

Planning and Zoning Board

Meeting Minutes

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

Date: September 28, 2022 Time: 4:10 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jeff Crockett
Benjamin Ayers
Shelly Allen
Jessica Sarkissian
Troy Peterson
Jeff Pitcher
Genessee Montes

MEMBERS ABSENT:

(*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
Charlotte Brigdges
Jennifer Merrill
Joshua Grandlienard
Sarah Staudinger
Pamela Williams

OTHERS PRESENT:

Call Meeting to Order.

Chair Crockett declared a quorum present and the meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m.

1. Take action on all consent agenda items.

* * * * *

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

Items on the Consent Agenda

***2-a Approval of minutes from previous meetings.**

Approval of minutes: Minutes from the September 14, 2022 study session and regular meeting hearing.

Boardmember Sarkissian motioned to approve the minutes from the September 14, 2022 study session and regular meeting. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Ayers.

Vote: 7-0

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Crockett, Ayers, Allen, Sarkissian, Peterson, Pitcher, Montes

NAYS – None

3 Take action on the following zoning cases:

Boardmember Sarkissian motioned to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Ayers.

Zoning cases: ZON22-00609, ZON21-01271, ZON22-00263, ZON22-00267, ZON22-00583, ZON22-00732, ZON22-00942 and preliminary plat: Baseline Logistics Park.

Vote: 7-0

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Crockett, Ayers, Allen, Sarkissian, Peterson, Pitcher, Montes

NAYS – None

* * * * *

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

- *3-a ZON22-00609 District 1.** Within the 2800 block of East McKellips Road (south side) and within the 1900 block of North Lindsay Road (east side). Located south of McKellips Road and east of Lindsay Road. (2± acres). Site Plan Review. This request will allow for the expansion of an existing car wash. Chris Doran, S.D.S Consulting, applicant; Twin Palms Invest LLC, Twin Palms Investments LLC, owner.

Planner: Jennifer Merrill

Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions

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

Boardmember Sarkissian motioned to approve case ZON22-00609. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Ayers.

That: The Board recommends approve the case ZON22-00609 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the final site plan submitted.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of Case Numbers BA92-040 and BOA22-00550.

Vote: 7-0

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Crockett, Ayers, Allen, Sarkissian, Peterson, Pitcher, Montes

NAYS – None

* * * * *

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

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

- 4-a ZON21-01271 District 4.** Within the 600 block of West University Drive (south side), within the 300 block of North Hosick (east side), and within the 300 block of North Date (west side). Located west of Country Club Drive on the south side of University Drive (1.5± acres). Rezone from Limited Commercial (LC) and Single Residence 6 (RS-6) to Multiple Residence 4 with a Planned Area Development Overlay (RM-4-PAD) and Site Plan Review. This request will allow for a multiple residence development. Tim Boyle, Tim Boyle Design, applicant; QCC Promotion and Marketing, LLC, owner.

Planner: Cassidy Welch

Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions

Summary:

Staffmember Cassidy Welch presented case ZON21-01271:

This is a request to rezone a property from LC and RS-6 to RM-4 with a Planned Area Development overlay, and Site Plan Review to allow for development of a multiple residence. The site is located on the south side of West University Drive and west of Country Club Drive. The General Plan designation for the properties Neighborhood. The site is also located within the West Main Street Area Plan. The zoning request before you today is a rezone to Multiple Residence-4 with a Planned Area Development Overlay and multiple residence is a permitted use in the RM Zoning District. On the site there is currently one single residence building with the remainder of the site, as vacant. So, the site plan is for 28 multiple residence units, varying from two stories to three stories, with a centralized amenity, as well as an amenity area located at the southeast area of the site, and nine visitor parking spaces located on the southern border of the site. The site will be exclusively accessed from University Drive with unit spacing both Hosick and Date. As a part of the PAD request, there are certain deviations from development standards that are being proposed. Those include reductions to the minimum building and landscape setbacks along Date - Hosick, as well as the rear southern property line, modifications to the building separation requirements, open space, setback of cross drive aisles, and interior parking lot landscaping, and then finally modifications to the building entrance requirements, the setback of attached garages, and the maximum fence heights along both Date and Hosick streets.

The applicant did attend a Design Review Board work session on March 8 of this year. The Design Review Board expressed concerns with the proposed design and compatibility of the use, and design with the surrounding development and recommended minor changes to be more consistent with the surrounding existing single residence subdivision. The applicant did conduct a citizen participation process, which included letters to property owners within 1000 feet, as well as HOAs, and registered neighborhoods. They held one virtual meeting in April of this year, there were no attendees to that virtual meeting. We did receive two attendees at the March Design Review Board session in opposition of the case, as well as one additional letter of opposition that was submitted for that Design Review Board, after the fact, and then one letter in support of the proposed development. In summary, we find that the proposed

development complies with the 2040 Mesa General Plan, as well as the criteria for a PAD Overlay and Site Plan Review, and staff is recommending approval with conditions.

Applicant Dave Zelner, 6368 South Foothills Drive, Gold Canyon, Arizona spoke:

I work with Tim Boyle Design. I think at this time since staff has kind of recommended approval, it may be just that we want to hear the comments and then kind of respond to those.

Chair Crockett opened the public hearing.

Mike Wright, 629 West Cabellero Circle spoke:

My address is right behind the Wright house, which is my business and property. We are directly across the street from this project, and we highly recommend it. We're kind of excited, frankly, about the improvement to the neighborhood that it would make. The current status of that property is a little bit sad. Half of it is in just open vacant property with weeds and dirt. And so, we look forward to having a project of this quality to see and for our customers to see as they come into the area. So, we do support it and hope that you'll approve it. Do you have any questions?

