cross-dock facility is going to be building B. Typically, this is more for logistics use and things of that nature. I'm not totally sure, the end user on that one. But I certainly understand that it's most likely going to be logistics of focus. But buildings A and C, I believe we're going to move more industrial warehouse kind of focus as well.

**Chair Crockett inquired:**

And if I could follow up on that, Josh, what we've tried to keep our cross-dock buildings located south of the Gateway Airport. Why is this an exception to what we've tried to do there?

**Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard responded:**

Sure. So certainly, as part of the Eastmark Community Plan, it does give them a little more leeway than we would normally have in other areas of the City. This specifically was already in the review process prior to us kind of establishing the location for these cross-dock facilities. So, because we didn't have those initial limitations, we felt that in order to prevent the oversaturation of other areas, we need to incorporate some of the ones that were already under review prior to that kind of designation taking place for trying to locate themselves with Gateway Airport.

**Chair Crockett added:**

But so, what impact, you'd said that cross dock facilities are typically distribution centers, does that then sort of mean that the buildings A and C are going to wind up being distribution as well, because the middle building is distribution, likely?

**Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard responded:**

Just because one of the users is going to be more focused on that area, doesn't mean that it's going to have forced the other buildings into that. As long as there's not any kind of conflicts in terms of truck movements and things of that nature, in the back of house. I think realistically, as long as you have an industrial product, or something similar use, that can be supportive of that use and not be impacted. I think that could still be maintained. But at the end of the day, we have limited control over which individual users, if they're allowed by right.

**Chair Crockett commented:**

Okay, I just I know I'm a broken record on this. But that Elliot Technology Corridor is very important to Mesa and I just I don't love the idea of a cross dock facility on Elliot Road, even if it's screened by buildings to the north and the south.

**Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard responded:**

I certainly understand that. But you know, in order to allow for us to focus more for specific users, such as data centers, or things of that nature long the Tech Corridor, this specifically is not within that Tech Corridor. This is the in the Eastmark Community Plan, so in order to maintain that kind of separation, kind of the intent for the Tech Corridor, and make sure that that is protected, we have to give a couple other areas.

**Chair Crockett added:**

Okay. And do you feel like you feel like you're sort of compelled to approve this because of the Eastmark Development Plan?

**Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard responded:**

It's allowed by right within Eastmark Community Plan. So, there's not much I could say, in order to prevent.

**Boardmember Allen inquired:**

I had a question. Where is this going into because Everton Terrace is pretty small.

**Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard responded:**

So, there's the existing driveway in here off of Elliot, and then the proposed entries off of Everton Terrace would be located here and here. Okay. And then on the other side, on Eastmark Parkway, it would be mirrored on the other side, as well just consistent in order to keep kind of along that x axis of the truck cars.

**Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard presented case ZON21-00080:**

This specifically is for a Rezone, Site Plan, and Council Use Permit, to allow for an RV and boat storage. This specifically is a unique site. It is located south of Thomas, east of Higley. It is on the north side of the Red Mountain Loop 202, just give you a little context of history on this site. As you can tell from the aerial, there is a large drainage channel that occurs just south of this. This parcel was originally a remnant parcel from when they're doing the design and has element of the Loop 202. Once the drainage and related infrastructure was built in place, the DOD felt like they could sell this parcel in order to have it a better use than just have it as plain right of way that is being unused. As part of this, the initial grading for Thomas is much higher than the rest of the property. Because of this elevation change, there is a significant kind of dip that kind of helps to shield, just to kind of give context on this site specifically. So, here's the site looking southwest from Thomas, you can see the initial berm that was created when they did, basically moving the earthwork forward that Loop 202 is a little higher up, as you can tell from that berm.

