

CITY OF MESA

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING

Held in the City of Mesa Council Chambers

Date: July 18, 2012 Time: 4:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Randy Carter, Chair
Beth Coons, Vice-Chair
Vince DiBella
Lisa Hudson
Brad Arnett
Suzanne Johnson

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

OTHERS PRESENT

John Wesley
Lesley Davis
Angelica Guevara
Jeff McVay
Debbie Archuleta
Jason Sanks
Margaret Robertson

Scot Rigby
Paul Gilbert
Susan Demmit
Ralph Pew
George Shore

Chairperson Carter declared a quorum present and the meeting was called to order at 4:12 p.m. The meeting was recorded on tape and dated July 18, 2012. Before adjournment at 5:40 p.m., action was taken on the following:

It was moved by Boardmember Suzanne Johnson, seconded by Boardmember Vince DiBella that the minutes of the June 19, 2012, and June 20, 2012 study sessions and regular meeting be approved as submitted. Vote: 6 – 0

Consent Agenda Items: All items identified with an asterisk (*) were approved with one Board motion.

It was moved by Boardmember Vince DiBella, seconded by Boardmember Suzanne Johnson that the consent items be approved. Vote:

Zoning Cases: GPMInor12-01, GPMInor12-02, GPMInor12-03, Z11-28, Z12-27, Z12-28, Z12-29, Z12-30, Z12-31, Z12-32, Z12-33, Z12-34, Z12-35

MINUTES OF THE JULY 18, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z12-35 (District 1)** 2100 West 8th Street. Located west of Dobson Road and south of the Loop 202 Red Mountain Freeway (170± acres). District 1. Site Plan Review. This request will allow the development of a stadium, team training facility, City recreation fields. City of Mesa, owner; Scot Rigby, applicant. (PLN2012-00181)

Comments: Staffmember Jeff McVay that case was the next stage in the Cubs stadium process. He stated that any future commercial would come back through the Planning and Zoning Board.

Scot Rigby represented the case. Mr. Rigby stated he was pleased with the staff report and agreed with the conditions of approval. He explained the City had just had the ground breaking ceremony for the site, and that they anticipated vertical development would start in October. He explained that the City of Mesa owns and controls the entire site. Regarding parking, he stated HoHoKam had 2,300 parking spaces, this site would have 4,300 spaces. There was also room for expansion at the site of the current ball fields.

Chair Carter asked if the soccer fields would be lighted. Mr. Rigby stated there would be perimeter lights, but the fields would not be lighted. Chair Carter then asked if parking would be allowed along 8th Street, Mr. Rigby stated it would not. Mr. Rigby stated the Paseo would be anchored by the stadium at one end and the Lake at the other end. The park would have splash pads and a climbing wall. The City was hoping for a hospitality use at the 20 acres at the northeast corner of the site.

It was moved by Boardmember Beth Coons, seconded by Boardmember Brad Arnett

That: The Board recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z12-35 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan submitted.
2. All future commercial development (Wrigleyville West, Riverview Park, NE Baseball Quads) consistent with the intent of Z11-026 (PAD Design Guidelines) will require separate site plan review and approval by the Planning and Zoning Board.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Design Review Board.
4. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations (Engineering, Transportation, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.).
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Development and Sustainability Department.

Vote: Passed 6 – 0

* * * * *

Note: Audiotapes 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

MINUTES OF THE JULY 18, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z12-27 (District 6)** The 5200 to 5300 blocks of South Ellsworth Road (east side). Located on the north side of the future State Route 24 freeway alignment between Ellsworth Road to approximately one-quarter mile east of the Crismon Road alignment; southern portion of the former General Motors Proving Grounds (485± acres). District 6. Rezone from Maricopa County Rural 43 SUP to City of Mesa LI. This request will establish City zoning on recently annexed property. Pacific Proving LLC, owner; Beus Gilbert PLC, applicant.

Comments: Staffmember Angelica Guevara explained the Community Plan for Pacific Proving Grounds North. She stated there have been numerous revisions over several months. She stated the City's vision was for more mixed use development, the applicant wanted office, retail, employment, commercial, and residential. Residential would be allowed north of Williams Field Road. She stated there were five Development Units. Plans for Development Unit's 1, 3 and 5 would come back to the Planning and Zoning Board for review. Plans for 2 and 4 would be reviewed and approved by Planning staff. She explained staff had worked with the applicant to write conditions to address the Board's concerns at their Tuesday study session. The Land Use Budget had been revised to increase the non-residential square footage. She stated the applicant would be coming back with site plans to show how they can meet the minimum square footage requirements, as well as providing additional language regarding the Main Street concept. They would also be providing images for more variety.