Stuart Quist, 451 North Cherry, Mesa spoke:

I hope to take, if I had more time, I would take more time, but three I will try to do. My name is Stuart Quist. I live at 451 North Cherry Mesa in the 1000 foot radius there. I've had my address for 60 years. I have been associated with this address, where I currently live for 43 years. The comment that I have submitted online, is a brief summary of what I would like to say. I am opposed to this project for many, many reasons. One of which I remember about 35 years ago in this very chamber. The debate on what is now past the place where Mr. Michael right now resides. They wanted to put in three story heights, high-density housing there, and the developers made the claim that they would never be able to sell, they would never be able to make money if they were single family homes. And here we are now, blessed with some really good quality families there including Mr. Michael Wright. And now he is saying no, we don't need that. We can go with a high-density housing now that he's got his. Well in this neighborhood, north and south of University is single family dwelling. There are a few, two and three and four apartment complexes on University. But it would be much better for the community, for the neighborhood, to have single-family homes there, good quality, high fences along University. If there's more reasons why I'm opposed to it, the drawings here that were shown are just a tiny bit deceptive. Yes, the current property, yeah, it's in this dismay, just like 35 years ago, the property there where Mr. Michael Wright lives now. But what these pictures don't show is the power lines on the south side of University, I'm pretty sure that they are using the City of Mesa utility power lines, high voltage, probably 115 kV. And I have recommended to the architect that when we put in a bus pull out, that would make it easier to accept the plan if there was a bus pull out, so that when the traffic backs up on University, eastbound morning and night, the buses would have place to pull out in the traffic would be able to flow better. But those power lines, if you could work with the City of Mesa Utility Company, or whoever they belong to, and have them go underground just in that section, then you could do a nice bus pull out, and it would be a lot more palatable to accept the whole project. Also, I don't see in the plans here, or it's not mentioned, any plans for EV charging stations. I would highly recommend it if it's going to be, as it's advertised- modern townhouses, let's get some EV charging stations, one per parking space.

The comments that I have submitted online, you have. We want to attract high quality families.

Chair Crockett stated:

I do have a letter of support here from DJ and Sarah Stapley, which will be part of the record on this case.

Vice Chair Ayers read the public comments that were submitted.

Esther Vreeland, 536 West 3rd Place, is opposed:

Roughly 45 years ago, Mr. Bernard Davis and others successfully petitioned the Zoning Board to change the zoning in the area to avoid having multi-level buildings. This area consists of single level homes and single level small businesses. So, the current zonings, LLC and RS-6 is very appropriate for the area. Mr. Boyle is trying to change the zoning to build what we didn't want all those years ago. This is a suburb not a city. We live here to get away from exactly what Mr. Boyle proposes. Many homes in a small footprint are very profitable, but it needs to be an appropriate area.

Delaney Cato, 660 West 2nd Place, is opposed:

The addition of the multifamily housing results in increased traffic and street parking and potentially decreased property values of current homes. Increase traffic during the proposed development because backups on University and additional traffic negatively impacts the safety of kids walking to school. Parking is a concern as residents often use garages for storage and park on the street, which negatively impacts existing neighborhood residents. The limited parking will also force visitors to park on the street. This proposal is inconsistent with the existing SFR neighborhood.

Damien Carpenter, three 322 North Hosick, is in support:

We have a housing crisis here in Arizona. 300 people are moving here daily and according to ADOH, we are 270,000 units housing unit short to meet our housing demand. This project will bring needed workforce housing to Arizona teachers, police officers, and families. I moved to the condo neighborhood a little over five years ago. This location for the proposed project has been an eyesore. It currently has one single family home and is surrounded by adjacent unkept dirt lots. I like the modern design of these proposed units and the added landscaping the units will bring to the neighborhood. Please pass.

Chair Crockett closed the public hearing.

Applicant, Dave Zelner spoke:

Thank you Chair, members of the Board, Dave Zelner. Do want to kind of highlight that the proposal for this project is attached, basically single family and so it's not what you would typically talk about in multifamily, where it's two bedrooms on top of three bedrooms on top of, you know. So, we think that, you know, these will be more stable tenants, because they have garages and amenities that will keep them there, and won't be kind of subject to the short term tendency that sometimes walkups have, I believe. Can we pull the zoning picture back up from the case?

The area, I think it this time, this property, the north, probably two thirds of it is actually zoned LC. So, it's not currently zoned for single family. There are two single family lots. So, I guess the belief that this would become single family. I don't know that that would be supported within this area for a variety of reasons, especially being on University. And so, we think that this offers a "middle housing option," and a form that is not as dense as it possibly could be. And so, we think that hopefully it will be supported. For that EV charging stations will probably come about at some point. And, that's something I think that the market should determine. We do have a bus stop being put here, and we are in compliance with the requests that transportation has made for this property. So, they did not ask us for a bus pull out. They did ask for a bus stop covered area and we have provided that. So I think a lot of things historically happened. And eventually things change so, I've noticed something might have happened 35 years ago, I'm not sure the circumstances are exactly the same now, in regards to the demand for housing, the need for housing and those kinds of things. So, we would just appreciate your support and the development.

Board Member Pitcher inquired:

Just a quick question, Are these going to be for rent? Or are these can be for purchase?

Applicant, Dave Zelner responded:

That's to be determined at this point. So

Vice Chair Ayers inquired:

Are they are they being metered separately?

Applicant, Dave Zelner responded:

I don't know that we've gotten that far in the design process for the construction permit. So, I think that's kind of also being worked out.

Boardmember Allen stated:

I guess my thoughts on this are, the way I'm leaning, I believe that this location because it faces University is more conducive to multifamily, than it is to a single family. So, for that reason, I would support this development.

Boardmember Allen motioned to approve case ZON21-01271. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Sarkissian.

That: The Board recommends approve the case ZON21-01271 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the final site plan submitted.
2. Compliance with all requirements of Design Review Case No. DRB21-01270.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, obtain approval of and record a final subdivision plat for the subject site.
4. Dedicate the right-of-way and easements required under the Mesa City Code at the time of application for a building permit, at the time of recordation of the subdivision plat, or at the time of the City's request for dedication, whichever comes first.
5. All off-site improvements and street frontage landscaping to be installed in the first phase of construction.

