

**CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE PLANNING & ZONING BOARD**

Held in the City of Mesa Council Chambers (Lower Level)
Date June 17, 2004 Time: 4:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Marty Whalen – Chair
Mike Cowan - Vice Chair
Rich Adams
Barbara Carpenter
Alex Finter
Bob Saemisch

MEMBERS ABSENT

Pat Esparza (Excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

John Wesley
Dorothy Chimel
Ryan Heiland
Tom Ellsworth
Scott Langford

Wahid Alam
Gordon Sheffield
Liz Zeller
Jim Smith
Lois Underdah

Maria Salaiz
Corey Smith
Michael Monroe
Linda Flick
Others

Chair Whalen declared a quorum present and the meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. The meeting was recorded on tape and dated June 17, 2004. Before adjournment at 5:15 p.m., action was taken on the following items:

It was moved by Vice-Chair Cowan, seconded by Boardmember Adams, that the minutes of the May 20, 2004 meeting be approved as amended. The vote was 6-0 (Esparza absent).

It was moved by Boardmember Carpenter, seconded by Boardmember Finter, that the minutes of the may 18, 2004 public meeting and the may 20, 2004 public hearing for GPMinor04-03 be approved as submitted. The vote was 6-0 (Esparza absent).

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS: All items listed with an asterisk (*) were approved as a group with one Board motion.

It was moved by Boardmember Carpenter, seconded by Vice-Chair Cowan, that the consent items be approved. Vote 6-0 (Esparza absent)

Zoning Cases: Z04-49*, Z04-50*, Z04-51*

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 17, 2004 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: Amending Sections 11-1-6, 11-3-6, 11-3-7, 11-3-8, 11-3-9, 11-3-10, 11-3-11, 11-4-5, 11-4-6, 11-4-7, 11-4-8, 11-4-9, 11-4-10, 11-4-11, 11-5-6, 11-5-7, 11-5-8, 11-5-9, 11-5-10, 11-5-11, 11-6-6, 11-6-7, 11-6-8, 11-6-9, 11-6-10, 11-6-11, 11-7-7, 11-7-8, 11-7-9, 11-7-10, 11-7-11, 11-7-12, 11-9-5, 11-9-6, 11-9-7, 11-9-8, 11-9-9, 11-9-10, 11-10-8, 11-10-9, 11-10-10, 11-12-4, 11-12-5, 11-12-6, 11-12-7, 11-14-2, 11-14-3, 11-15-1, 11-15-2, 11-15-3, 11-15-4, 11-15-5, AND 11-16-2 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to Design Guidelines and Site Development Design Standards. **CONTINUED FROM THE MAY 20, 2004 MEETING.**

Comments: Wahid Alam, Planner II, gave an overview of the changes which had been made to add clarification and to remove conflicting provisions. He explained that a Technical Review Committee had been created – made up of local professionals and current and former Planning & Zoning and Design Review Board members. Using feedback from the development community, the committee incorporated changes to the guidelines. Mr. Alam explained that this had been a long process and thanked the committee members and staff involved for their contributions.

Boardmember Saemisch thanked Mr. Alam for his work on the project, adding that this was not going to be the end of this project. The design guidelines must be flexible and changeable so the Board may be reviewing it again in the next 2-3 years. There will be information sent out to the development community which will allow them to respond.

Chair Whalen also thanked Mr. Alam. He suggested to Boardmember Saemisch that the development community do some sort of competition to design an “Arizona parking lot”.

Dorothy Chimel, Principal Planner, explained that staff would be meeting to look at opportunities to gather information and feedback electronically from the development community and other customers who are designing in accordance with the design guidelines. That way staff can capture topics that need to be discussed in the future and perhaps new design standards or items in the code that could be modified or amended to better address the needs of the development community. She added that landscaping had been a huge issue for both staff and the development community. As soon as a survey form and database is on-line, staff will be announcing it through various newsletters that go out, the Development Advisory Forum, etc.

It was moved by Vice-Chair Cowan, seconded by Boardmember Saemisch to approve and recommend to the City Council approval of the amendments to the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to Design Guidelines and Site Development Design Standards.