Paul Gilbert, 4800 North Scottsdale Road represented the case. Mr. Gilbert stated they had spent the last year working with staff on this project. He stated they would be making minor changes to the plan prior to the City Council meeting to address final City concerns. He stated they were in agreement with all of staff's conditions. Most of the changes had been to the Land Use Budget. He confirmed the applicant was in accord with the revised Land Use Budget. Mr. Gilbert gave a brief history of this site, and stated the numbers are still very similar. He stated they had worked with Lynn Kusy, at the Airport as well as representatives from Boeing to address any concerns they have, and both are in favor of this proposal. He stated it was very important for them that the Airport be successful. They need the Airport to be successful so that their project can be successful. The airport compatibility standards was included in the Community Development Plan.

Mr. Gilbert stated this proposal was for the Mixed Use Community District of the City's Strategic Plan, which calls for live, work, play areas, and a wide variety of high density and low density. The Strategic Plan requires urban centers, which they have. The plan they propose is intense, high quality and pedestrian oriented. They have both high density and low density residential. The Strategic Plan states this area is the prime residential area for this area. The Strategic Plan requires they have urban centers with minimum floor area ratios of .35 or higher, with the adjustments to the land use budget they meet that as well. Mr. Gilbert stated their plan met all of the goals and requirements of the Strategic Plan. He stated density was fundamentally important to the City meeting their employment goals for the Gateway area. He then quoted the Strategic Plan "In order to attract the types of employers and workers envisioned, development will need to be intense, of high quality, and provide for pedestrian orientation". He stated their community plan directly responded to the vision of the Strategic Plan. They added a section to the Community Plan dealing with sustainability in 4.1. Also in their design guidelines, when they come in, they will address the details of sustainability. He stated the land use budget reflected the desired minimum of .35 FAR, he stated that had been a major concern, and he understood why Chair Carter questioned whether they could meet the goals of development along Ellsworth. He stated they were uncomfortable with the original requirement, but they were comfortable with the revised goal. He stated they believed the new goal was realistic.

MINUTES OF THE JULY 18, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Regarding quality, he stated Mr. Coen and Mr. Levine had a lot of people contacting them to buy this property. They felt Harvard Investment would do the quality job they needed to ensure the project south of the freeway will work. He stated they would include quality parks and trail systems, with 65 acres of parks and open space, and 8 miles of trails and pathways. There would be community open space as opposed to private open space. There would be a minimal usable open space requirement with 10% for community residential and 5% for community residential small lots. They had increased the minimum rear yard setback to 10'. For the small lot residential approximately 1,600 sq. ft. would be setbacks and open space, for 7,000 sq. ft. lots 2,400 sq. ft. would be open space and setbacks. Each development unit would have guidelines. For DU2 and DU4 the Planning and Zoning Board would not see the guidelines, so they were proposing a new condition "the residential development design standards as required by Chapter 7.4C of the Community Plan shall be distributed to the Planning and Zoning Board for review and comment as part of the administrative staff review and approval process. A study session shall be held with the Planning and Zoning Board to discuss the proposed design guidelines upon request by the Planning and Zoning Board". Mr. Gilbert then presented the entry features as an example of their proposed quality. For DU1, DU3, and DU5 the Planning and Zoning Board would review. The Board would also review Subdivision Plats for all development. The Planning and Zoning Board would be able to review the Subdivision Plats against the Design Guidelines.

Regarding changes being made to the Community Plan, a majority of the changes would be to the Land Use Budget. Two of the changes were to conform to stipulations 23 and 24 addressed setbacks and definitions.

Boardmember Beth Coons confirmed they could go to smaller lots but that would trigger a whole new set of requirements and guidelines. They did not anticipate having many lots smaller than 4,000 sq. ft. They were asking for flexibility. Boardmember Coons confirmed that DU2 and DU4 there was about 384 acres, so for community residential and community residential small lot 95% or 362 acres could be 2,000 sq. ft. lots. Mr. Gilbert stated they could not sell a subdivision with only 2,000 sq. ft. lots. Also staff would not approve the subdivision because it was not a variety of development. Then they would have to receive Subdivision approval from the Planning and Zoning Board. Boardmember Coons was concerned with the 95% statement. She liked allowing flexibility, but to the extreme 95% was a concern. Mr. Gilbert stated the internal controls were put there to insure that would not happen.