Overall, the destination on the site is Employment as part of that, is provided for a wide variety of employment uses and high-quality settings. The proposed rezone involves changing the recently



existing zoning of RS-90 to Light Industrial with a Planned Area Development overlay. This use specifically is allowed with the Council Use Permit in the LI district. Overall, the site plan, the structure that is being provided on site, which will house the leasing office, as well as general quarters for any staff on site is going to be located on east side. As part of this, they also did a landscape plan that does increase the amount of buffer along Thomas. And as part of the comments, last night at Design Review, there was comments that were heard, felt like the Design Review mentioned to move or extend the landscape to the west. I'll work with city staff because that is our own right of way. And we're happy to incorporate that as part of the design. But just wanted to provide that to you as part of those comments from Design Review last night. The PAD itself, is requesting a modification to allow for an 8-foot wall in the front yard. Typically, on the side that you'd have a three-and-a-half-foot wall requirement, or a max foot height of six. So, in order to help screen the proposed RVs, and related boats, we want to make sure the screening was high enough to shield those, as well as making sure that any outdoor storage, because of the increased height of the walls would not have any setback other than to make sure safe use of the RVs and boats. Specifically on the site plan, it's kind of hard to tell, but just south of this, of the cul de sac and kind of in that area, there's only a five-foot buffer, I'll try to highlight it over here, five feet instead of typical 30. But because of the extended right of way from the 202 on ramp itself, that is going to help to shield it more than usual. So that's why staff is consistent with the proposal of that five-foot reduction. So again, here's the landscape plan. So, the enhanced landscaping that DPS did to extend was on that northern portion. And as you can see, it kind of tapers off and just trying to blend that taper, and with the existing right of way. Based off that, again, it was presented to DRB last night with that minor comment, mainly just focusing on that landscaping, not anything that would affect the buildings themselves. And as part of this staff, are members of the applicant team sent out letters to HOAs, and neighbors within 1000 feet. And as of this meeting, I've not received any comments on those. So based off that staff finds that the overall plan complies with the 2040 Mesa General Plan, complies with review criteria for Chapter 22 for a PAD overlay, as well as within 11- 69-5 for Site Plan review, and Staff recommends approval of conditions.

**Boardmember Pitcher inquired:**

Shielding this, and shielding that, are we shielding the 202? Because that's not necessarily a nice view of Mesa looking at both storage.

**Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard responded:**

Yeah, so certainly as part of kind of the DRB comments last night, our landscape kind of expert on the DRB did recommend incorporating some either palo verde, or mesquite trees within that seed mix along that southern portion of the 202 in order to keep it more of a natural desert look, as well as it helps shield the proposed RV storage facility, and in conjunction with the eight-foot walls, that they would have on that site.

**Chair Crockett commented:**

So, if I could just follow up on that point, Josh. So, along the 202 south side of this project, there's going to be an eight-foot wall along there. That is correct. Okay, and I mean, RVs are taller than eight feet, right? So, you'll still, you'd still be able to see RVs over the wall as you're driving along the 202.

**Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard responded:**

Theoretically, you might be able to see the tops of them. But because of the depression and kind of the overall height of the 202, at that segment, it's going to be rather difficult to see, you might be able to see it for a moment or two, but because of kind of the elevation changes, it's a little difficult.

**Chair Crockett added:**

To see because this is down in a bit of a bowl. Is that right?

**Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard responded:**

That is correct. So, it is depressed.

**Boardmember Peterson inquired:**

And frankly, I think the sightlines off of Higley Road are worse because they are up about 10 feet right than this site. So, looking down from the west side on Higley Road, go back to the landscape plan. So, there's a lot of on the west side and on the south side, a lot of regrading and vegetation going on. You said the west side is City of Mesa right of way?

**Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard responded:**

That is correct. And that south is an ADOT right away, though, that is correct.

**Boardmember Peterson inquired:**

Okay. So as all that is on board with doing this?

**Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard responded:**

Yes, based off the letters and contacts from the applicant, ADOT doesn't have an issue with the proposal, and doesn't feel like it's impacting their right of way or their drainage system. And they'll give these months to do the work that needs to be done.

**Conversation ensued and Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard responded:**

And that's why it was requested last night for staff to understand the seed mix and try to incorporate a little more natural desert functions rather than just something that would have been hydro seeded for two years, and then lose grass over time when it's not maintained. It also has an eight-foot wall around the whole facility.

**Chair Crockett inquired:**

So, Josh, I have one more one more question on the palo verde trees and landscaping. So south of this facility on the south side of the wall, that's where the trees are going to be planted?

**Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard responded:**

It'd be as part of the seed mix for the overall kind of portion on there. So, they're not going to be exact, we obviously can't formally place when the seeds get distributed, and things of that nature. But the intent is to have more of a natural look, rather than something that's augmented like, or kind of just kind of designed like the one on Thomas, in order to help blend it in. And people just see it as natural desert.

**Chair Crockett inquired:**

That's kind of a little unfamiliar to me. So, you talked about a seed mix, is this the seeds that get sprayed out? And they have different trees and vegetation that grow from those? So, they're not planning box trees along there? Is that right? And from that seed mix, you can actually get trees, it'll grow large?

**Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard responded:**

Landscape Architects have reassured me that you could do that. So, I certainly take their expertise, they stamp it, so I trust them. And I believe there might be some minor, you know, incidental irrigation from the drainage flows. But it'd been from all the natural wash and things of that nature.

**Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard presented case ZON21-00995:**

This is for a Rezone from LA-PAD to LI-PAD-BIZ, and a Site Plan Review. This is for a two-building industrial development. This specifically is located west of Ellsworth on the south side of Pecos. Specifically on the west side of 89th Place. Here's the site looking southwest from Pecos Road and on the right, as you could tell, it's already existing lot within the Gateway Airport Commerce Park. The specific request since this is an existing PAD, they're asking request within that PAD and deviations from that. The specific request for roof articulation is to have a one foot rather than a two foot, or 1/10 required to have a CMU that exceeds 50% of the materials, as well as truck loading and overhangs can be at the front, not facing the street, as well as parking lot. They went for a specific parking based off their use, which is 25 public facing to any kind of person interested in utilizing the business, while 20 are reserved for staff and members of fleet vehicles. The required landscaping has also been reduced from 15 to five along the west property line, which is existing industrial while you have a 12-foot foundation base rather than the 15-foot-long exterior walls based off of the overall metal. Designed with metal canopies, unique configurations of the CMU blocks as well stucco, staff feels that this is a superior design that helps to justify the request. There's two buildings specifically building A on the north side with Building B on the south side, that access from a central drive aisle. They do include overhead doors as part of within that drive aisle. I find that these uses are more for the smaller industrial firms in order to kind of be a starting place, or at least someplace they can have some kind of storage specifically with the overhead doors, as well as having a small office to operate out of it. Also, as part of the overall design of this facility, they have provided for outdoor seating areas that give some open space for employees to enjoy the weather, when it's nice like it is today.

Overall, here's some elevations for building A. Certainly they have come a long way from what I initially saw and based off the recommendations, I believe the DRB has already approved this either last month or the month before. So certainly, it has their approval and at this point is going through P&Z. And building B is almost mirrored, on but just flipped on the south side of the site. Overall, letters were mailed to property owners within 1000 feet, we did receive contact from neighboring property owners concerned about the parking and driveways. As part of that, that was initial part of the phase. And then we helped to basically improve the design in order to get a spot that we felt helped to mitigate those concerns as best as we could, as well as receiving contact from the overall Gateway Commerce Park just letting us know about their overall support of the project. Overall, staff finds that the site plan complies with the 2040 General Plan, Chapters 69 for Site Plan Review, and meets the criteria for a BIZ, within Section 11-21 of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance, therefore Staff recommends approval of conditions.

**Boardmember Allen inquired:**

I have one, and just for clarification for my own benefit here, the overhead doors you said are on the interior basically between the two buildings. That is correct, right. Okay, so are those doors large I mean, then look like it's large enough for a huge semi to get in there, may be a short box truck but not a long one. This is more for a smaller type of a use instead those big, long semis, right?

**Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard responded:**

Yeah, I have the elevations pulled up on screen right now, it looks like the canopies at 10. That looks like it might be a foot lower than the top of that overhead door. So, at most, I would say 12 feet, but realistically probably a 10-foot clear height.

**Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard presented case ZON22-00607:**

This request is for a Rezone, Preliminary Plat and Site Plan Review. Also, there's an accompanying annexation case with this. And I'll get in a little further detail about the annexation because it's a little bit more unique. But this specifically is for an overall industrial development. Overall, here's the site. It is north of Elliot, east of Sossaman, is on the west side of 80th. Just located south and east is the Hawes Crossing overall Development Master Plan community. So as part of that, just give you a little context, here's the current site looking north from Elliot Road. Also, the General Plan destination on this site is Mixed Use Activity, as well as Employment. This one fits more under the employment sector, specifically for providing a high-quality employment opportunity that does provide for multiple different opportunities within that. The specific rezone is for a farm AG and Limited Commercial to Light Industrial with a PAD. It is hard to tell on this map, but I'll try to point it out as best I can. There is a small, I believe it's about 10 feet strip along the southern portion that is currently within the jurisdiction of Maricopa County. So that is the part of the annexation. It's about 0.5 acres for the whole length of that. It's kind of it's a remnant of when we annex the Elliot Road right of way. So as part of that, we're making sure we go in and annex that so we can make sure we have jurisdiction over the portion of the land. So specifically, as allowed within the LI District by right.

Overall, here's the site plan for all eight structures. You have 80th on the east side, and Elliot on the south, you have most of the truck courts located interior. For those that were would be able to be seen from Elliot, those have been screened by buildings, specifically buildings six help screen the truck base for one and four, and then eight for building five. The overall modifications for this site is to provide a maximum building height due to the proposed articulation, as well as making sure we have the necessary clear height for any manufacturing uses. For any capital investments, they might have to put inside these buildings, as well as a reduction to the parking to help provide for one space per 600 for the whole development rather than based off of our shell industrial parking based off the landscape plan.

Again, this had very minor comments last night at DRB. Mainly just kind of trying to shield a few items, but nothing that's going to impact site plan. And, again, just reiterating it was just minor comments on the elevations. This was an older version of the elevation. So, I just want to make it clear that the chevron or the argyle, kind of look to it as not going to be carried forward. They have replaced those with more of a standard form liner look that we feel was more consistent with the neighborhood, as well

as kind of is more aesthetically pleasing. As part of that staff has mailed, mailed out letters to property owners within 1000 feet, as well as HOAs, and registered neighborhoods at this time have not received any comments on this property. Based off that staff finds the overall site complies with 2040 Mesa General Plan, the criteria for a PAD within Chapter 22 of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance, as well as Site Plan Review within Chapter 69 of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, Staff recommends approval with conditions.

**Boardmember Pitcher inquired:**

Looks like this one you got for the buildings of cross dock, right.

**Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard responded:**

No. So none of these buildings cross dock because there's not docks on both sides. It's only on one side.

**Staffmember Cassidy Welch presented case ZON22-00669:**

So, this is a request to Rezone a property from RS-35 to Public, Semi-Public with a Planned Area Development overlay and Site Plan Review to allow for a development of a public safety facility. The site is located north of Brown Road on the east side of Power Road. The General Plan designation for the property is Neighborhood. So, the intent behind the Neighborhood character areas to provide a safe place for people to live feel secure and enjoy their enjoy their surrounding community. And the proposed development is consistent with the General Plan. So, the request is for a rezone to Public Semi-Public. So public safety facilities such as fire stations and police substations are a permitted use in the Public Semi-Public zoning. Here you can see an existing photo of the site it is currently vacant. So, the site plan is for one large scale building at approximately 50,000 square feet with secured police and fire vehicle parking in the rear, on the east side of the lot. The primary access to the site will be from Power Road. At the time that the staff report and the PowerPoint were prepared and the site plan was prepared, there was a secondary emergency egress access to the east to the adjacent Grenada Road. We have heard from the applicant, is the City of Mesa Engineering Department that based off of concerns from surrounding developments, particularly the residents that are immediately adjacent to the east, that they will be removing that access to Grenada and closing that off. So that space will be filled in with landscaping and that will come through at a separate Administrative Site Plan Modification, at a later day.