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

Development Standards	Approved
<u>Minimum Yards</u> – <i>MZO Table 11-5-5</i> Front and Street Facing sides - Adjacent to a local street (Date) 13 feet (Hosick) 9 feet Interior Side and Rear -Multiple story 13 feet (South property line)	
<u>Landscape Yards</u> – <i>MZO Table 11-5-5</i> Front and Street Facing sides - According to the required yards (Date) 0 feet (Hosick) 0 feet Interior Rear Yards	Minimum 6 feet as shown on the site plan
<u>Minimum Building Separation</u> – <i>MZO Table 11-5-5</i> -Three-story building	23 feet
<u>Required Open Space</u> – <i>MZO Section 11-5-5</i> -Private Open Space	Private open space shall be at least 32% covered
<u>Setback of Cross Drive Aisles</u> – <i>MZO Section 11-32-4</i>	21 feet
<u>Interior Parking Lot Landscaping</u> – <i>MZO Section 11-33-4</i>	Landscape islands shall be a minimum of 2 feet wide and 15 feet in length
<u>Building Entrance</u> – <i>MZO Section 11-5-5</i> - Individual unit entrances	Minimum depth of 2 feet and minimum horizontal area of 30 square feet
<u>Access, Circulation and Parking</u> – <i>MZO Section 11-5-5</i> - Attached Garages	Two-Story Units: In multi-story buildings that include livable floor area, garage

	doors located below upper story living space shall be recessed at least 2 feet from the upper story façade.
<u>Maximum Fence Height –</u> MZO Section 11-30-4 - Required Street Side Yards	No fence or freestanding wall within or along the exterior boundary of the required front yard shall exceed a height of 4 feet

Vote: 7-0

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Crockett, Ayers, Allen, Sarkissian, Peterson, Pitcher, Montes

NAYS – None

* * * * *

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

- *4-b ZON22-00263 District 2.** Within the 5600 to 5800 blocks of East Inverness Avenue (north and west side) and within the 5600 to 5800 blocks of South Sunview (north and south sides). Located east of Higley Road and north of Baseline Road (50± acres). Rezone from Planned Employment Park with a Planned Area Development Overlay and Council Use Permit (PEP-PAD CUP) to Planned Employment Park with a Planned Area Development Overlay (PEP-PAD), Light Industrial with a Planned Area Development Overlay (LI-PAD), and Site Plan Review. This request will allow for an industrial development. Sean Lake, Pew & Lake, PLC, applicant; VHS ACQUISITION SUBSIDIARY NUMBER 11 INC, owner. **(Companion case to Preliminary Plat “Baseline Logistics Park,” associated with item *5-a)**

Planner: Cassidy Welch

Staff Recommendation: Continue to the October 12, 2022 Planning and Zoning Board meeting

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

Boardmember Sarkissian motioned to continue case ZON22-00263 to the October 12, 2022 Planning and Zoning Board meeting. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Ayers.

That: The Board recommends to continue case ZON22-00263 to the October 12, 2022 Planning and Zoning Board meeting.

Vote: 7-0

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Crockett, Ayers, Allen, Sarkissian, Peterson, Pitcher

NAYS – None

* * * * *

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

- *4-c ZON22-00267 District 6.** Within the 10600 and 11000 blocks of East Williams Field Road (south side) and within the 6200 and 6300 blocks of South Signal Butte Road (both sides). Located south of Williams Field Road on both sides of Signal Butte Road. (122± acres). Rezone from Agriculture (AG), Light Industrial with a Planned Area Development overlay (LI-PAD), General Commercial with a Planned Area Development overlay and Council Use Permit (GC-PAD-CUP), and General Industrial (GI) to General Commercial with a Planned Area Development overlay and Council Use Permit (GC-PAD-CUP), and Light Industrial with a Planned Area Development overlay and Council Use Permit (LI-PAD-CUP). (125± acres). This request will allow for the future development of an auto mall, large commercial development, and a multiple residence development. Pew & Lake, Applicant; Michael Schuerman owner.

Planner: Joshua Grandlienard

Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions

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

Boardmember Sarkissian motioned to approve case ZON22-00267. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Ayers.

That: The Board recommends approve the case ZON22-00267 conditioned upon:

1. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, specific site plan shall be submitted and approved in accordance with Chapter 69 of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance.
2. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, design Review application shall be submitted and approved in accordance with Chapter 71 of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance.
3. Dedicate the right-of-way and easements required under the Mesa City Code at the time of application for a building permit, at the time of recordation of the subdivision plat, or at the time of the City's request for dedication whichever comes first.
4. All off-site improvements and perimeter landscaping along Williams Field Road shall be installed with the first phase of construction.
5. All off-site improvements and perimeter landscaping along Signal Butte Road shall be installed with the first phase of construction.
6. Access and circulation, drainage, and retention, internal landscaping, and landscape yard landscaping shall be installed with the corresponding phase as shown on the conceptual site plan.
7. Compliance with the development agreement, Maricopa County Recorder's number 2020-0649618, and any future amendments.
8. Concurrently with submission of the specific site plan application, submit an operational plan and good neighbor policy for the future development of multiple residence in the General Commercial district.
9. Execute and comply with any amendments to the development agreement which will in part limit the location of certain uses on the property.
10. Compliance with all requirements of Chapter 19 of the Zoning Ordinance including:
 - a. Owner must execute the City's standard Avigation Easement and Release for Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport prior to or concurrently with the recordation of the final subdivision map or the issuance of a building permit, whichever occurs first.
 - b. Due to the proximity to Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport, any proposed permanent, or temporary structure, as required by the FAA, is subject to an FAA filing, for review in conformance with CFR Title 14 Part 77 (Form 7460) to determine any effect to

navigable airspace and air navigation facilities. A completed form with a response by the FAA must accompany any building permit application for structure(s) on the property.

- c. Provide written notice to future property owners that the project is within two miles of Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport.
- d. Prior to issuance of any building permit, provide documentation by a registered professional engineer or registered professional architect demonstrating compliance with the noise level reductions required in Section 11-19-5 of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance.
- e. All final subdivision plats must include a disclosure notice in accordance with Section 11-19-5(C) of the Zoning Ordinance which must state in part: "This property, due to its proximity to the Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport, will experience aircraft overflights, which are expected to generate noise levels that may be of concern to some individuals."

11. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.

Vote: 7-0

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Crockett, Ayers, Allen, Sarkissian, Peterson, Pitcher, Montes

NAYS – None

* * * * *

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

- *4-d ZON22-00583 District 3.** Within the 700 block of West 8th Place (south side). Located west of Country Club Drive and north of Rio Salado Parkway. (.25± acres). Site Plan Review. This request will allow for a multiple residence development. Victoria Snively, United Realty MTA, applicant; Thomas and Sarah Ahdoot, owner.

