

# Planning and Zoning Board



## *Study Session Minutes*

Mesa City Council Chambers – Lower Level, 57 East 1<sup>st</sup> Street  
Date: September 28, Time: 3:00 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  
Jennifer Merrill  
Charlotte Bridges  
Joshua Grandlienard  
Sarah Staudinger  
Pamela Williams

### **OTHERS PRESENT:**

### **Call meeting to order.**

- 1 Chair Crockett declared a quorum present, and the meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.**
- 2 Review items on the agenda for the September 28, 2022, regular Planning and Zoning Board Hearing.**

**Staffmember Jennifer Merrill presented case ZON22-00609:**

The request is for Site Plan Review and it's to allow the remodel and expansion of an existing carwash. The location is east of Lindsay Road and south of McKellips Road. The General Plan Character Area, there's two characters for the site, on the eastern edge of the site, its Neighborhood. The purpose of that character area is to provide safe places where people live, and also to provide a sense of place to the community. The west side of the site is in the Neighborhood Village character area, and the purpose of that character area is to provide shopping and service needs for the nearby population. The zoning district is Limited Commercial, and Limited Commercial allows for retail and service uses, and it serves residents within 10 miles. Also, the carwash use is a permitted use with approval of a Special Use Permit, and a Special Use Permit is granted for this facility. Here's a photo looking southwest into the site from McKellips Road. This slide shows the overall site plan with north oriented towards the top of the of the slide. The next couple of slides are going to be enlarged versions of the site plan, and north will be oriented towards the right side. You can see the carwash in the central portion of the site. It's that semi-circle building. On the west side of the site is the existing building that contains a restaurant and a couple of other businesses. The proposal involves expanding the carwash into the east side of the site, or the eastern parcel. The carwash already uses that portion of this site for overflow parking, and they're proposing to expand the carwash formally, and to establish some vacuum car spaces in that area. So, here's the expanded site plan, and this shows the west portion of the site with the restaurant. This slide shows the carwash and the expansion area at the bottom of your screen. It shows the existing carwash with the canopies and the parking, and there is a proposed new canopy which will replace an existing canopy. Then there are 20 new vacuum stalls. Those vacuum stalls are located at the north portion, just north of the existing carwash building, as well as the northern half of that east parcel.

The applicant completed a citizen participation process, and they notified surrounding property owners within 1000 feet, as well as HOAs, and registered neighborhoods. And as of today, there haven't been any responses to those to the mailing. In summary, the request complies with the Mesa 2040 General Plan, as well as with the criteria for Site Plan Review in Chapter 69 of the Zoning Ordinance. And staff recommendation is approval with conditions, and I'm happy to answer your questions.

**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 PAD overlay and Site Plan Review to allow for a development of multiple residence. So, the site is located on the south side of University Drive, west of Country Club. The General Plan designation for this area is Neighborhood Suburban. The intent behind the Neighborhood Suburban is to provide safe places for people to live and multiple residences is identified as a primary zoning use when adjacent to arterial fringes. The site is also located within the West Main Street Area Plan. The zoning request is for Multiple Residence-4 with a PAD Overlay. Multiple Residence is a permitted use in the RM-4 Zoning District. There is an existing single residence house that is being currently used for, it looks like, operations of a business and the rest of the site is vacant. The site plan is for 28 multiple residence units, at two to three stories, with a centralized amenity space, as well as an amenity space located in the southwest corner. There are nine visitor parking stalls in addition to the two covered parking spaces with each unit. The site will be accessed from University Drive with units facing both Date and Hosick to the east and west. As a part of the PAD, they did request deviations to certain development standards. Those include reductions to the required street side frontage is on Date and Hosick, a reduction to the south

property line, and then reductions to landscape yards are both on Date and Hosick, as well as on the rear property line (that south property line), a reduction to the minimum building separation, modifications to private open space standards, reduction of that setback from cross drive aisles from the University Drive, and then a modification of the parking lot landscapes for those visitor parking stalls along the south side, and then modifications to the unit entrance requirements, the attached garages being recessed from the second story livable space, and then maximum fence height along the street both along Date and Hosick. So, the Design Review Board reviewed the application in March of this year, the Design Review Board did express some concerns with the design and compatibility with the surrounding single residence subdivision, as well as the use compatibility at that Design Review Board.