Because this site is a City project, it has to go to Design Review Board twice, once for comments and recommendations, and second for action. So, the applicant attended both the Design Review Board work sessions in August and September. Just yesterday evening, the Design Review Board voted approval of the proposed elevations. You can see those elevations here. As a part of the rezone process, the applicant did conduct a citizen participation outreach, which included property owners within 1000 feet, as well as HOAs, and registered neighborhoods. They also conducted outreach prior to the formal submittal, including the property owners immediately adjacent to this site. There were two neighbors that attended the Design Review Board work session during the August hearing. Their concerns were over the use of the police and fire station, as well as that access off of Grenada and the applicant has worked with those two property owners who attended and came to some resolution. We also heard from one applicant from a neighborhood from a resident who's outside of the 1000 foot

distance but was within the registered neighborhood a list and they had concerns about not being notified of the Design Review Board. The applicant record rectified that with the second Design Review Board and made sure that all HOAs, and registered neighborhoods were notified for that second Design Review Board work session. In summary, we find that the proposed development complies with the 2040 Mesa General Plan, and meets the criteria for Site Plan Review, and Planned Area Development overlay and staff is recommending approval with conditions.

**Boardmember Peterson inquired:**

Explain if you would go back to the site plan, the north side of the project it shows there's nothing there and it says purported roadway, but it doesn't go anywhere and there's no landscaping or anything. What's how's that being treated?

**Staffmember Cassidy Welch clarified:**

That is an SRP easement, they are currently 12 KV volt power lines, overhead power lines within that SRP easement. So, the applicant has worked extensively with SRP, and SRP indicated that they did not want any landscaping in that area. Because of those overhead lines, as well as needing access to maintenance of those lines. The applicant is going to work with both of the property owners on the north and south side of Grenada to as well as the City of Mesa Transportation Department to find some resolution on how that will dead end.

**Staffmember Sean Pesek presented case ZON22-00677:**

The request is Site Plan Modification, as to allow for development of industrial building. The location is north of McDowell, west of Greenfield. It's actually within the Industrial Common Subdivision Falcon, I believe it which was approved in the late 90s. It's been here for quite some time. There are a few lots that have yet to be developed. This is one of them. This is looking towards the site from Norwalk. The character area is Employment. It supports employment type uses and LI supported, as well as office and warehouse uses. The zoning is LI with a PAD overlay. And like I said that PAD overlay was established in the late 90s. In the proposed uses, are allowed in the district. The site plan in a fairly small building 3300 square feet, there's 786 square feet of office on the second floor, there's a single drive for from Oasis circle, and seven, sorry, eight parking spaces are provided. And seven are required for Mesa Zoning Ordinance. The site plan modification is for building area. This was previously approved in 2019 as an Admin case, and that floor area was for 532 square feet. And again, the proposed is over 3600 square feet and that's a 10% or greater increase. And that's why we're here for this major modification. The landscape plan was reviewed last night at the work session, no comments on the plant palette and landscape design. The elevations were also reviewed, and the Board and the Design Review Board had no comments.

So, a letter was mailed to 1000 feet, and HOAs, and there was also a public notice letter mailed to all property owners within 500 feet. And no response to the applicant and staff didn't receive any responses as well. So, in summary, this request complies with the 2040 Mesa General Plan, and meets the review criteria for Site Plan and 11-69- 5 and our recommendation is approval with conditions.

**Staffmember Sean Pesek presented case ZON22-00682:**

This is a request to Rezone from an LI to LI PAD, as well as a Council Use Permit and Site Plan Review. And this is to allow for the expansion of an existing RV and boat storage facility, as well as mini storage. That location is west of the future Hawes Crossing, the east side of Sossaman Road, south of Elliot, as shown on the vicinity map. You can see the existing RV boat storage facility just south. This is looking east from Sossaman Road, a previous use. The existing zoning is Light Industrial, this is permitted in that district with approval of a Council Use Permit. The existing RV boat storage facility, to my knowledge never received the permit. It was approved in 2018, and at that time, we didn't require a Council Use Permit for this type of use. But we do now, and that's why we're here for this expansion. The General Plan is Mixed Use Activity and Employment, and that character area is intended to provide for a wide range of employment opportunities. I know this isn't an employment opportunity per se, but primary uses do include outdoor storage, which you could say is storage in RV and boat storage. So, with that we think that it complies with the General Plan, the site plan so the three new storage buildings, I'll point them out here. Actually, let me just say everything in green is existing, and then everything in blue is proposed. There's a portion just south of existing phase one. This is one of the rows of detached garages. The other one is along Sossaman Road. And then the third is along the east property line and then everything in between here, I believe are parking canopies for the RVs and boats. So, the detached garages will total 47,000 square feet and the canopy structures will total just under 180,000 square feet. And the property owner will utilize the existing driveway on Sossaman Road so there won't be a second driveway added. And then four additional parking spaces will be added in phase two, shown in blue. The landscape plan was reviewed last night and the applicant will be using the same plant palette that was used for the existing RV boat storage facilities. So just maintaining that as we go north along the road, and then having the same tree and shrub species along the perimeter of the site just to have consistency.

