

CITY OF MESA

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING

Held in the City of Mesa Council Chambers

Date: August 21, 2003 Time: 4:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Marty Whalen, Chair
Mike Cowan, Vice-Chair
Rich Adams
Barbara Carpenter
Pat Esparza
Alex Finter
Bob Saemisch

MEMBERS ABSENT

OTHERS PRESENT

Dorothy Chimel
Michelle Dahlke
Ryan Heiland
Lois Underdah
Maria Salaiz
Wahid Alam
Craig Coty

Sean Lake
John Gendron
Bill Petrie
Mark Metzger
Wayne Balmer
Laura Hyneman
Steve Beck

Mayor Hawker
Neal Barna
Charlie Deaton
Julie Rice
Joe Padilla
Nick Wood
Boy Scout Troop 995
others

Chairperson Whalen declared a quorum present and the meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m. The meeting was recorded on tape and dated August 21, 2003. Before adjournment at 7:15 p.m., action was taken on the following items:

It was moved by Boardmember Cowan, seconded by Boardmember Esparza that the minutes of the June 19, 2003 meeting be approved as submitted. The vote was 4-0-3 (Adams, Finter, Saemisch were not present at the June meeting).

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Esparza that the minutes of the July 15 and July 17, 2003 meetings be approved as submitted. The vote was 5-0-2 (Cowan, Finter were not present at the July meetings.)

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

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Cowan that the consent items be approved. Vote 7-0

Code Amendments:

- *1. Amending Sections 11-1-6 and 11-13-2 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding "Special Events".
2. Amending Sections 11-19-5 and 11-19-8 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding "Vehicle Signs".
- *3. Amending Sections 11-16-2 and 11-13-2 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding "Vehicle Display Platforms".
- *4. Amending Sections 11-1-6, 11-18-4, 11-18-7, and 11-18-8 of the Zoning Ordinance

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

pertaining to the establishment of a "Zoning Hearing Officer".

General Plan Amendments: *GMinor03-01 and *GMinor03-02.

Zoning Cases: *Z03-12, *Z03-20, *Z03-32, *Z03-34, *Z03-35, *Z03-36, Z03-37, Z03-38,
*Z03-39, *Z03-40, *Z03-41, *Z03-42, Z03-43

Preliminary Plat: *Paloma Estates

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: Amending Sections 11-1-6 and 11-13-2 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding "Special Events".
CONTINUED FROM MAY 15, AND JULY 17, 2003 MEETINGS.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Cowan

That: The Board recommend to the City Council approval of Amending Sections 11-1-6 and 11-13-2 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding "Special Events".

Vote: Passed 7-0

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: Amending Sections 11-19-5 and 11-19-8 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding "Vehicle Signs".

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

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Cowan

That: The Board continue this item to the September 18, 2003 meeting.

Vote: Passed 7-0

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: Amending Sections 11-16-2 and 11-13-2 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding "Vehicle Display Platforms".

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

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Cowan

That: The Board recommend to the City Council approval of Amending Sections 11-16-2 and 11-13-2 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding "Vehicle Display Platforms".

Vote: Passed 7-0

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: Amending Sections 11-1-6, 11-18-4, 11-18-7, and 11-18-8 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the establishment of a "Zoning Hearing Officer". **CONTINUED FROM MAY 15, AND JULY 17, 2003 MEETINGS.**

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

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Cowan

That: The Board table Amending Sections 11-1-6, 11-18-4, 11-18-7, and 11-18-8 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the establishment of a "Zoning Hearing Officer".

Vote: Passed 7-0

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **GPMInor 03-01 – (District 4)**The 1300-1400 blocks of South Country Club Drive (36.63 ac.±). Proposed change to the General Plan Land Use Map from Community Commercial (CC) and High Density Residential (HDR) 10-15 dwelling units per acre to Medium Density Residential (MDR) 6-10 dwelling units per acre. American Land Lease, owner; Sean Lake, Pew and Lake, P.L.C., applicant. **CONTINUED FROM THE MAY 15, AND JUNE 19, 2003 MEETING.**

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

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Cowan

That: The Board continue GPMInor03-01 to the September 18, 2003 meeting.