Planner: Charlotte Bridges

Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions

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

Boardmember Sarkissian motioned to approve case ZON22-00583. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Ayers.

That: The Board recommends approve the case ZON22-00583 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the final site plan and landscape plan submitted.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations, except as modified by the approved Development Incentive Permit (Case No. BOA21-00584).
3. Recordation of a lot combination prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Vote: 7-0

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Crockett, Ayers, Allen, Sarkissian, Peterson, Pitcher

NAYS – None

* * * * *

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

- *4-e ZON22-00732 District 5.** Within the 1400 block of South Crismon Road (west side). Located west of South Crismon Road and south of East Hampton Avenue. (1.3± acres). Site Plan Review and Special Use Permit. This request will allow for carwash. M3 Design, applicant; KFH Crismon & Hampton LLC, owner.

Planner: Samantha Brannagan

Staff Recommendation: Continue to the October 12, 2022 Planning and Zoning Board Meeting

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

Boardmember Sarkissian motioned to continue case ZON22-00732 to the October 12, 2022 Planning and Zoning Board meeting. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Ayers.

That: The Board recommends that case ZON22-00732 be continue to the October 12, 2022 Planning and Zoning Board meeting.

Vote: 7-0

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Crockett, Ayers, Allen, Sarkissian, Peterson, Pitcher, Montes

NAYS – None

* * * * *

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

- 4-f ZON22-00942 District 2.** Within the 1200 to 1300 blocks of South 48th Street (both sides) and within the 4700 to 4800 blocks of East Hampton Avenue (north side). Located east of Greenfield Road and south of Southern Avenue. (15± acres). Rezone from Single Residence-43 (RS-43) and Single Residence-15 (RS-15) to Multiple Residence-3 with a Planned Area Development overlay (RM-3-PAD) and Site Plan Review. This request will allow for a multiple residence development. Pew & Lake, applicant; Sunny Mesa INC, owner.

Planner: Joshua Grandlienard

Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions

Summary:

Boardmember Pitcher was recused.

Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard presented case ZON22-00942:

This specifically is for a Rezone, a Site Plan Review for a multiple residence community. This is located specifically south of Southern Avenue, relatively east to Greenfield, directly north of Hampton, and the essentially the knuckle at Hampton and 48th. And overall, the General Plan designation for this site is Neighborhood. The intent of the Neighborhood district is to provide a clean, safe, and healthy area as well as the sense of place, and provide housing of multiple different types. The requested rezone for this site is for Multiple Residence-3 with Planned Area Development Overlay, as part of that the one request is for the Planned Area Development is for the height of the wall separating this and single residence uses.

On the existing site seen from 48th Street itself, this is where the main entrance for the facility will be located, and the only entrance accessible by the residents on site. Overall, the site plan here provided to you does show the overall site plan for this site, you'll see a secondary access going to Hampton Avenue. This is specifically for emergency exits only. Based off the initial outreach that the applicant had gone through, multiple citizens had concerns about the increased traffic flows on Hampton and 48th. As part of that, they worked with staff, as well as the applicant to address that, and have fire access only. They've reduced the overall density from what was originally proposed, as well as the overall heights for buildings 9, 10, 12, 4, and 3 from a three-story height to a two-story height to help feather, or taper the overall height in that area, as well as provide for some extended retention on the west side in order to create a additional buffer as well. Again, just to reiterate the only PAD modification for this site, the zoning code has a requirement that in any residential zone, the max height be six foot, the applicant is requesting eight based off their outreach and based off of the concerns of citizens, specifically within the Sunny Mesa neighborhood to the south and southwest of this site. There were concerns due to the height of the structures overall. Here's the general landscape plan, it's a little easier to see kind of the buffering provided on the west side of the site. And overall, again, just to reiterate, the south side of the site has no pedestrian access to Hampton Avenue, and 48th is emergency access for fire vehicles, since that is a requirement for fire code due to the number of units on site.

This request was seen before the Design Review Board on July 12. There's minor comments provided, at this time those have been addressed and are reflected on the site plan and elevations as part of your packet. Overall, here's the citizen participation area for those notified

within 1000 feet as part of their extensive citizen participation outreach. There's multiple neighborhood meetings, I believe, at least two, possibly three, and then numerous one on ones between the applicant and the representatives, as well as concerned citizens. Most of the comments were in general opposition to the use. And then as if they were going to have to live with it on how to address that most correctly as part of that the reduced density and heights for those chastened structures were reduced, as well as that access on Hampton resolved with emergency access, as well as that increased buffering and that wall height on the western and southern edge. So based off of that, and the general findings of staff, staff is recommending approval with conditions. Happy to answer any questions.

Applicant Sean Lake, 1744 South Val Vista spoke:

Here on behalf of the Killian family and LMC Development for the proposal that's before you this evening. We appreciate the opportunity to be here to talk about what's left, I guess the last piece of the Killian family farm. For those who have lived in Mesa for quite a long time, you can kind of remember that the Killian Farm was a substantial area in this area going north including Sunland Village, the Sunland Village towers going south. There's a lot of land that has been developed going over to the Walgreens and over a lot of development kind of in this mile area, if you will, that the Killians and other farmers have have developed over the years. But over the years, it's kind of been whittled away and developed, and developed, and developed, and developed, and developed, and developed, and developed and now we're down at the end of Max's life. Mr. Killian, who I've known for many, many, many years, we're down to the last remaining parcel that is left with the Killian ranch and that's what we're here to discuss, the south half or generally south half of that property and what is being proposed proposed for that development.

As always, staff has done an excellent job; we've appreciated working with Josh and Rachel and the planning staff on this project, and also extensive outreach with the neighbors and working on the project. Shown on the screen is the property that we're talking about generally bounded on the west by Sunny Mesa, on the south by Hampton and a Fulton development, and then on the east by the Franklin Brimhall schools there. Then on the north, obviously, would be the north half of a proposal that you'll see in the next month. Then also and I believe, the LDS church that has one off of 48th Street, those are kind of the boundaries around this site. As Josh pointed out, it is Neighborhood, which allows a variety of different uses for the General Plan as I won't spend a lot of time, the existing zoning is both a combination of R-43 for the ranch, and R1-15. We're proposing to take it to RM-3 for the development of the proposed property. Now let's talk a little bit about the development plan and then we'll talk about some of the changes that have occurred. The proposed project will be entirely accessed off of 48th Street.