Planning Director John Wesley, then stated he agreed with Mr. Gilbert regarding the items that were in the Community Plan that gives some assurance that as those come in, if there is too much of one kind the internal controls would come in. He stated they had talked about setting arbitrary percentages but decided they wanted to let the market set the design. He suggested the Board could let the 95% remain for the community residential and establish a smaller percentage for the small lot residential.

Chair Randy Carter confirmed that the plats would come before the Planning and Zoning Board. The Board could then turn down the plats if there were too much of one type.

It was moved by Boardmember Suzanne Johnson, seconded by Boardmember Brad Arnett

That: The Board recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z12-27 conditioned upon:

MINUTES OF THE JULY 18, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

1. Compliance with the Zoning Ordinance and all City development codes and regulations for the proposed development.

Vote: Passed 6 – 0

* * * * *

Note: *Audiotapes 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*

MINUTES OF THE JULY 18, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z12-28 (District 6)** The 5200 to 5300 blocks of South Ellsworth Road (east side). Located on the north side of the future State Route 24 freeway alignment between Ellsworth Road to approximately one-quarter mile east of the Crismon Road alignment; southern portion of the former General Motors Proving Grounds (485± acres). District 6. Rezone from LI to PC. This request will establish the Pacific Proving Grounds North Community Plan. Pacific Proving LLC, owner; Beus Gilbert, applicant. (PLN2011-00321)

Comments: Staffmember Angelica Guevara explained the Community Plan for Pacific Proving Grounds North. She stated there have been numerous revisions over several months. She stated the City's vision was for more mixed use development, the applicant wanted office, retail, employment, commercial, and residential. Residential would be allowed north of Williams Field Road. She stated there were five Development Units. Plans for Development Unit's 1, 3 and 5 would come back to the Planning and Zoning Board for review. Plans for 2 and 4 would be reviewed and approved by Planning staff. She explained staff had worked with the applicant to write conditions to address the Board's concerns at their Tuesday study session. The Land Use Budget had been revised to increase the non-residential square footage. She stated the applicant would be coming back with site plans to show how they can meet the minimum square footage requirements, as well as providing additional language regarding the Main Street concept. They would also be providing images for more variety.

Paul Gilbert, 4800 North Scottsdale Road represented the case. Mr. Gilbert stated they had spent the last year working with staff on this project. He stated they would be making minor changes to the plan prior to the City Council meeting to address final City concerns. He stated they were in agreement with all of staff's conditions. Most of the changes had been to the Land Use Budget. He confirmed the applicant was in accord with the revised Land Use Budget. Mr. Gilbert gave a brief history of this site, and stated the numbers are still very similar. He stated they had worked with Lynn Kusy, at the Airport as well as representatives from Boeing to address any concerns they have, and both are in favor of this proposal. He stated it was very important for them that the Airport be successful. They need the Airport to be successful so that their project can be successful. The airport compatibility standards was included in the Community Development Plan.

Mr. Gilbert stated this proposal was for the Mixed Use Community District of the City's Strategic Plan, which calls for live, work, play areas, and a wide variety of high density and low density. The Strategic Plan requires urban centers, which they have. The plan they propose is intense, high quality and pedestrian oriented. They have both high density and low density residential. The Strategic Plan states this area is the prime residential area for this area. The Strategic Plan requires they have urban centers with minimum floor area ratios of .35 or higher, with the adjustments to the land use budget they meet that as well. Mr. Gilbert stated their plan met all of the goals and requirements of the Strategic Plan. He stated density was fundamentally important to the City meeting their employment goals for the Gateway area. He then quoted the Strategic Plan "In order to attract the types of employers and workers envisioned, development will need to be intense, of high quality, and provide for pedestrian orientation". He stated their community plan directly responded to the vision of the Strategic Plan. They added a section to the Community Plan dealing with sustainability in 4.1. Also in their design guidelines, when they come in, they will address the details of sustainability. He stated the land use budget reflected the desired minimum of .35 FAR, he stated that had been a major concern, and he understood why Chair Carter questioned whether they could meet the goals of development along Ellsworth. He stated they were uncomfortable with the original requirement, but they were comfortable with

MINUTES OF THE JULY 18, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

the revised goal. He stated they believed the new goal was realistic.