Vote: Passed 7-0

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **GPMInor 03-02 – (District 1)**The 1000 – 1100 block of McLellan Road, north side (14.1 ac ±). Minor General Plan Amendment. This case involves amending the General Plan from Medium Density Residential 4-6 du/ac (MDR 4-6± du/ac) to High Density Residential 15+ du/ac (HDR 15± du/ac). Suggs Homes Inc., owner; Withey, Anderson & Morris PLC, applicant. **CONTINUED FROM THE JULY 17, 2003 MEETING.**

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

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Cowan

That: The Board continue GPMInor03-02 to the September 18, 2003 meeting.

Vote: Passed 7-0

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-12 – (District 5)** The 4400 block of East McLellan Road (south side), south to East Hannibal (2.02 ac±). Rezone from R-3 to R-3 P.A.D. This case involves the development of an apartment complex. John Bellerose, owner/applicant. Also consider the preliminary plat of “Bellerose Apartments.” **CONTINUED FROM THE MARCH 27, 2003, APRIL 17, 2003, AND MAY 15, 2003 MEETINGS.**

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

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Cowan

That: The Board continue zoning case Z03-12 to the September 18, 2003 meeting.

Vote: Passed 7-0

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-20 – (District 4)** The 1300-1400 blocks of South Country Club Drive (36.63 ac.±). Proposed change to the General Plan Land Use Map from Community Commercial (CC) and High Density Residential (HDR) 10-15 dwelling units per acre to Medium Density Residential (MDR) 6-10 dwelling units per acre. American Land Lease, owner; Sean Lake, Pew and Lake, P.L.C., applicant. **CONTINUED FROM THE MAY 15, AND JUNE 19, 2003 MEETING.**

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

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Cowan

That: The Board continue zoning case Z03-20 to the September 18, 2003 meeting.

Vote: Passed 7-0

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-32 – (District 6)** The southwest corner of Sossaman Road and Hampton Avenue (36 ac. ±). Rezone from AG (Conceptual M-1 and PEP) DMP to M-1-PAD-DMP. This case involves the development of a mixture of industrial uses including auto dealerships. DMB Superstition Springs Investors, owner; Karrin Kunasek Taylor, Esq. (Biskind, Hunt, & Taylor, P.L.C.), applicant. Also consider the preliminary plat of “Superstition Springs Center Auto Loop.” **CONTINUED FROM THE JULY 17, 2003 MEETING.**

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

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Cowan

That: The Board approve the preliminary plat of “Superstition Springs Center Auto Loop” and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z03-32 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the conceptual site plan and preliminary plat submitted, (without guarantee of lot yield, building count, lot coverage) except as noted below.
2. Review and approval by the Planning and Zoning Board, Design Review Board and City Council of future development plans for M-1 uses, except for vehicle dealerships designed in substantial conformance with the conceptual site plan.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic Engineering, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.).
5. Dedicate the right-of-way required for deceleration lane along Sossaman Road 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.
6. All street improvements and off-site landscaping along Sossaman Road and Hampton Avenue frontages to be installed in the first phase of construction. All street improvements and off-site landscaping along the Internal Loop Road to be installed upon development. All on-site improvements to be installed on remainder of parcels upon parcel development.
7. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Technical Review Committee.
8. Compliance with all requirements of the Design Review Board including foundation base requirements, permanent canopy design, parking area landscaping, screening, and building design.
9. The zoning case does not grant approval of any signs. Review and approval of a Special Use Permit by the Board of Adjustment for a comprehensive sign plan is required.
10. Owner granting an Avigation Easement and Release to the City, pertaining to Williams 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).
11. Retention basins to be 6:1 slopes maximum when adjacent to public rights-of-way or pedestrian walkways.
12. Provide landscaped setbacks along the Internal Loop Road, measured from right-of-way line, as follows for vehicle dealerships only:
 - A. Building setback – 35-feet along street frontage.
 - B. Special display parking – 12-feet along street frontage.
 - C. General display parking – 12-feet along street frontage.
 - D. Customer, employee, and service parking – 20-feet along street frontage. Final layout and design to be reviewed and approved by the Design Review Board.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