We did have residents who expressed concerns with the proposed development. The applicant did conduct a citizen participation process which included notification to property owners within 1000 feet, as well as registered neighborhoods, and HOAs. The applicant held a neighborhood meeting prior to formal submittal, and then one after formal submittal. There were no attendees at that virtual neighborhood meeting, but we did have two comments in opposition at the DRB. I also provided a letter of opposition that was submitted for Design Review after the actual Design Review Board hearing. Then before you is a letter of support that was received this week and it's my understanding that there are also some comment cards for this case. So, in summary, we find that the proposed development complies with the 2040 Mesa General Plan and meets the criteria for PAD Overlay and Site Plan Review and staff is recommending approval with conditions. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

**Boardmember Peterson inquired:**

The neighbor concerns, could summarize those and what of that has been met or addressed during the design process?

**Staffmember Cassidy Welch responded:**

Chair, Boardmember Peterson, there's an overall concern with multiple residence use at this location. Some of the larger concerns expressed were overflow parking into the neighborhoods, and the applicant addressed that by providing a full two car covered garage that complies with the minimum space dimensions, as required in our zoning ordinance in addition to nine additional visitor parking stalls on the site. There are also some limitations on parking. There's a requirement to keep it no closer within 100 feet from University intersection on both Hosick and Date, and then Date has additional no parking requirements. So those were addressed by the applicant with the revised site plans.

**Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard presented case ZON22-00267:**

This request is just for a Rezone. It is for a future auto mall and a larger commercial center. To give you a little context, this is the site, there's a previous zoning case for the GCC-CUP-PAD already shown here. This is mainly to include the previously excluded AG parcels that you'll see hatched in on this slide. It is currently within the general plan designation of Mixed-Use Activity, as well as Employment. Mixed-Use Activity, the intent is to provide a significant retail center to attract customers from a large radius, as well as providing a wide variety of ranges for employment uses in a high quality setting. Based off of the proposed rezoning, this would create for a large commercial center reaching that goal of the Mixed-Use Activity of providing that larger retail center. The original zoning case ZON20-00129, did have those initial GC-PAD-CUP requirements for that Mixed-Use, that they're looking to still

maintain, but adding in those extra parcels allows for that auto use and possible larger commercial to occur on those as well. On this side, you'll see the LI-PAD-CUP at this time. That would be for the larger commercial center. I know I've been in talks with the applicant, that location might be changing. The site plan is purely conceptual at this time. As you can see on parcel one, which is in that southeast corner, that'd be that large commercial center, and then parcels 9,10, 11,12, 13, and 14 would be just that GC-PAD-CUP, and then 15,16, 17 would also be within that but those are merely conceptual at this time. All those site plan reviews will come in with a later permit. As part of their citizen participation, properties within 1000 feet were notified. As you can tell from the aerial, most of that is open desert or currently in construction, and we have not received any comments from anybody interested on this property specifically. Based off that, staff finds that the overall Rezone complies with 2040 General Plan, and complies with the review criteria of Chapter 22 for PAD Overlay, and I'm happy to answer any questions you might have, and staff recommends approval conditions.

**Staffmember Charlotte Bridges presented case ZON22-00583**

This is a request for Site Plan Review and alternative compliance to allow for the development of a multiple residence project with three dwelling units. The site is located west of Country Club, it's north of Rio Salado at 727, West 8th Place, and that's on the south side of 8th Place. The General Plan designation of the property is Neighborhood, and the purpose of Neighborhoods is to provide safe places for people to live, feel secure, and enjoy their surroundings, and it may contain a large variety of housing options. The zoning on the property is currently Multiple Residence district 3. The proposed project is developing under that zoning district and once again, they're proposing three dwelling units with a density of 12 dwelling units per acre. This site is surrounded by multiple residences on the west. To the south, it is a single-family residence that fronts on to Rio Salado Parkway.