Regarding quality, he stated Mr. Coen and Mr. Levine had a lot of people contacting them to buy this property. They felt Harvard Investment would do the quality job they needed to ensure the project south of the freeway will work. He stated they would include quality parks and trail systems, with 65 acres of parks and open space, and 8 miles of trails and pathways. There would be community open space as opposed to private open space. There would be a minimal usable open space requirement with 10% for community residential and 5% for community residential small lots. They had increased the minimum rear yard setback to 10'. For the small lot residential approximately 1,600 sq. ft. would be setbacks and open space, for 7,000 sq. ft. lots 2,400 sq. ft. would be open space and setbacks. Each development unit would have guidelines. For DU2 and DU4 the Planning and Zoning Board would not see the guidelines, so they were proposing a new condition "the residential development design standards as required by Chapter 7.4C of the Community Plan shall be distributed to the Planning and Zoning Board for review and comment as part of the administrative staff review and approval process. A study session shall be held with the Planning and Zoning Board to discuss the proposed design guidelines upon request by the Planning and Zoning Board". Mr. Gilbert then presented the entry features as an example of their proposed quality. For DU1, DU3, and DU5 the Planning and Zoning Board would review. The Board would also review Subdivision Plats for all development. The Planning and Zoning Board would be able to review the Subdivision Plats against the Design Guidelines.

Regarding changes being made to the Community Plan, a majority of the changes would be to the Land Use Budget. Two of the changes were to conform to stipulations 23 and 24 addressed setbacks and definitions.

Boardmember Beth Coons confirmed they could go to smaller lots but that would trigger a whole new set of requirements and guidelines. They did not anticipate having many lots smaller than 4,000 sq. ft. They were asking for flexibility. Boardmember Coons confirmed that DU2 and DU4 there was about 384 acres, so for community residential and community residential small lot 95% or 362 acres could be 2,000 sq. ft. lots. Mr. Gilbert stated they could not sell a subdivision with only 2,000 sq. ft. lots. Also staff would not approve the subdivision because it was not a variety of development. Then they would have to receive Subdivision approval from the Planning and Zoning Board. Boardmember Coons was concerned with the 95% statement. She liked allowing flexibility, but to the extreme 95% was a concern. Mr. Gilbert stated the internal controls were put there to insure that would not happen.

Planning Director John Wesley, then stated he agreed with Mr. Gilbert regarding the items that were in the Community Plan that gives some assurance that as those come in, if there is too much of one kind the internal controls would come in. He stated they had talked about setting arbitrary percentages but decided they wanted to let the market set the design. He suggested the Board could let the 95% remain for the community residential and establish a smaller percentage for the small lot residential.

Chair Randy Carter confirmed that the plats would come before the Planning and Zoning Board. The Board could then turn down the plats if there were too much of one type.

It was moved by Boardmember Beth Coons, seconded by Boardmember Brad Arnett

That: The Board recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z12-28 conditioned upon:

MINUTES OF THE JULY 18, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative and the redlined Community Plan ("CP") as prepared and submitted by staff.
2. The Planning Director is authorized and directed to correct the Community Plan for grammatical, formatting, and other errors that do not affect or change the meaning of the CP's substantive requirements or standards.
3. With respect to handling of technical engineering issues and standards all of the Master Reports are to be considered in draft format with revisions needed to accommodate the changes prepared by staff on the land use budget. All of the Master Reports must be finally approved by the City Engineer and/or the City Traffic Engineer before approval of the first Development unit Plan.
4. Staff has the option of submitting the Development Unit Design Guidelines for review by the Design Review Board.
5. Site Plan Review through the public hearing process by the Planning & Zoning Board of future Development Unit plans for DU1, DU3, and DU5.
6. All preliminary subdivision plats require approval by the Planning and Zoning Board.
7. Compliance with all requirements of the Design Review process for development proposals including the following:
 - a) Buildings 4 or more stories in height.
 - b) Multiple-residence and attached single residence projects that exceed the standard density of the RM-2 density range.
 - c) Mixed-use, commercial and/or industrial projects that have frontage on an arterial or collector street or that are a part of an existing or planned development that has frontage on an arterial or collector street.
 - d) Mixed Use, commercial and/or industrial projects that have, or will have, greater than 20,000 square feet of gross floor area.
8. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations except those modified with the approval of the Community Plan or those identified as requiring future review and approval by the City Engineer if approval is granted by the City Engineer.
9. Future development shall fully comply with all requirements of the Community Plan.
10. 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.
11. All required landscape areas adjacent to the property line of the site shall be installed in the first phase of construction for development site when adjacent to residential districts.
12. Certificates of Occupancy and/or Completion for individual non-residential buildings shall not be granted until required parking and landscaping are constructed for each development site in compliance with applicable standards.
13. All undeveloped parcels within a group commercial, industrial, or office project shall have temporary landscaping, extruded curbs, and screen walls where parking and loading/service areas are visible from Rights of Way and public areas.
14. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Technical Review Committee.
15. All non-residential buildings to be architecturally designed to comply with the approved design guidelines for each Development Unit.
16. Should an automobile service station be proposed, it requires approval of a Special Use Permit by the Board of Adjustment. Should an automobile service station be proposed along Ellsworth Road, the design will be carefully reviewed and approved only if it is found that the design is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Mesa Gateway Strategic Development Plan, the goals of the Mesa Gateway Airport,