13. Provide landscaped setbacks along East Hampton Avenue, measured from back of curb, as follows for vehicle dealerships only:
 - A. Building setback – 50-feet along street frontage.
 - B. Special display parking – 17-feet along street frontage.
 - C. General display parking – 25-foot average with a minimum of 20-feet along E. Hampton Road. Final layout and design to be reviewed and approved by the Design Review Board.
 - D. Customer, employee, and service parking – 35-feet along street frontage.
14. Provide landscaped setbacks along South Sossaman Road, measured from back of curb, as follows for vehicle dealerships only:
 - A. Building setback – 65-feet along street frontage.
 - B. Special display parking – 32-feet along street frontage.
 - C. General display parking – 40-foot average with a minimum of 35-feet along S. Sossaman Road. Final layout and design to be reviewed and approved by the Design Review Board.
 - D. Customer, employee, and service parking – 50-feet along street frontage.
15. Along the length of the deceleration lane required on South Sossaman Road, provide landscaped setbacks measured from back of curb, as follows for vehicle dealerships only:
 - A. Building setback – measured from back of curb, maintain setback established In Condition of Approval #14.
 - B. Special display parking – 20-feet minimum along street frontage.
 - C. General display parking – 23-feet minimum along street frontage.
 - D. Customer, employee, and service parking – 38-feet along street frontage. Final layout and design to be reviewed and approved by the Design Review Board.
16. Provide landscaped setbacks measured from P.A.D. D.M.P. perimeter property line (along ADOT retention basin and/or drainage tract) as follows for vehicle dealerships only:
 - A. General or special display parking where a 6-foot high (minimum) screen wall is not provided – 10-feet,
 - B. Customer and/or employee parking without a 6-foot high (minimum) screen wall – 10-feet,
 - C. General or special display parking where a 6-foot high (minimum) screen wall is provided – 2-feet and provide 8-foot by 8-foot clear landscape islands every 10 stalls unless otherwise approved by the Design Review Board.
 - D. Service area parking – provided 8-foot by 8-foot clear landscape islands every 10 stalls unless otherwise approved by the Design Review Board.
17. Provide landscaped setbacks at street corners for vehicle dealerships as follows:
 - A. Building setback – 35-feet,
 - B. Special display parking setback – 5-feet from sight visibility line.
 - C. All other parking setback – 20-foot average with a minimum 10-foot setback. Final layout and design to be reviewed and approved by Design Review Board.
18. Provide on-lot building setbacks for vehicle dealerships a minimum of 15-feet separation. Building separation on adjoining lots to be per City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance requirements.
19. Provide 12-inch minimum screening of general display parking areas for vehicle dealerships only.
20. Provide landscaped setbacks within vehicle dealerships only as follows:
 - A. Side yard landscape setback – for a distance of 40-feet from the front ROW line. (Trees & shrubs per Code & Design Review Board).
 - 0-feet – auto service building adjacent to same
 - 10-feet – auto service building or display adjacent to retail uses
 - 10-feet – display adjacent to display or service or adjacent to a wall which is 6-feet high or

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

higher.

21. Provide revised Design Guidelines and P.A.D. project narrative prior to the Introduction of the Ordinance to the City of Mesa City Council.
22. Photometric study to be reviewed and approved by Design Review Board.

Vote: Passed 7-0

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-34 – (District 6)** 3200 block of South Signal Butte Road (east side) (42.6 ac. ±)
Rezone from R1-43 to Public Facilities (PF). This rezoning will facilitate conformance with the
Mesa 2025 General Plan. Salt River Project, owner; City of Mesa, applicant.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Cowan

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z03-34
conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
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.

Vote: Passed 7-0

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-35 – (District 6)** Southwest corner of Pecos Road and Signal Butte Road (320 ac. ±) Rezone from R1-43 to M-2. This rezoning will facilitate conformance with the Mesa 2025 General Plan. Arizona State Land Department, owner; City of Mesa, applicant.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Cowan

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z03-35 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
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. Site Plan Review and approval of future development plans for parcel 218-56-563A (subject site).