So if you look on this plan, kind of in the middle, to the right top is 48th Street. 48th Street is a collector that will access directly up to Southern Avenue. So all of this property will come and go from 48th Street off of Southern; there will be no access to the south. No vehicular, no pedestrian access to the south, that was redesigned as a result of working with the neighbors. So this will be gated community that will come and go off of 48th Street, and the only users that would use 48th Street are the LDS church, and the medical office building, then obviously the north development when that develops as well. So, there would be no access to the east, to the west, or to the south, it will all go straight out to Southern which is a major arterial in the

City of Mesa. The proposal is for a gated multifamily community with buildings roughly one story, two story, and three story, as you transition as a result of working with the neighbors. The perimeter along the west and south have one story structures, those would be garages along those two to create that buffer after the landscape strip along that west and south side. Then you'll see kind of, we'll call them tan buildings, and there's kind of a distinction, tan and we'll call it white or beige. The 10 buildings along the west and along the South would be two story structures. Then as you transition into the site, it would go up to three story structures. Further in and closer to the school, and closer to the church the density is around, or it'd be 248 units of about 17 units to the acre, with about 12 buildings broken up and spread evenly throughout the site with open space significantly exceeding the standards or code of the City of Mesa, as well as parking exceeding the code, the City's parking standard for this overall project. The amenities for this project are extensive and spread throughout the community. There are different locations. It's not just one central amenity in the center, but there's a main amenity in the center, but then there are also parks spread throughout the project, so that you don't have far to walk from your specific home to get to a recreational area, to go walk your dog, or to just go kick a ball, or or lay out in the sun by the pool if you want. So there's a lot of things that you can do. There's a lot of amenities, extensive amenities, that were are listed here to really exemplify the high quality of this project. This is not an average multifamily complex, we think this is going to be much higher rent area; we think the rent that will be demanded will be higher rent in here. So the quality of this development will reflect that with the amenities, and the buildings, and the architecture. We have gone to the Design Review Board and they did like the elevations. They thought they were very attractive and nice and so we've made some changes in design to as a result of that DRB meeting to reflect the high quality, the nice project that we're trying to build here in this area.

As I mentioned earlier, there has been extensive outreach with the community. You've got multiple different groups and organizations in HOAs on the on the west, and the east, and the north, and the school and the church on the on the east side, extensive outreach. You do have letters of support from several of those groups in your packet to the proposed project. But let's kind of go over, there were a lot of neighborhood meetings, a lot of individual meetings. We were hosted at a barbecue, which was very nice by the community to the west, to host a barbecue and invite us to come and present the project. So in addition to what is required by the code, I think the applicant LMC went above and beyond to try to work with the community and the neighbors to meet, and listen, and hear, and make revisions to the plan as a direct result of those discussions. Some of the changes that were made as a result of those meetings with the neighbors, obviously we're a reduction in the density, transitioning of the one story to two story to three story as you get internal to the site, moving the buildings further away from the neighbors both on the west and the south sides, creating large landscaped areas and setbacks (particularly on the west side), the buffering along the south side, placement of trees in and around the project to address specific buffering areas (as you go for this project that was looked at as well). The parking ratio was substantially increased so that it did meet code, and exceed code so that is also in there, again, I mentioned enhances the elevations. Towards the end, there was also a discussion about the wall, there is a wall along the west side and they did agree as part of this, provided the neighbors to replace the existing wall along the west side with an eight foot wall. We will do that obviously, you have to have the permission of that neighboring property owner to tear down the existing wall and replace it. But

if those neighbors do agree, they have agreed to go ahead and replace that existing wall with an eight foot wall along that perimeter. So as far as, Hampton Road goes, as a result of that you can see they pushed and shifted some buildings around so there's some substantial setbacks. Here are some setbacks along the west side, you can see quite a big distance between 160 to 240 feet at different vantage points, and you can see the key up in the top right corner. So there is a large setback, particularly on the west side and you can see on the bottom image how you transition, or the middle image for you transition from the perimeter, eight foot wall, the landscape strip, the single story, the two story, the three story, as you go further into the site along the south side the same thing. They pushed buildings around to have two story buildings along that south side after the landscape strip and there will be improvements done to Hampton Road, which is there to kind of finish it off. Those who have driven Hampton lately, it's a road but on the north side it's kind of dirt and is not really finished, and then at the corner, it's not really finished. So they will make improvements and finish off Hampton Road, as part of this development, but will not access Hampton. So they're gonna improve it for others to drive on that public road on Hampton. So that will be completed as part of this project.

The last slide that I have, in an earlier version of the project, we did show access to Hampton, on the south. We thought that would be important to have you know having access to the north to Southern and to Hampton, but that was a major issue for the community in talking with the neighbors to the south. So that access point was removed, and it will not access south to the Hampton. Now we do have emergency access only for fire trucks to crash through a gate, and get through there but that would only be emergency access. Nobody within this development will be able to take their car and drive through that area to get to south the Hampton, all traffic in and out of this project will go north to 48th Street, is directly to Southern. So there were a lot of big changes that were done as a result of a lot of meetings, and extensive outreach with the community. We think we've come up with a great plan that buffers and transitions, and meets the needs and is working with the community. We think this is going to be a high quality project that will fit in the community and will be beneficial to this area. We think this will be a good asset to the Killian legacy of farm that has developed for many, many, many years transitioned down. So we think this is will be a good statement to kind of to put a stamp on that last little piece of property of the ranch or the the farm. So with that, we'd be happy to answer any questions, but we would request your support on this project. Thank you.

Chair Crockett inquired:

Is there any plan to signalize 48 and Southern?

Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard responded:

Yeah, I believe Ryan's here for the Transportation Department. But at this time, based off the comments provided to me by transportation, there is no signalization planned at this time.