There is a PAD request with the Site Plan and rezone. And that's to reduce the setback from along the south property line. And that's adjacent to residential zoning, and that's from 22 feet to five feet. And the justification here is that although the adjacent zoning is residential, there is actually a recycling facility in Maricopa County. So that's a justification for that. The Council Use Permit, I just wanted to include the criteria here, talks about advancing the goals of the General Plan. The location, size, and operating characteristics need to be consistent with the district and conform with the General Plan, and other plans and policies adopted by the City. The use can't be detrimental to the adjacent surrounding properties and improvements. And then the property needs to be served by public services and public facilities. All of these criteria have to have been met. This is a pretty minor expansion to the existing boat storage facility. And I will say that I spoke with the applicant beforehand. Apparently, within a couple of months, all of the storage units were rented. So, Design Review, the Board reviewed the elevations to the detached garages last night and the parking canopies, and no comments were made on the on the building and landscape design. A letter was mailed to all property owners within 1000 feet, and HOAs, and registered neighborhoods within a mile, and no comments were received from interested parties. So, in summary, the request complies with the General Plan, Chapter 22 for PAD Overlay, criteria for Council Use Permit, and then meets the review criteria for Site Plan Review. And the recommendation is approval with conditions. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

**Chair Crockett inquired:**

What is going in across the street to the west of this facility? Well, on the west side of Sossaman.

**Staffmember Sean Pesek responded:**

It's Maricopa County. I don't know if the City's annexing that land and developing it. I know to the east is Hawes Crossing.

**Chair Crockett inquired:**

So, we just we talked about an RV storage facility earlier, in terms of the quality of construction on these to make sure they look nice. I mean, what kinds of things does the City look for? And did you find that in this project?

**Staffmember Sean Pesek responded:**

Good question. So last night, several Boardmembers pointed out that the west facade of building, that's the largest length of detached garage, they wanted to make sure that there was some articulation provided on that side, just because that addresses Sossaman Road. But other than that, a majority is taken up by these parking canopies, which I don't include an image of in the PowerPoint. I think they're included in the packet. But it's hard to make it look visually appealing when it's an RV, boat storage facility. But I think the applicant did a good job with the elevations. And they were well received by the Design Review Board

**Chair Crockett inquired:**

Will the canopies be shielded by the building on Sossaman to a certain extent, I mean, if should drive down Sossaman you'll see the building. But to the east of that. I mean, will we see the canopies?

**Staffmember Sean Pesek responded:**

To a certain extent along this north side, you might be able to see when you're coming south on Sossaman Road. I'm not sure if there's a perimeter wall along the north property line, but there are some trees there.

**Chair Crockett added:**

But the recycling facility is north of this correct?

**Staffmember Sean Pesek responded:**

It's to the south.

**Staffmember Sean Pesek presented case ZON22-00924:**

This request is a rezone from RSL 4.0 -PAD to RSL 4.0 -PAD- PAD. So, we're adding a second PAD overlay and the purpose of this rezone is to reduce the minimum lot depth for RSL 4.0 lots within parcel of Hawes Crossing Village 2. So that's shown here it's outlined in blue and the reason for that, during our review of the final plat, or replat of parcel A, we noticed there were 10 lots that didn't meet the minimum lot depth for RSL 4.0 So we need we needed to add a second PAD overlay to reduce the minimum lot depth and that will allow these 10 lots outlined in red.

**Chair Crockett added:**



So just to jump in quickly, does that mean this is correcting a technical issue? I mean, is this what's the status of the subdivision today?