Vote: Passed 7-0

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-36 – (District 6)** North of the northwest corner of Sunview and Baseline Road (17.05 ac. ±) Site Plan Review. This request is for the development of offices and ancillary retail uses. Mesa Arizona Real Estate Investment, owner; Tim Rasnake, Archicon, applicant. Also consider the preliminary plat.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Cowan

That: The Board approve the preliminary plat and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z03-36 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 coverage) except as noted below.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Design Review Board, including landscaping, pedestrian connections, patient drop-off areas and elevations.
3. All pad buildings, landscaping, elevations, signage, site lighting and pedestrian links to conform to the approved Design Guidelines for the Arizona Health and Technology Park.
4. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic Engineering, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.).
6. All street improvements and landscaping to be installed in the first phase of construction.
7. Prior to building permit approval for the administration building identified in Phase II, the applicant must provide evidence of conformance with Fire Code requirements or an alternative approved by the Fire Marshall.
8. Buildings used for the sale of medical supplies in conjunction with a medical office or clinic cannot be identified from a public street by signage, display, building orientation or other visual means per Section 11-6-2-A-3 of the Zoning Ordinance.
9. Compliance with the Comprehensive Sign Plan approved by the Board of Adjustment (ZA01-41).

Vote: Passed 7-0

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-37 – (District 5)** Southwest corner of Power Road and McDowell Road (17.59 ac. ±) Rezone from OS to C-2 and Site Plan Modification. This request is for the development of a commercial shopping center. Tom Allen, Trustee, owner; Irwin Pasternack, applicant. Also consider the preliminary plat.

Comments: Dick Presto, representing the applicant, gave an overview of the project. He mentioned that the Diamond Shamrock on the corner is not owned by the current developer of the remainder parcel. He added that he felt they had submitted a really nice project, had eliminated driveways, re-oriented buildings and done a lot of things with this shopping center that most developers are not doing.

Chair Whalen stated that there was a concern regarding curb cuts on McDowell and the number of drive-through restaurant pads. Mr. Presto responded that the original site plan developed for that site had previously approved five driveways along McDowell and up to three approved on Power Road. He added that their site plan originally had four driveways and they had dropped it to three. Because it is a 17-acre center the deletion of one of those driveways is going to hurt the center economically. He advised Boardmembers that they have cut down to one drive on Power Road and felt they had made concessions in that respect.

Regarding drive-throughs, Mr. Presto explained that there were only two and they are separated by the full length of the property, adding that the new zoning requirements for development in the City of Mesa are such that the drive-throughs are certainly going to be nice looking buildings. He informed the Board that they could eliminate one drive-through and make it a retail pad, or a sit-down restaurant.

Boardmember Carpenter stated that she was the one who had removed this item from consent. She added that this project was in her neighborhood and she understood there was potential for a specialty grocery store and the neighbors she knows would be very excited about that. She stated that she had an issue with four driveways plus one for the gas station and it was an issue for traffic control.

Ms. Carpenter mentioned that a concern of hers was the number of drive-through pads on the site, that her preference would be just one. She added that she also has an issue with the street design but she would take that up with the City.

Regarding the pad marked as a daycare center, Ms. Carpenter stated that she did not like that location; it had poor traffic circulation for safety of children. She added that she had a problem with fumes from the gas station. Regarding access to the gas station, she stated that if people thought they could turn left north on Power and cut through the parking lot where the day care is and get to the gas station they would go that way rather than go through the intersection. She added that it did look as though it were designed to discourage that.

Mr. Presto stated that the entire site plan was conceptual regarding the tenant mix and could go in different directions. The possibility of a day care is only one of a potential number of users for that parcel.

Chair Whalen asked that the Design Review Board be alerted to placement of vapor recovery equipment at the gas station in relation to a day care center.

Boardmember Saemisch asked if there is a left-turn allowed across Power Road and if that had been approved by Transportation. Ms. Chimel clarified that various divisions review all cases

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

presented to the Board and forwarded to City Council, including Transportation. Mr. Saemisch stated that a right turn lane seems logical and he was surprised that Transportation had not said anything.

Regarding the drive-through pads, Mr. Saemisch mentioned that they were well oriented and well separated from each other. He added that he did not see any traffic implications, that it was an excellent design over-all. He also stated that the day care could be resolved through design review.

Ms. Carpenter stated that there is a very high level of bicycling in that area and the bicycle lane is between the decel lane, the right hand turn lane and the lane that goes straight. She added that you end up criss-crossing and that is an issue to look at. Chair Whalen noted that is not unique to this project and it is safer for the cyclist.