MINUTES OF THE JULY 18, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

- and is designed for an urban setting.
17. Applicant shall provide guidelines and illustrations for an urban designed automobile service station to be added to Chapter 9.5 of the Community Plan prior to approval of DU1.
 18. Review and approval of a Special Use Permit by the Board of Adjustment for a Comprehensive Sign Plan for the entire community and/or individual development parcels as required by the Community Plan.
 19. Review and approval of a Council Use Permit for uses identified within the land use tables as required by the Community Plan.
 20. Prior to any ground-disturbing activities, the acreage should be inspected by a qualified cultural resources specialist. The extent of the historic properties present should be delineated, and their integrity assessed as required by the letter dated April 23, 2008 by David Jacobs of the State Historic Preservation Office.
 21. Owner granting an Avigation Easement and Release to the City, pertaining to Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport which will be prepared and recorded by the City (concurrently with the recordation of the final subdivision map, prior to the issuance of a building permit). –should be provided prior to the approval of the 1st DUP.
 22. Written notice of this Avigation Easement be provided to future residents, and acknowledgement received that the project is within 1 mile(s) of Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport.
 23. Noise attenuation measures to be incorporated into the design and construction of the homes to achieve a noise level reduction as identified within the Community Plan.
 24. Amend the Community Plan in the CR and CRSL LUG's to provide at least one useable open space area a minimum of 100 s.f. on each lot.
 25. Amend the Community Plan to include a minimum building height of 20 feet for buildings within the CMU LUG.
 26. The residential development design standards as required by Chapter 7.4C of the Community Plan shall be distributed to the Planning and Zoning Board for review and comment as part of the administrative staff review and approval process. A study session shall be held with the Planning and Zoning Board to discuss the proposed design guidelines upon request by the Planning and Zoning Board

Vote: Passed 6 – 0

* * * * *

Note: *Audiotapes 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*

MINUTES OF THE JULY 18, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z12-31 (District 6)** 6837 East Monte Avenue. Located north Guadalupe Road and east of Power Road (0.2± acres). District 6. Modification of the PAD within an RS-6 zoning district for the Superstition Springs Village Unit Seven single-residence subdivision. This request will allow an office as an accessory use as part of a PAD overlay within a single-residence subdivision. (PLN2012-00160).

Comments: This case was removed from the consent agenda by a resident of the subdivision.

George Shore, a resident of the subdivision for 17 years spoke in opposition to the case. Mr. Shore stated the Homeowners Association used to rent a building across Power Road and at that time there were two employees. Now they are in this house, there is an RV gate for a golf cart and they are modifying the home and the lot. He stated the Association gave him a hard time for having an RV gate and gave his neighbor a hard time for having a structure that was visible above the fence. Why should they be allowed to do what they don't allow the residents to do? He stated they told residents they would double their fees if this case was not approved and they had to find another location. He stated this was the Superstition Springs Master Association, 1000 foot notification was not enough.

Ralph Pew represented the case and explained they had applied to modify the PAD for the Superstition Springs Village Unit Seven single-residence subdivision. Staff was concerned with parking issues, so they were changing the request to include a Special Use Permit for an alternative parking plan, which was the reason for the continuance to the August 15, 2012 meeting.