On September 7, the Board of Adjustment approved a DIP for this project, and essentially reduced the building setback and landscape yards around the perimeter of the property. The site plan obviously shows access from the site to 8<sup>th</sup> Place, and it shows one building with three dwelling units. It is a two-story building to the south of the building there are five covered parking spaces, and then two uncovered parking state spaces just immediately along the south property line. Once again, the landscape plan was reviewed by the Board of Adjustment and approved for a DIP to reduce the required landscape yards and the material around the perimeter of the site. The site plan does show trees and shrubs along the northeast and west property lines, but it's pretty much eliminated along the south property line. For alternative compliance, we're seeking your recommendations for the street facing facade. The side of the building is facing 8th Street and the entrances are on the west side, the applicant has provided a kind of a gateway, or a monument for the pedestrian connection that comes from the right of way into the site, to kind of give it a sense of place and a sense of direction. The other requirement is the entrance at the individual units, they're required to have a minimum space that's 10 feet in width, or 10 feet in every direction and then approximately, I think it's 50 square feet. The applicant is proposing a smaller covered entrance, about five by five. But then they have a longer trellis that extends from the entrance of each units to kind of give a more protected entry feature into the individual units. As far as the primary building material, the majority of the building is stucco. It has windows. It does have some metal trim but, metal trim isn't counted. The metal part of the facade isn't counted as a primary material per the zoning ordinance, so the primary building material is stucco in this case and that's pretty much on all four walls. These are elevations these are just 2d elevations that

kind of let you know what the material is. The model is much better. it shows more of the ins and outs to the articulation of the walls, the movement that's in the building from the first floor to the second floor, and then obviously the dramatic roof. This is just a site plan that gives you a better idea of what the entry elements are into each unit. Once again, there is I think it's about 25 square foot covered entry, recessed into each unit, and then the trellis that extends over the sidewalk, and then is more on in line with the drive aisle.

As far as citizen participation, they did complete that process. They did hold the neighborhood meeting and mailed letters to the property owners within 1000 square feet of the site, the registered homeowners association, and neighborhoods. They did receive one call in support and one call in opposition. Since the mailing, I have received two calls pretty much in opposition, until they found out where the site was located. There was some confusion with the address, that 727 West 8th Place isn't in sync with the adjacent house numbers, or apartment numbers. The two calls I received were from neighbors over on the west side of the site, in the single-family residence neighborhoods. They thought the units were going a multifamily project was going into their single-family neighborhood. So, once we kind of cleared that up, neither caller had an opposition to this particular project at this location. We did send out school analysis and received the information back that there's capacity to serve the facility at the elementary, middle school, and high school for the area.

So, in summary, staff is finds that the request complies with the 2040 General Plan, and meets the criteria for Site Plan Review, and it meets the Alternative Compliance Review section of the MZO. And staff is recommending approval with conditions, I'll be happy to answer any questions you might have.

**Boardmember Allen inquired:**

Charlotte, for clarification. These units are for rent, correct?

**Staffmember Charlotte Bridges responded:**

Chair, Boardmember Allen, Yes.

**Boardmember Allen inquired:**

And then the parking, it's all in the back, I saw with a covered- kind of a slanted cover over it. I didn't hear how many spaces that were out there but, is there a guest parking

**Staffmember Charlotte Bridges responded:**

Chair, Boardmember Allen, there's seven spaces total, each unit is required to provide 2.1 parking spaces. So essentially, seven parking spaces are required. And that's what it's provided. So, there's two spaces per unit, give or take a car for each unit, and then at least one additional parking space.

**Boardmember Allen inquired:**

Okay. And then my next question is on the opposition, you said that there was one support and one opposition that you had received before, and then you received two calls of confusion about the address. Can you tell me a little bit about the one that was in opposition before that?

**Staffmember Charlotte Bridges responded:**

Chair, Boardmember Allen, Yes. So, I believe that information came from the citizen participation plan submitted by the applicant. And I believe it's just summarized in there that saying they're just generally not in support of this use.