Vote: 6-0 (Esparza absent)

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 17, 2004 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: Consider Recommended Alternatives To Facilitate Infill Development

Gordon Sheffield, Senior Planner, explained that this report was the result of an effort by the Mayor, Dorothy Chimel and Tammy Albright to look at the practices involved in the development of infill property within the City of Mesa. He added that the project began in January of 2003 and took about a year to have a product they felt could be presented to the public. He explained that Mesa no longer has large areas to masterplan. He added that there is still the General Motors property which may be considered for residential development in the future, but there really isn't any other area. He stated alternatives need to be considered and discussed examples of "infill" development (Dobson & Main, Stapley & US 60, Southern Avenue Corridor, Hurley Farms site, and also the Town Center area).

Mr. Sheffield spoke about the "barriers" and the "benefits" associated with Infill Development and summarized the alternatives recommended by the Infill Working Committee:

1. Use of Existing Programs
2. Modifications to the Zoning Ordinance
3. Process Improvements
4. Pre-Plan Neighborhood/Transportation Corridors and
Creation of Special Districts

Boardmember Saemisch thanked Mr. Sheffield for a job well done on this project, adding that the idea of an Infill Specialist is a way to create the high visibility that this need is going to create. By having that specialist there can be articles and examples brought forward. We should be promoting our developments that are really good.

Boardmember Finter asked how this would relate to downtown and if this document would be used by the Redevelopment Office or if they are under separate guidelines. Mr. Sheffield explained that the City has two Planning offices – one for downtown and one for the rest of the city. Planning cooperates with the Redevelopment Office but there is a separate set of rules that govern the downtown.

Boardmember Adams stated he had read the report and found it to be well-researched and well-written. He commended all those involved and asked what the next step would be. Mr. Sheffield explained that no specific policies were coming forward with this report, it was a work plan and through the consent of the Council, staff would be able to direct energies in that direction.

Vice-Chair Cowan stated that this would give the Board a road map by which to work. He commended Mr. Dan Brock, Boardmember Saemisch, and all those who worked on the project and stated he was looking forward to using and referencing the document.

Boardmember Finter asked if Mr. Sheffield could go into detail regarding the costs in 4B and 4D.

Mr. Sheffield responded that the recommendation outlines possible costs for implementing the work program, perhaps doing it in house and hiring one staff specialist. The cost to the City would be roughly \$100,000. If we start hiring consultants to implement each of the various alternatives (re-do the zoning code, hiring a consultant to handle various specific plans, in addition to hiring an infill

specialist) the cost could reach \$600-675,000. A lot of that depends on the RFP's, how much work the city does – it is a wide range in cost. The idea is basically a trade-off between the total cost in terms of dollars and how much time you want to take to do that. If you want to take a long period of time and do it for a very short cost, then the time would be long and the cost would be relatively low. If we were to try to do it very quickly, try to hire a lot of consultants at the very same time, the costs go way up but the time to implement goes way down.

Boardmember Carpenter stated that this was an excellent report and she definitely wanted to accept the whole thing but would go with a motion to recommend alternative 2. She added that she would really like to send a sense of urgency to this, to use this. Ms. Carpenter mentioned that Mr. Finter raises a good question about considering cost but her preference would be to assign priorities first, then look at the cost, then figure out how we're going to pay for it and if we don't have enough funding maybe spread it out over a longer period of time or whatever we have to do. The urgency is so great, we're enjoying far more growth than any other cities and we should be the one setting the model and example for the rest of the country.

Boardmember Finter stated that he was really concerned about the cost. He clarified that this was a really great document and so much work had been achieved, he didn't want to focus only on how expensive this has the potential to be, because we have alternatives one, two, and three and parts of four that would be great. He stated that he would not be supporting \$600-700,000 to get this rolling, adding that if you look at the city's budget concerns and where the budget is right now, that is the cost of staffing a fire station or a full complement of police officers. Mr. Finter emphasized that he did not want this to detract from all the good work that's been done, the pre-planning and all the wonderful things that would make a great difference in this community, it's just that he could not be in favor of sending a recommendation that has a bill for \$600-700,000.