It was moved by Boardmember Carpenter, seconded by Boardmember Cowan

That: The Board approve the preliminary plat and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z03-37 conditioned upon:

1. As shown on the site plan and elevations submitted, (without guarantee of lot coverage) except as noted below.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Design Review Board, including landscaping, pedestrian connections and elevations.
3. View fencing shall be constructed, in lieu of a solid masonry wall, around the designated play areas adjacent to the day care center. Final fence design to be approved by the Design Review Board.
4. All landscaping throughout the development, including perimeter landscaping, shall conform to the Desert Uplands Development Standards native plant palette.
5. All street improvements and perimeter landscaping to be installed in the first phase of construction.
6. Full compliance with all current Code requirements, unless modified through appropriate review and approval of the variance(s) outlined in the staff report.
7. 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.
8. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Technical Review Committee.
9. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
10. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic Engineering, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.).
11. Review and approval of a Special Use Permit by the Board of Adjustment for a comprehensive sign plan.
12. Written notice be provided to future tenants, and acknowledgment received that the project is within two miles of the Falcon Field Airport.

Vote: Passed 7-0

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-38 – (District 6)** The 3800 block of South Power Road (eastside) and the 6900 block of East Elliot Road (southside) (20.63 ac.±). Site Plan Review. This case involves development of an apartment complex. Farnham Realty, Inc., owner; Sean Lake, Pew & Lake, PLC, applicant.

Comments: Sean Lake, representing the applicant, stated that they had filed an application for a site plan review. He added that the discussion deals with site plan issues and not land use and requested that the Board focus their evaluation on site planning issues. Mr. Lake stated they are not aware of any unresolved issues and feel they are in conformance with the original zoning as approved in 1999. He distributed additional information from the previous case (Z99-16) and read excerpts from the City Council minutes of that case (Z99-16) and from the June 12, 2003, City Council Study Session.

Mr. Lake stated that the rationale for staff's recommendation for denial is the General Plan. He added that it is his understanding that the City Attorney had already rendered the opinion that the zoning trumps the General Plan and the zoning is already in place. Mr. Lake said City Council had already decided the issue as far as land use and zoning. He mentioned that the applicant had a neighborhood participation meeting and no one showed up. He urged Boardmembers to support the project because he felt land use issues have been decided, discussed and voted on and the site plan is consistent with all requirements of federal, state and local, pertaining to the development of the site plan.

Mr. Lake said the site was chosen for its proximity to the airport. The applicant understands that this is 2.3 miles away from the runway. They have a similarly located project in Tucson that they have operated for six years and it is 97% occupied. They have never had any complaints or problems associated with the airport.

Mr. Lake stated that they have found that with apartments - if someone is unhappy they have the option of moving away. They think it is important to have this type of a mixed-use residential project near employment core.

Eldon Von Lehe (7150 E. Camelback, Scottsdale) representing owner Farnham Realty, stated that he confirmed what was presented by Mr. Lake.

Mayor Keno Hawker stated that this zoning case reflects a lot on what we are doing in Mesa and our vision for Mesa. The power line corridor has always been the "line in the desert", south of that line is not supposed to be for any type of residential. He pointed out that were two cases on the agenda being rezoned to public facilities and M-2. He mentioned that Mesa is in the process of cleaning up all zoning that we inherited from the County that had a "holder" on it to reflect our master plan.

Mayor Hawker reminded Boardmembers that the Vision 2025 committee decided that one of the goals of that committee was to have our jobs to housing balance was in line at build out and this project can jeopardize that. He added that the future and development of Williams Gateway relies on protecting those flight corridors in and out of the airport and not having residential development conflict with those. He stated that it was actually voted on as mixed-use residential in 1999 and, at that time, it was consistent with the General Plan. In November 2002, however, that was changed by the voters. In an overwhelming vote of the population they confirmed that they wanted that as mixed use employment and embraced the idea of the jobs to housing ratio and freeing those areas from conflict with residential underneath the flight path of departing and arriving airplanes.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

In the April 1999 Council Meeting when this was approved as a site plan we were under the opinion that there was a use by right on this site. I should have voted against it then and been consistent all the way through. I've come to realize that when you are bidding on projects like the Boeing 77 and other projects, you cannot have residential conflicts in your arrival and departure paths. He encouraged Boardmembers to look out for what the master plan said and what they feel is in the best interest of Mesa as they vote on this case.