**Staffmember Joshua Grandlienard presented case ZON22-00942:**

This request is for a Rezoning and Site Plan Review for a multiple residence. This multiple residences located off of 48 off Southern just north of Hampton, as well as north of where 48th currently terminates, and is generally east of Greenfield. Specifically, this is within the neighborhood subtype to provide a clean, safe, healthy area for as well as a sense of place for community. It was originally combined with the parcel to the north, as a two part projects and then at request of the applicant, this has been split, and this is just for the market rate- luxury multifamily while the portion of the north will be at a later hearing for multiple residents sorry. So as part of that, this is just specifically for emblem. And then this request is just for Multiple Residence-3 with a Planned Area Development on this site. As part of the conditions, you'll see there is a need for lot line adjustment prior to that going forward. And then because of the existing lot and configuration, the site currently is a farm working for the Killian family. That's why you can see most of farming equipment in this site visibility photo, it is currently still in use as for that use. Here's the overall site plan for Emblem. As you can see, the main access is off the 48th.

As part of the initial discussions through citizen participation, many of the citizens in the neighboring areas were concerned about that accrss south on Hampton on the what Transportation called the "knuckle," half cul de sac essentially, where it goes down to 48th. Through those discussions, that is a fire access only, it's a little more visible on the landscape plan, where there is a little more grass in that area make it clear that it is fire access only. There'll be no pedestrian access on that southern side as well. So as part of this request, there is one PAD modification, and that is specifically for an eight foot high wall. As part of those discussions with citizens, mainly the properties to the south and to the west directly adjacent to this property, had concerns about line of sight and things of that nature of taller buildings looking into their backyards. As part of those discussions, the applicant was willing to agree to increase those heights from six to eight, and staff is in support of that deviation due to the request of those concerned citizens. Overall, again, here's the landscape plan. I will say buildings 9, 10, 12, 4, and 3, all are two story while the more central buildings are three story. So, it steps up or kind of feathers out, tapers, if you will into the existing two story and single family homes to the south, and to the west of this site. It was originally taken to Design Review on July 12, as part of that Design Review Board had some minor comments in terms of for architecture. Since then, those have been addressed and have been included as part of the elevations that you had in your packet. And as typical for citizen participation, for a Rezone, there was notification for 1000 feet within the area. As part of that, there is multiple neighborhood meetings, as well as specific one on ones with the applicant and concerned citizens, mainly within the Sunny Mesa neighborhood, which is on the west and south side of this site. And as part of those discussions, led to that secondary entrance, which is required by the fire code to be accessed by emergency vehicles only, as well as that deviation to increase that wall height to eight feet. As well, the original site plan was lot more dense, they have reduced units as order to listen to those concerned citizens, as well as reducing the heights adjacent to those properties. So originally, it was a three story all across the board, and as part of that, they've reduced those two stories in order to hear it listen to those citizens. So based off of that staff finds that the overall site complies with 2040

General Plan, complies with the Chapter 22 for a PAD overlay, as well as Site Plan Review within Chapter 11-69-5, and staff recommends approval with conditions; happy to answer any questions.

**Boardmember Peterson commented:**

Yeah, just for first staff on the in the packets for the citizen participation plan, there's typically a citizen participation report. A lot of times the report is just copy exactly of the plan and it doesn't offer any other details, discussion of issues that came up or that type of thing. The majority, I would say it's pretty much just the same thing as the plan. Is there a way we can get, if there's been no comments can we at least get a statement that the there are no comments, or something like that to close it up, rather than wonder what's going on?

**Assistant Director Rachel Prelog responded:**

Yes, Chair, Boardmember Peterson. We can do that, we can we can request that the applicants provide some sort of statement if there was no comment from the public.

**3 Planning Director Updates:**

There were no Planning Director updates.

**4 Adjournment**

**Boardmember Allen motioned to adjourn the study session. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Ayers.**

**The study sessions was adjourned.**

Vote: 7-0

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

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

NAYS – None

Respectfully submitted,

---

Michelle Dahlke  
Principal Planner

\* \* \* \* \*

**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)**