Mr. Sheffield acknowledged the efforts of Dan Brock, Greg Hitchens, Mark Reeb, Bob Saemisch, Art Jordan, Michael Garcia, Pat Esparza, Jillian Hagen, Dorothy Chimel and Tammy Albright.

Boardmember Saemisch stated that he thought it was difficult to even explain to the audience what alternative 2 even means and it would be difficult as it moved to Council. He added that's one of the reasons we are still tentative on a Hearing Officer issue, and are going to have another subcommittee dwelling on that issue. He stated that all of these issues, if not relegated to a subcommittee, should perhaps be looked at in more depth before we make an actual recommendation. Mr. Saemisch advised that he did not want to over-commit or under-commit until they (the Board) were a little more definitive about what they want to do, adding that he thought it was more of a menu than a direction.

Chair Whalen stated that he championed Mr. Finter's concern about the budget but reminded that they are the Planning & Zoning Board, to advise on Planning & Zoning matters, adding that when you view the future of a city as it relates to infill, \$600-700,000 is not a lot of money. He clarified that was not to suggest that the coffers are overflowing, but that he is not willing to turn down the recommendation just because the City Council might not have the money. It is the City Council's decision as to whether they want to buy it or not. The Board's advice is whether it's something worth buying.

Boardmember Finter asked if that were an annual or a one-time cost. Mr. Sheffield stated it was a one-time cost and could be spread out over a period of several years. The only recurring cost would be staff cost.

Boardmember Adams asked if any of the costs are new or if any of the costs are now in the budget, is it new expense? Mr. Sheffield responded that the consulting costs would be new costs, the staffing costs would be dependent upon whether or not they would shift someone over from an existing position to spend full-time with it or whether they would hire somebody new. When it was presented to the General Development Committee Councilmember Walters had mentioned that we already have specialists in infill who work in the Redevelopment Office and there might be a refocusing of some of their efforts to include this. He added he was not sure about the viability of that, they would have to look into some of the specific issues but that is a possibility also.

Boardmember Adams stated that he was not saying he didn't share Mr. Finter's concern about the costs but that he was thinking this is more of a work plan which is going to move on and is more in the purview of the City Manager's Office to allocate financial resources and human resources around as needed. He added that he was more concerned with getting the message of this document delivered to Council, as this will go back to other committees, and be looked at again and again. He mentioned that he does have concerns about the hearing officer, realizing that his motion moves on the document that recommends that.

Chair Whalen stated that he was in agreement with Boardmember Adams, however this is not an option, the Board is not responding because someone got a great idea to go out and paint the streets green or something. He added that the Board is responding to what is the inevitable and ultimate reality of what's happening to our City as we grow, you can't just ignore it. Mr. Whalen said it's bad if it costs and I don't want to spend money, but at the same time I don't see a realistic option to do nothing.

Boardmember Saemisch added that the recommendations were not cast in stone and therefore there is lots of flexibility to remain in future discussion.

Boardmember Finter asked about Chandler's IDID program where they fund roughly ¼ million dollars per year. It is funded from the General Fund every year and then there are staff costs. He thought it was more of an annualized cost. Mr. Sheffield stated that if Council decided to go with an infill development incentive it would have to budget that and it would be an annual cost.

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Vice-Chair Cowan

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council to accept the recommendations of the infill working committee in total: several small changes will be needed to initiate and enact the recommendations, including a presentation to the Design Guideline Review Committee regarding the development of proportional development standards for smaller sites. Other changes may include the use of a consultant or additional in-house staff to review permitted land uses in zoning districts and the development of small changes to the use of existing overlay districts, such as the BIZ and PAD districts. Also discussions would begin on the development of city-sponsored specific plans or infill incentive districts. Such plans would, of necessity, ask for neighborhood and local business input into how that neighborhood or corridor should develop.