Mark Metzger, Boeing Company, stated that as a pilot stationed in Mesa he works very closely with the airplane companies. He pointed out that their concern is that if residential properties are allowed within the "fly friendly" zone, that will defeat what they are trying to do in keeping Williams Gateway as a viable economically developable airport that will be with us in the future. Residents of any kind in this area will have a negative impact on that. The concern is that we continue to have the "way in" and "way out" that does not conflict with the residents. Another concern is that we don't have a facility with a negative impact on the residents. We want to be as friendly as we can.

Mr. Metzger explained the differences in noise levels and stated that every time a KC-135 does a pattern at Williams Gateway that it would be like having a conversation with the lawnmower running next to you. If it's a 737 its like the garbage disposal. You cannot have a conversation when you have that kind of noise. This will be a pulsating noise as the aircraft goes over. He stated that Avigation Easements and Buyer Beware Clauses are very nice and highly recommended but they don't work because it just prevents the neighbors from taking legal redress but doesn't prevent them from picking up the phone and calling Williams Gateway to say "my family cannot live like this". It will affect economic viability of the airport and reduces employment and all the work done with the General Plan. He emphasized that they (Boeing) came to Mesa because Culver City was no longer viable for a major aircraft manufacturer to work out of there.

Chair Whalen asked about the procedure for a plane with an engine out. Mr. Metzger stated it would vary according to airplane and temperature but basically it would be safer if there was nothing there. He referred to an aircraft in Fresno, CA a few years ago that had gone into an apartment complex directly in line with the end of the runway.

Charles Deaton, Mesa Chamber of Commerce, clarified that their interest is in keeping the area as unencumbered as possible so that it can become the job center that all are looking for. He clarified that they do not wish to take a formal position on the case until the Board had heard from the developer.

Neil Barna, Chair of the Chamber of Commerce Board, stated they would like to take a "wait & see" attitude with regard to hearing the Board's decision and hearing from the developer. He added that he strongly supports the General Plan adopted by the voters and he is strongly in favor of Mayor Hawker's position. Mr. Barna stated that we need to protect not only the airport but the job hub that will develop.

Nick Wood, representing Williams Gateway Airport, stated that clearly things have changed since 1999 and they are seriously concerned with having a low income housing apartment project sandwiched in between heavy industrial, light industrial and commercial, and having the over-flight. Regarding the idea that if people move in and if they are unhappy can just move away, Mr. Wood stated that these people don't have many options, they can't easily change their positions. This project would not only put people in harm's way but in an area where the

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

noise would be unbearable as the airport becomes larger and may eventually be a reliever for Sky Harbor Airport.

Wayne Balmer showed the property that was part of the 1999 zoning case. It was a “cafeteria” zoning plan with a General Plan designation of “mixed use”, allowing 30% of the property to be used for residential development. At that time the plan was approved. Since that time it shows that the properties have been divided but they have not done a subdivision plat. He showed the edge of the runway used by the heavy aircraft (scheduled to be lengthened to 12,500 ft) It will be 2,500 feet closer to the property than it is now. He explained the differences between mixed-use – employment designation and the mixed use with residential allowed.

He spoke about noise levels and explained that the average is used but it does not reflect single-event noise.

Mr. Balmer explained the flight concentration areas. He stated that the applicant had proposed a fine project, but in the wrong place.

Boardmember Saemisch asked how many flights were projected for the future. Mr. Balmer responded that they currently operate at 180,000/operations/yr (a takeoff or landing). The projection is that they will go to 550,000 to 600,000 per year.

Boardmember Adams asked why take-offs are in a northwesterly rather than a southeasterly direction. Mr. Balmer responded that take-offs and landings are directed according to wind direction. Mr. Adams asked if the Zoning Verification was something done with most projects and would most developers realize that it is a letter with no teeth regarding binding any of the parties. Mr. Balmer responded that the Zoning Verification is a form letter that does not involve in-depth research. Most times people are buying a building. Typically they would have a zoning attorney, local architect or engineer who would stop by Planning and say “I’m interested in that piece of property [on the zoning map], what can you tell me about it?” Getting a building permit and getting zoning are two different things.