Chair Carter stated many of Mr. Shore's concerns were not the Board's prevue, he wondered if Mr. Shore would have any recourse through the City.

It was moved by Boardmember Beth Coons, seconded by Boardmember Lisa Hudson

That: The Board continue zoning case Z12-31 to August 15, 2012

Vote: Passed 6 – 0

* * * * *

Note: Audiotapes 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

MINUTES OF THE JULY 18, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z12-32 (District 4)** 68 East Main Street. Located east of Center Street on the north side of Main Street (1± acre). District 4. Council Use Permit. This request will allow a restaurant with a drive-thru in the Downtown Core zoning district. Louis T. Hines Trust #1, owner; Chris Cooper, Arizado Architecture and Design, applicant.

Comments: This case was placed on the consent agenda by the Board and therefore was not discussed individually

It was moved by Boardmember Vince DiBella, seconded by Boardmember Suzanne Johnson

That: The Board recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z12-32 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan submitted.
2. Removal of the existing drive-thru exit to Main Street and installation of pavers that match existing sidewalk.
3. Consistent with the plant materials, alignment, and spacing of existing landscape planters to the east, installation of a six-foot by sixteen-foot (6'x16') landscape planter generally located between the pedestrian light standards on either side of the existing drive-thru exit to Main Street with associated 36 inch box size tree and ground cover.
4. Compliance with all requirements of an Administrative Design Review.
5. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations (Engineering, Transportation, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.).

Vote: Passed 6 – 0

* * * * *

Note: *Audiotapes 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*

MINUTES OF THE JULY 18, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z12-34 (District 5)** Parcel 14/15 at Mountain Bridge. Located south of McKellips Road and west of Ellsworth Road (32.1± ±±±±). Rezone from RS-9-PAD-PAD to RS-9-PAD-PAD and Site Plan Review. This request will allow the development of a single-residence subdivision. Pinnacle Ridge Holdings, LLC, owner; Paul Dugas, applicant. (PLN2012-00185)

Comments: This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually

It was moved by Boardmember Vince DiBella, seconded by Boardmember Suzanne Johnson

That: The Board continue zoning case Z12-34 to August 15, 2012

Vote: Passed 6 – 0

* * * * *

Note: *Audiotapes 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*

MINUTES OF THE JULY 18, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **GPMInor12-01** The 9800 through 10000 blocks of East McKellips Road (south side). Located at the southwest corner of McKellips Road and Crismon Road (40± acres). District 5. Minor General Plan Amendment to adjust the boundaries of the existing Mesa 2025 General Plan Land Use designation from LDR 0-1 to LDR 1-2. This request will allow the development of a single-residential subdivision. US Development Land, LLC, owner; Ralph Pew, Pew and lake, PLC, applicant. (PLN2011-00285)

Comments: This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually

It was moved by Boardmember Vince DiBella, seconded by Boardmember Suzanne Johnson

That: The Board continue zoning case GPMInor12-01 to September 19, 2012

Vote: Passed 6 – 0

* * * * *

Note: *Audiotapes 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*

MINUTES OF THE JULY 18, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z11-28 (District 5)** The 9800 through 10000 blocks of East McKellips Road (south side). Located at the southwest corner of McKellips Road and Crismon Road (40± acres). District 5. Rezone from RS-35 PAD to RS-15 PAD. This request will allow the development of a single-residential subdivision. US Development Land, LLC, owner; Ralph Pew, Pew and lake, PLC, applicant. (PLN2011-00286)

Comments: This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually

It was moved by Boardmember Vince DiBella, seconded by Boardmember Suzanne Johnson

That: The Board continue zoning case Z11-28 to September 29, 2012

Vote: Passed 6 – 0

* * * * *

Note: *Audiotapes 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*

MINUTES OF THE JULY 18, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **GPMInor12-02** The 10800 to 11100 blocks of East Williams Field Road (north side) and the 5600 to 6000 blocks of South Signal Butte Road (east side). Located at the northeast corner of Signal Butte Road and Williams Field Road (105± acres). District 6. Minor General Plan Amendment to adjust the boundaries of the existing Mesa 2025 General Plan Land Use designation from Business Park (BP) to Medium Density Residential 4-6 du/acre (MDR 4-6). This request will facilitate the future development of a single-residential subdivision and commercial corner. Pacific Proving LLC, owner; Beus Gilbert PLC, applicant. (PLN2011-00358)

Comments: The request was read into the record. There was no discussion.