Chair Crockett

So we're not planning to signalize that. I think that's one of the things I would be really interested in with the volume of traffic, which are these units coming off of that north direction. So it's coming up looks like

Ryan Hudson, City of Mesa Transportation Department spoke:

Chair, Board, Ryan Hudson I'm the City of Mesa Transportation Department, City Traffic Engineer and I can certainly speak to what we look out for when we look at warrants for signalizing an intersection. So specifically for that intersection, we look to the minor street, what kind of trips would be anticipated for that south leg and how that interacts with the major arterial street, which is Southern in this case. We follow federal standards for what would warrant a traffic signal and that's based upon the anticipated number of trips coming out of the site, and how that (primarily the left turn onto Southern) would interact and what kind of delay would be anticipated, what kind of demand would be there, the volumes, looking at the numbers for what's anticipated here, that trip generation coming out of the site. It is not anticipated to meet those warrants. So we are not recommending a traffic signal at this time at that intersection. Thank you.

Chair Crockett opened the public hearing.

Cindy Siems, 4743 East Harmony Circle in Sunny Mesa spoke:

And I've got many many concerns over this development. First of all, it being three stories is way too tall for this area. There is nothing in this area that is three stories. Having that many people in that small area and having only one access out of that area is going to be horrendous. Waiting in line, especially with the other project that's going in, and using that same exit on 48th Street up to southern, is going to be horrendous. The other issue I have is with the parking in that area. They said it's like 1.3 parking spaces per unit, and you're going to have three bedroom units with kids coming in, and having three cars and then their friends come over, and there's not enough parking. I've seen this with many apartments that my son has been in, and they end up parking in the neighborhoods around. This is not designed to work in this area. This needs to be single family homes. It's going to put too much traffic coming in and out of that area, and it's going to be too tall for this area, is just going to be an eyesore. I know you guys think it looks pretty, but it's not. It's not appropriate for this area. We've got a school and a church. And now you're going to put apartments and big buildings in there that are just, we've already got eight apartment complexes around this area and I'm living in a custom home neighborhood. This is just not acceptable. It needs to be single family homes. If you can't approve that and you go ahead and approve this apartment complex it needs to at least be no more than two stories.

Robert Johnson, 4762, East Harmony Mesa, spoke:

The problem is I need more than 3 minutes. I've lived in the area for about 22 years, I'm the HOA president, and I've actually had the opportunity to work with all the other HOAs within the area. So we made multiple changes, they actually came out, we probably had 10 meetings, we had it directly with a developer. He came right straight to us, we sat down and talked, I can't even tell you how many times he's out the house. Very good. We're actually in favor which you usually don't hear, because most people don't want apartments. But when we looked at the whole scenario, kind of fits within us. The traffic out the back was an absolutely a disaster. You have to see the road and understand the traffic patterns, and what we have to live with for the extra traffic coming out. That was an absolutely a non-starter and we couldn't do it, it wouldn't even work. I could go over 100 things, but they set it up that way. So it's not out the front and we appreciate that. They also did come up with a wall, we're million dollar plus homes, way

over a million dollars these days in the same base area. So security for us, is a big thing. Being an HOA president, I gotta protect everybody, we do have guarded gates for coming into the area. So raising the wall to eight foot was absolutely a must with the high trees that they're going to put in with the drainage control, we had to work with all that. That came into compliance with us, we worked with the neighbors on the back that this directly affected with traffic and everything, and it just worked for us. So we went ahead and went forth with that. So we're gonna go ahead and back that project, with that we liked it. There's extra space, and that they've worked that way and opened it up, and there's that problem that we do have is that we're doing an apartment complex on the back, and they're looking to do an apartment complex on the front. One of the main things that we don't want to do is that this has a impact on the front one, we're going to directly oppose the front project for this deal. We feel it is too dense; we feel it is too tall. She was just talking about the front project, and the three story they've actually made the back. So it's tolerable. Like I said, nobody really wants an apartment complex, but we feel it's the easiest thing for the neighborhood. And we understand that there are more homes that are needed so we're gonna go ahead and and back them, and stand by it. And we're happy that they've worked with us in that degree. But we do not approve the other project, and do not want this one to reflect the approval of it on the other project. Okay.

Assistant City Attorney, Sarah Staudinger added:

I just wanted to remind the Board, that since the speaker did mention a different project that isn't on today's agenda to not speak on that. Thank you.

Colleen Olsen, 4659 East Great Circle spoke:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Board members. I will take an extra minute here that doesn't count as a I live in Sunny Mesa and my backyard is going to be right next to this complex, this apartment. I did not know you had a letter from the HOA, that most of us had approved this. There has not been a vote on this. I have not voted for this, and I am against this. And I spoke to two or three friends in the last few days, when they heard I was speaking and they agreed with me, but that's beside the point. Okay. I'm Colleen Olson and I live at 4659 East Great Circle and our property is to the west of this complex. And we are against going from a single residence to a multi-residence and the reasons are, this is a very stable residential area. To the south of homes, we have Fulton homes, to the east of homes, we have Hampton homes. On the west end is Hunters Glenn, to the east is Kellian farms, and to the west is Sunny Mesa and this feeds Mesa High, Brimhall and other schools. As you look at the City of Mesa from Stapley, clear to Power Road, you will not find where they have put apartments amidst so many single homes. As you go west on Greenfield, you find the Summer Mesa Subdivision, the Alfred Ranch homes, the Dana homes, and Bradley estates, they're all homes and you do not find this. There are apartments on both Southern and Greenfield, and Higley and Greenfield and if we have this, this traffic would become horrendous. I will not be able to pull out of Sunny Mesa, I don't think, and make a left hand turn. If this goes in, the traffic will be that heavy, and also, it's just going to get worse. We want to keep this as a great single family area, as spoke of the history. Thank you. We have a history with the City of Mesa. Sally's fabrics, you are keeping a sign from our 50 years of business in Mesa, you're holding this sign and trying to find a place to put it. I hope you do. So we do have history with you also. And like I said, there are apartments. There are apartments on the north side of Baseline, hundreds of apartments between Greenfield and Higley. We don't need more multiple residential homes and we want to keep it this way. And I thank you.