Boardmember Finter stated that it appears that in 1999 there was a very clear distinct opinion about this property and since that time there have been changes. He added that his impression is that the property owner and developer really didn’t see this coming and since we are going to clean up the zoning and get this turned around and on track, is there a process in place, or should there be a process to let people know if there are concerns about these zonings so they don’t spend the money and the effort and get too far down the road so we are at this stage.

Dorothy Chimel, Planning Director, stated that there is a process and that would be the pre-submittal process. All of the applications that come forward to the Board go through that process of gathering information from the Planning Division. It is, in fact, a requirement in order to get on the agenda. At the pre-submittal process and within the pre-submittal report staff very carefully pointed out to the applicant that this site was not in compliance with the basic policy decisions by the City of Mesa adopted by Council and approved by the citizens and reflected in the Mesa 2025 General Plan. She added that staff, for all cases, make an equally concerted effort to address all the site plan and development standards so the pre-submittal package also went into great detail to address the site itself – the very first statement under “land use” was that this was not consistent with the 2025 General Plan.

Mr. Balmer stated that when the Council asked that staff rezone the property that had the Paloma Estates Subdivision plat on it he had either called or written letters to all of the property

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

owners who had R1-43 zoning telling them that he would be in touch with them regarding rezoning of their property in the future stating that the City Council is proposing to change this and I will be in touch with you, and then calling people specifically to do zoning cases. At the same time I was doing that, Ms. Chimel told me that the R-3 piece had been re-activated. Then we looked to see if there were any other multiple family zoned properties in that area that we ought to be contacting. Right now, other than at ASU East we do not know of any other multiple family properties within that area outlined on the map.

Sean Lake stated that many of the speakers had referred to a zoning case. He added that this is not a zoning case but a site plan case. The discussion about airport overflights and land use are land use issues, they have been considered, discussed, evaluated and voted on by the Planning & Zoning Board and the City Council. Most recently, in June City Council voted for this project to move forward. He added that he really supports the development of Williams Gateway and thinks this is a good mixed use and compatible. Mr. Lake stated that they want to be part of the economic engine that will be part of Williams Gateway and they think they can co-exist and he urged support of the project.

Dorothy Chimel, Planning Director, stated that most of the points had been made, however she did want to highlight a few things. One basis for decision-making is the Mesa 2025 General Plan. It is not a land-use map, it is a series of policies and very clearly identifies that it is a statement of city policy, it is the guide that planners use to make the decisions that are brought forward. It is a framework for more specific planning, a tool for education and communication, a means of providing a long-range perspective and a way to improve the quality of life. Important are the existing unsafe conditions; the Board has seen maps showing existing conditions over the site; planes that were not there when the case was initially heard in 1999. There was a concern regarding the proximity of Williams Gateway and therefore the previous case did not include approval of the site plan. Instead there was a requirement that it come back for P&Z review and City Council approval. The conceptual design that was presented did stay outside of the noise contour lines that were presented in place at that time and also complied with the General Plan that was in effect at that time (where a percentage of the entirety of the property could be devoted to a multi-family residential project).

Ms. Chimel continued that today the conditions of the General Plan are such that this is mixed-use employment and not mixed-use residential. There was a great deal of discussion at the time that the 2025 General Plan was being developed regarding appropriate land uses. Noise is a concern and safety is a concern. It is not in a clear zone but in an area where we need to be conscientious and very concerned with noise, livability and safety. This is a major employment center for the region. Also, there has been a great deal of attention regarding protecting the opportunities for employment and to capture the jobs that are necessary to meet the policy direction in the Mesa 2025 Plan.

Regarding when did this first arrive -- the Paloma Estates case was continued from the February meeting and we started looking at this and presented it to Council immediately after the Planning & Zoning Board for discussion and direction from Council. The pre-submittal case very carefully pointed out that this site was not in compliance, would be impacted by overflights and that staff was not in support of the development. That conference was May 5, 2003.

Boardmember Adams stated he was sympathetic to the position that the applicant finds himself in and there could have been some possibility of misunderstanding regarding the Zoning Verification Letter. There are compelling arguments on both sides of the issues, however he is in favor of staff's recommendation for denial because of the importance of Williams Gateway to

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

the city over the next 20, 30 or 40 years as an economic and employment center. This needs to override the issues surrounding this case, for the good of the city and the fact that the General Plan has been in place for over a year.