**Staffmember Sean Pesek responded:**

Chair Crockett, so the status right now is the master plat. The master plan was approved by City Council a few weeks ago, and that master plat identified the development parcels within Village 2, so you can see parcel A. The other parcels aren't shown. It's not showing the subdivided lots, it's just showing the development parcels and then the main arterial roads. After that master plat is approved and it has been approved the developer, Taylor Morrison will come in with replats of each parcel. Replat of parcel is the first one that we received, and that's showing the individual lots in the internal roadways. And during our review of that replat, we noticed that these 10 lots were 75-foot, they had depths of 75 feet and the code requires a minimum depth of 80 feet. So, the solution of course, would be to just increase the depth but at that point, they were already far in their construction permits. They weren't approved, but they were pretty far in the review of the construction permits. So, their solution was to just add a second PAD overlay for parcel A, only to increase the depth from 75 to

**Chair Crockett added:**

I think we're going have some questions, but we kind of jumped in so I'll let you go ahead and continue and then we'll get to questions.

**Staffmember Sean Pesek:**

The location is west of Hawes Road again, it's within parcel A of Hawes Crossing Village, this is looking towards the site from Elliot Road. The zoning right now, parcel A, part of it is RSL 2.5 PAD, in part and most of it is RSL 4.0 PAD. And again, their proposed change is just for RSL 4.0 PAD, next to add another PAD overlay that's within the boundary of parcel A. The General Plan for Hawes Crossing Village 2 is Neighborhood. And the purpose is to provide safe places for people to live, that use won't change with this request. So overall, the request complies with the General Plan. It's also within the Gateway Strategic Development Plan and the Inner Loop District use hasn't changed here. So, the request complies with that Strategic Plan as well. And here's the proposed PAD. The minimum per code is 85 feet, and they are requesting a reduction to 75 feet. And so those 10 lots that I showed in red were submitted with 75-foot depths. A letter was mailed to all property owners within 1000 feet and there was no comment received from interested parties. Our recommendation is approval with conditions and happy to answer additional questions.

**Staffmember Sean Pesek presented case ZON22-00896**

The location is east of Mesa Drive, east of Mesa Drive south of Main Street. This is the Grove on Main Apartment Development. And this is an image of it looking southeast from Main Street. The General Plan character area designation is Neighborhood Transit District and Station Area, and it's also within the Temple Pioneer Park Neighborhood Planning Area. The zoning is a Transit T5 Main Street Flex. And the purpose is to provide a transition between residential and commercial through a mixture of ground floor uses, which the Grove does have. So, this request is just a pre plat. It's a condominium plat and it's to identify areas for the condominium ownership. So that includes the pedestrian areas, some landscaping, and then the pool area. This was a snippet of the plat that was in the packet. The site plan was originally approved in 2018 with a zoning clearance case. And staff finds that the request

complies with the 2040 General Plan, and the Subdivision regs, and the recommendation is approval with conditions

**Chair Crockett inquired:**

There was a condominium plat that was approved in 2001 that had a one-year expiration. So, I was wondering if we were back in because that that condominium plat expired by the passage of time. And now we're redoing it.

**Staffmember Sean Pesek responded:**

I saw that in the case history as well, it looked like it was the one that was approved in 2020 or 2021. And it expired. So that's why we're here.

**3 Planning Director Updates**

**Assistant Director Rachel Prelog delivered the Planning Director's updates:**

I'll just say you may have seen an announcement go out that we have hired a new planning director. Mary Kapowski Brown will be joining us at the beginning of November. Staff is very much looking forward to that. We also, as I mentioned last time, we have the RFP for the General Plan that was released, and we had re-released that. So that will be open until September 26th. So spread the word about if you know any firms interested in submitting an application, but that's all I have.

**4 Adjournment**

**Boardmember Sarkissian motioned to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Pitcher.**

**The meeting was adjourned.**

Vote: 5-0 (Boardmember Sarkissian, absent)  
Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:  
AYES – Crockett, Ayers, Allen, Peterson, Pitcher  
NAYS – None

Respectfully submitted,

---

Michelle Dahlke  
Principal Planner