David Tantaleaw, 4721 E. Harmony Circle, Mesa, Arizona, Sunny Mesa spoke:

I have maybe three points to make: the first one is that we did enjoy working with the developer on this project. A big issue that we had was when they came combined with two developments, we will not going to accept that, again, too dense, you know. So moving forward, if that other development comes in front, we're not going to accept that too much densification, exactly for the same reasons that you've been hearing all along. And the key thing is, that this developer has worked with us, the front developer, by the time they add everything up is going to be a mess in that area. You already have apartments in Southern and Greenfield, you have apartments and Higly and Southern, you have apartments in Hampton and an Higley. You know, so I think the suffocation is very good for what you're trying to achieve within the City of Mesa. I'm a registered professional engineering that was working in the City for 40 years and I want to make a couple of points that I think, I disagree with traffic control. One is Southern goes from three lanes to two lanes, right in that area. There's no way you're going to be able to expand it to three lanes because of Sunny Mesa, you're not going to take property away from the existing owners. You have the school, you have traffic aligning the school every morning, and they're trying to get into the school, which is going to be the exit point for this development. So in my opinion, you do need a light in there. There's no question about that. You know, yes, you're looking at that development alone. Yes, you don't need it if it's just that, but if you look at the whole compartment, I'm sorry, that's not going to work. The second concern is the grading and drainage of the area. This development is going to drain against Sunny Mesa, its going to end up in that new wall. If it overflows t is going to be relying on a 24 inch existing storm drain that was put over 30 years ago. That's an asset that belongs to the City. We need a guarantee from you guys, that is going to be operating as designed, by the grading and drainage plan. You know, the last thing that we want is for our homes to get flooded, because that 24 inch line is plugged from all the sediment from the farm over 30 years. Okay, thank you.

Jessie Pitcher, 4660 East Garden Circle, spoke:

And I just want to, I'm actually part of the Killian family, so it's a little bit sentimental for me. But on this particular project, I just don't appreciate the three story apartments. There's not a single three story buildings in this entire area. They have been great to work with, they've added some nice buffering and whatnot. I'm not sure the traffic department has been there during school time drop offs and pickups. I would highly recommend studying that just a little bit more. Other than that, it's all I want to say tonight. Thanks.

Vice Chair Ayers read a public comment that was submitted:

Sally Tackett, 4645 East Gables Circle, is opposed:

We are strongly opposed to this development that this proposal affects our property and privacy directly. We are already surrounded by eight apartment complexes totaling over 2100 units. This would add an additional 500 units. We are saturated by 55 plus in Sunland Village. We would like to see more single family homeowners in our area, owning their properties, putting down roots and contributing to the community. No apartments, nothing over two story, no more retirement housing, multi-residence, parking and traffic are already a problem. Say no to this multi-residence project. Thank you. Okay,

Chair Crockett closed the public hearing.

Applicant Sean Lake spoke:

Board members, I appreciate the comments, and it has been a pleasure working with the neighbors and we have appreciated working with them in a time where you work on a lot of different projects and neighbors aren't exactly nice. The neighbors here are really nice. They're very friendly. So I do compliment them on working with with a developer on this project. Let me address some specific issues. We're certainly willing to continue to work with the City's traffic engineer on a traffic signal at 48th Street. We'll continue to work on that. We'll provide additional information right now, the City is not recommending that doesn't warrants it, but we'll work with them on that. The other issue that was brought up, was not enough parking and the neighborhood. Now one of the particular concessions that was made when we closed off the vehicular access south to Hampton, because the concern was that people would not park in the community. That they would go park in the neighborhoods to the south. We not only closed out vehicular access, but we also closed off pedestrian access. So if somebody parked along Hampton, on the south, I think the fastest way would have to be to walk out, I guess around through the school up and back out to Southern and then back over west down to 48th, and then back into the community. That's a really long walk to get to, from your car to your apartment. I don't see that happening. That was done intentionally, so that people didn't and the parking was brought up to the code to exceed the code requirements. So we think parking should not be an issue for this project. Three story was was brought up, it's just too tall. We think you have a lot of different size and diversity of development in this area. I've been driving around this area for a long time, but I just wanted to go out there this morning to look at the old Killian ranch, and what has developed by Max and different developers over the many years. To see what has happened not only with the Killian Ranch, but things around it. And so if you kind of go up, you know a mile in each direction, and look to see what's happening you've got about 80% of that property within a mile radius, that is single family residential homes. But you also have the Sunland Village Towers, those three four story towers, if you can think kind of a little north, and a little west of this project. You've got Stone Canyon, which is two and three story multifamily, which is just over on Southern and Higley. You've got multifamily over on Greenfield as well, you go south of the freeway down by the the hospital, again is multi-story, and you have two and three story multifamily there. So to say that three stories is really out of character in this area, particularly on the old ranch, you do have a combination of single story, two story, three story, and even four story development on that old property. And I would applaud Max for doing that, and having the foresight to have that much diversity of housing, and commercial, and residential, and office, and banks, and retirement with with Sunland Village, all in that kind of that Ranch area. And so, we do find a lot of different diversity and we think this fits, and will be a very good asset to this area. So with that, we would hope you'll support it. And I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Boardmember Sarkissian inquired:

One of the comments, if you'll be handling it or the City will be handling it, is the comment about the drainage channel, making sure it's cleared out before everything continues. It's probably full of sediment and making sure it's cleared out properly and dugout.

Applicant Sean Lake responded:

Chairman Crockett, Boardmember Sarkissian, absolutely. That again was a foresight by Max in doing this, he worked with the City of Mesa. The retention basin that you see on the north

side of US 60 at Greenfield, there wouldn't be a Greenfield if it weren't for the foresight of Max in working with the City of Mesa to not only establish an on off ramp at Greenfield, but as part of that creating that retention basin over there on the north side of the freeway at Greenfield Road. But the farm, the Killian Farm drains into that pipe, and then over into that retention basin. That's what it was set up with the ranch going away and development coming in, that pipe will be cleared out so that that there is free flow of water.

Board Member Peterson inquired:

Ryan, well, you just discussed the City process, you already explained how it doesn't warrant a traffic light. Currently how that, overtime, is evaluated. So if there are some situations that come up, how does the City addresses those?

Ryan Hudson, City of Mesa Transportation Department responded:

Sure, Boardmember Peterson, Chair, so we have a traffic studies in the traffic engineering group. So we take traffic studies, requests all throughout the City on a daily basis, whether that'd be a request for a traffic signal or request for a left turn arrow, site visibility, so on and so forth. That would fall within those confines of just a typical traffic study requests, those are things that we handle with our engineers and our team in house. We would go out and collect data, perform observations, do a delay study to see if those warrants meet. So it would be something that we could react to, if traffic conditions warrant that.