Vote: Passed 5-1 (Finter voting nay; Esparza, absent)

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 17, 2004 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **GPMInor04-04 (District 6)** The 1900 to 2000 block of South Crismon Road (east side) and the 10000 to 10400 block of East Guadalupe Road (north side). Located on the southeast corner of Baseline Road and Crismon Road and the northeast corner of Guadalupe Road and Crismon Road (45 ac ±). Minor General Plan Amendment to reconfigure existing land use designations. Arizona State Land Department, owner; Catherine Balzano, applicant.

Comments: Chair Whalen recessed the Planning and Zoning Regular Meeting and declared the second public hearing for GPMInor 04-04 open at 4:04 p.m.

Scott Langford (Planner II) stated that this was a request to reconfigure existing land uses, adding that there would not be any acreage changes, just a rearrangement of the land uses. He stated that staff was in support of this recommendation.

There were no citizens present who wished to speak in regards to this item.

It was moved by Boardmember Carpenter, seconded by Boardmember Finter

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council approval of minor general plan amendment case GPMInor 04-04.

Vote: Passed 6-0 (Esparza absent)

Chair Whalen declared the public hearing closed at 4:10 p.m.

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 17, 2004 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z04-49 (District 4)** 1130 and 1110 South Horne. Located east of Mesa Drive and north of Southern Avenue (2.35 ac \pm). Rezone from M-1 to M-1 PAD and site plan review. This request is to allow for the development of a light industrial development. Todd Allen, owner; Corey Smith, applicant.

Comments: This item was on the consent agenda, therefore it was not discussed individually.

It was moved by Boardmember Carpenter, seconded by Vice-Chair Cowan

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z04-49, conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan and elevations submitted, (without guarantee of lot yield, building count, lot coverage) except as noted below.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic Engineering, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.).
3. Dedicate the right-of-way 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. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Technical Review Committee.
5. Full compliance with all current Code requirements, unless modified through appropriate review and approval of the modifications outlined in the staff report.
6. Retention basins to be 6:1 slopes maximum when adjacent to public rights-of-way or pedestrian walkways.

Vote: Passed 6-0 (Esparza absent)

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 17, 2004 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z04-50 (District 2)** The 1600 block of East University Drive (south side). Located south of University Drive and west of Gilbert Road (1.08 ac±). Rezone from O-S to C-1 and site plan review. This request is for the development of an office with fleet vehicle parking. Lisa Miller, owner; Josh Oehler, applicant.

Comments: This item was on the consent agenda, therefore it was not discussed individually.

It was moved by Boardmember Carpenter, seconded by Vice-Chair Cowan

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z04-50, conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan submitted, except as noted below.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Design Review Board.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic Engineering, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.).
4. Dedicate the right-of-way 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.
5. Obtainment of a Development Incentive Permit (DIP) from the Board of Adjustment or the Zoning Administrator for all code deviations.
6. Retention basins to be 6:1 slopes maximum when adjacent to public rights-of-way or pedestrian walkways.

Vote: Passed 6-0 (Esparza absent)

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 17, 2004 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z04-51 (District 2)** The 1600 to 1700 block of East Main Street (south side). Located west of Gilbert Road and south of Main Street (0.98 ac \pm). Site Plan Review. This request is to allow for the development of a commercial building. Ernesto G. Castro, owner; Michael P. Monroe, applicant.

Comments: This item was on the consent agenda, therefore it was not discussed individually.

It was moved by Boardmember Carpenter, seconded by Vice-Chair Cowan

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z04-50, conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan and elevations submitted, (without guarantee of lot yield, building count, lot coverage) except as noted below.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic Engineering, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.).
3. Dedicate the right-of-way 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. Compliance with all requirements of the Design Review Board.
5. Retention basins to be 6:1 slopes maximum when adjacent to public rights-of-way or pedestrian walkways.
6. Provide a minimum six-foot high masonry wall along the property line common with the residential development.

Vote: Passed 6-0 (Esparza absent)

H. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

The vote was unanimous to elect Vice-Chair Cowan to the position of Chairperson.

Elections for Vice-Chair were deferred to the July meeting (due to Ms. Esparza's absence).

John Wesley, Planning Director, was affirmed as Secretary to the Board.

Respectfully submitted,

John Wesley, Secretary
Planning Director