It was moved by Boardmember Brad Arnett, seconded by Boardmember Lisa Hudson

That: The Board recommend to the City Council adoption of case GPMInor12-02

Vote: Passed 6 – 0

* * * * *

Note: *Audiotapes 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*

MINUTES OF THE JULY 18, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z12-29 (District 6)** The 10800 to 11100 blocks of East Williams Field Road (north side) and the 5600 to 6000 blocks of South Signal Butte Road (east side). Located at the northeast corner of Signal Butte Road and Williams Field Road (105± acres). District 6. Rezone from Rural 43 SUP to City of Mesa LI. This request will establish City zoning on recently annexed property. Pacific Proving LLC, owner; Beus Gilbert PLC, applicant.

Comments: The case was read into the record. There was no discussion.

It was moved by Boardmember Suzanne Johnson, seconded by Boardmember Vince DiBella

That: The Board recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z12-29 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the Zoning Ordinance and all City development codes and regulations for the proposed development.

Vote: Passed 6 – 0

* * * * *

Note: *Audiotapes 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*

MINUTES OF THE JULY 18, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z12-30 (District 6)** The 10800 to 11100 blocks of East Williams Field Road (north side) and the 5600 to 6000 blocks of South Signal Butte Road (east side). Located at the northeast corner of Signal Butte Road and Williams Field Road (105± acres). District 6. Rezone from LI to RSL-4.5 PAD and LC. This request will facilitate the future development of a single-residential subdivision and commercial corner. Pacific Proving LLC, owner; Beus Gilbert PLC, applicant. (PLN2011-00358)

Comments: This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually

It was moved by Boardmember Vince DiBella, seconded by Boardmember Suzanne Johnson

That: The Board continue zoning case Z12-30 to August 15, 2012

Vote: Passed 6 – 0

* * * * *

Note: *Audiotapes 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*

MINUTES OF THE JULY 18, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **GPMInor12-03** 1141 North Greenfield Road. Located at the southeast corner of Greenfield Road and Brown Road (18± acres). District 2. Minor General Plan Amendment to adjust the boundaries of the existing Mesa 2025 General Plan Land Use designation from Low-Density Residential 1-2 du/acre (LDR 1-2) to Medium Density Residential 2-4 du/acre (MDR 2-4). This request will allow the development of a single residential subdivision. Land holdings Investment Co., LLC, owner; Paul Dugas, applicant. (PLN2012-00110)

Comments: Chair Carter read the request into the record.

Boardmember Coons confirmed there had been a neighborhood meeting and the neighbor's concerns had been addressed.

It was moved by Boardmember Vince DiBella, seconded by Boardmember Beth Coons

That: The Board recommend to the City Council adoption of case GPMInor12-03

Vote: Passed 6 – 0

* * * * *

Note: *Audiotapes 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*

MINUTES OF THE JULY 18, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z12-33 (District 2)** 1141 North Greenfield Road. Located at the southeast corner of Greenfield Road and Brown Road (18± acres). District 2. Rezone from RS-15-PAD to RS-15-PAD and Site Plan Review. This request will allow the development of a single residence subdivision. Land Holdings Investment Co., LLC, owner; Paul Dugas, applicant. (PLN2012-00110)

Comments: Chair Carter read the request into the record.

Boardmember Coons confirmed there had been a neighborhood meeting and the neighbor's concerns had been addressed.

It was moved by Boardmember Beth Coons, seconded by Boardmember Vince DiBella

That: The Board recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z12-33 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan and preliminary plat submitted, (without guarantee of lot yield, building count, or lot coverage).
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Lots 17-21 are restricted to single story.
4. 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.
5. Administrative review and approval by the Planning Director required for the residential product.
6. All street improvements, street frontage landscaping, and perimeter theme walls to be installed in the first phase of construction.
7. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Technical Review Committee.
8. View fences on residential lots shall comply with the City of Mesa pool fence barrier regulations.

Vote: Passed 6 – 0

* * * * *

Note: Audiotapes 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

MINUTES OF THE JULY 18, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

John Wesley, Secretary
Planning Director

DA:
I:\P&Z\P&Z 12\Minutes\7-18-12.doc