Boardmember Peterson inquired:

And those are those are initiated both by City staff, or if there's citizens that have concerns about it, then that'll prompt a study for in the future for additional assessment of the light at that point?

Ryan Hudson, City of Mesa Transportation Department responded:

That would be correct. Yeah, a lot of our traffic studies requests are prompted by citizens, that is probably a good bulk of them. But we certainly do watch over areas where there's significant growth or significant change. We collect traffic volumes on an annual basis throughout the City to see how those are changing. You know, we keep an eye on the proactive side, as well as, the reactive side.

Boardmember Peterson inquired:

Thank you. And then just one more question, your assessment to this point, just to confirm that that includes the school traffic, and school traffic impacts on Southern Avenue.

Ryan Hudson, City of Mesa Transportation Department responded:

Boardmember Peterson, Chair, that's correct. The existing traffic volumes on Southern Avenue, they're under 15,000 vehicles per day and to put that into perspective, I know that that cross section does change east of 48th Street to three lanes in the eastbound direction, and then it reduces to the west of 48th street to a five lane cross section, in the planning capacity for a five lane cross section is upwards of 30,000 vehicles per day. So if you look at the arterial capacity, that's not an issue. We have introducing some new trips on Southern Avenue, I think the real question becomes the capacity of the intersection at 48th Street. The existing school, it probably has, a pretty high peak 15 to 30 minute period, you know in the morning, and in the afternoon where we've got parents coming in front of the school, a traffic signal would not

serve those trips. It would be what was described as kind of backup from the school that would then extend across 48th Street, that would affect the ability for a northbound vehicle to come on to Southern. That's how I see that school traffic could potentially affect 48th Street. But that traffic, and that backup really comes back to the school and making sure that their circulation is working, as best as it can be served. So hopefully that that describes and answers your question.

Boardmember Peterson stated:

Yeah, I think so. So Southern, the current capacity, and over time, stabilized capacity is call it 50% of design capacity for the existing roadway.

Ryan Hudson, City of Mesa Transportation Department responded:

I would say that's pretty accurate. If you look around the City, at other five lane cross sections that are similar to Southern Avenue, like Val Vista or other other cross sections, we see 20-25,000 vehicles per day.

Boardmember Sarkissian stated:

I agree with the concern about the traffic and 48th Street access. I mean, in the future, it's going to be something to be reevaluated. But at this time, based on the traffic comments and how due diligence is done, and regardless of the school traffic. I would love a streetlight at all the school entrances, it's just not something that warrants traffic lights. But I do feel that the property has done a lot to fit into the neighborhood, removing that access off a Hampton, and removing the pedestrian access to remove that concern as well. I have seen, in various parts of the valley, the three and even four, sometimes even five stories, it's awkward. Sometimes they get that high, but next to the single family residential they have had less separation. I feel this site has done a great job with the step by step, ladder up to the higher three stories, and I feel in multifamily three stories is pretty typical to get to make it an effective product, and utilize the site the most. I feel like they have a great landscape plan, open space plan. I think they've done a lot of work here. And I do think they'll have a great product. So I am fine with this product as it's being shown, and I'm supportive of staff's recommendation.

Boardmember Allen stated:

I agree with with Jessica's position on this one. I think I've never seen a developer go to these extremes to work with a neighborhood. All my years of being in the development industry, working for the City, I've never seen a developer step up this much. So I appreciate what they're doing. I do feel for for you folks that have lived there a long time, and it is going to be a little bit difficult. I know you have the back entrance on and off of Hampton to get in and out of your subdivision. Maybe it's not as convenient, but I do know there's a back access there. So I feel the same way. I feel like I support this development. I think that Max, I've known Max for a lot of years, and he I live on part of the farm that was originally the farm, not this development, but and it's a great location. And I think strategically the way he mapped it out, it makes sense. There's a little bit of everything in that area, commercial, multifamily, single family custom homes, there's a lot of different things. So I support this project as well.

Boardmember Allen motioned to approve case ZON22-00942. The motion was

seconded by Boardmember Sarkissian.

That: The Board recommends approve the case ZON22-00942 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the final site plan, landscape plan, elevations, and construction documents submitted.
2. Dedicate the right-of-way and easements required under the Mesa City Code at the time of application for a building permit, or at the time of the City's request for dedication whichever comes first.
3. Prior to issuance of any building permit, the applicant must record a lot line adjustment with Maricopa County to accommodate the proposed development.
4. Compliance with all requirements of DRB22-00439.
5. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations, except the modifications to the development standards as approved with this PAD and shown in the following table:

Development Standard	Approved
<u>Fences and Freestanding Walls:</u> <i>MZO Section 11-30-4(A)</i> Maximum height -Side and Rear Yards	8 feet adjacent to single residence uses

Vote: 6-0 (Boardmember Pitcher, recuse)

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Crockett, Ayers, Allen, Sarkissian, Peterson, Montes

NAYS – None

* * * * *

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

5 Discuss and take action on the following preliminary plats:

- *5-a "Baseline Logistics Park" District 2.** Within the 5600 to 5800 blocks of East Inverness Avenue (north and west side) and within the 5600 to 5800 blocks of South Sunview (north and south sides). Located east of Higley Road and north of Baseline Road (50± acres). Preliminary Plat. Sean Lake, Pew & Lake, PLC, applicant; VHS ACQUISITION SUBSIDIARY NUMBER 11 INC, owner. **(Companion case to ZON22-00263, associated with item *4-b)**

Planner: Cassidy Welch

Staff Recommendation: Continue to the October 12, 2022 Planning and Zoning Board meeting

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

Boardmember Sarkissian motioned to continue the preliminary plat case "Baseline Logistics Park" to the October 12, 2022 Planning and Zoning Board meeting. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Ayers.

That: The Board recommends to continue the preliminary plat "Baseline Logistics Park" to the October 12, 2022 Planning and Zoning Board meeting.

Vote: 7-0

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Crockett, Ayers, Allen, Sarkissian, Peterson, Pitcher, Montes

NAYS – None

* * * * *

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

7 Adjournment.

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

Vote: 7-0

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Crockett, Ayers, Allen, Sarkissian, Peterson, Pitcher, Montes

NAYS – None

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

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

* * * * *

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