Boardmember Carpenter stated that safety is paramount and having lived on Air Force bases where they test engines at night, it is noisy. She added that she has issues with the site plan itself. It is for low income families and low income financing has been procured. She mentioned that she was confused by the ADA funding and what it may or may not require of the applicant when it comes to affordable housing, adding that she did not see an accessibility plan on the site plan, there is no handicapped parking, nothing in the project narrative that any of the units will be adapted for people with disabilities. If 90% of the renters are people who will need some kind of assistance – low income or moderate income – she expects to see something in the narrative that talks about housing distress, people who have households with housing problems those who are cost-burdened paying more than 60% of their incomes for rent & utilities. That information is easily accessible and available. She added that is very important in her point of view. Ms. Carpenter expressed that the line of issues are multiple. One is what is the sequence of events? A very important item is what is the impact on residents of the proposed project. If they are indeed housing distressed population then the problems we have already brought forward will be exacerbated. Fairness to all parties is important and there is a lot to like about the project. What is concerning is location. When it comes to accessibility for people who are in housing distress or of low income we also have transit and transportation issues and currently I don't think there are any transit accessibilities to this site. She asked if the applicant had looked at potential future accessibility. There is also a question about Council direction. She stated that she is tending toward continuance.

Chair Whalen asked Ms. Chimel what the staff recommendation was, continuance or denial? Ms. Chimel responded that, as noted in the staff report and packet, the recommendation was for denial.

Mr. Lake stated that they had complied with all state, federal, and local regulations pertaining to handicapped parking, all of the first floor units are fully convertible for accessible units and they do comply with all the ADA regulations.

Vice-Chair Cowan asked for clarification regarding whether this project was or was not in compliance with the General Plan. Ms. Chimel stated that residential is not allowed in this area as defined by the General Plan. Based on the 2025 Plan this would be mixed-use employment and would not allow for any residential. He asked if beyond the development of this area there were other mechanisms to address the zoning discrepancies or concerns and the relationship with Williams Gateway Airport. Mr. Cowan stated that they are in a difficult spot on this case but he would look at it from the ethical school teacher perspective of housing a projected 87 children in this community that are put in a potential harm's way situation. He added they are in a difficult spot as to whether this is a site plan issue, a zoning issue, an economic issue or a long-range plan community issue. He had to either agree with the denial proposal by staff or the possibility of a continuance because looking at it as a viable attractive area for families, regardless of their economic circumstances, he had a difficult time seeing this as a viable opportunity for family members to establish a community to raise their children in an area that is conducive to the development of children.

Boardmember Saemisch stated that he has not seen this type of housing (affordable housing). Most people want to come in and build luxury apartments. It is obvious that luxury apartments would not be at the end of a runway. He stated that this probably makes some sense

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

economically to go this route but he did not think quality of life issues would make this a good project, even for affordable housing.

Chair Whalen stated that it is just a bad idea to put housing in this location. The Board has an opportunity to continue or deny, adding that he would like to send a strong message to City Council along with the opportunity to rezone.

Boardmember Esparza stated that she supports the development of Williams Gateway Airport as a vital economic hub of Mesa, however if it was so important early on the City should have taken measures to ensure that the zoning in the area was in conformance with the General Plan. She added that she felt she was being put in a position to deny the case based on something that was not thought out when 2025 Plan came out. Ms. Esparza informed that she would not deny the case based on staff's recommendation.

Boardmember Finter stated that he did not have the technical expertise or experience that other Boardmembers have but this is a difficult and unfortunate case. He stressed that he believes in Williams Gateway and it is important to make every effort to maintain that as the final economic hub we have in the community. Mr. Finter added that he would be in favor of a continuance as it seemed there are major issues that need to be handled before they look at a site plan review.

Boardmember Adams stated that he felt this was the second time he had to consider a case in a situation where an applicant may be a sort of a victim of Mesa 2025. He added that he thought that had a mechanism been put in place at that time to address those parcels that did not fit and initiate those zoning issues then, the Board would not be dealing with this now and individuals who may have made substantial time and monetary investment would have had earlier notice that this was going to happen. He stated that he would support a denial to send a message regarding the importance of the Williams Gateway area.

It was moved by Boardmember Saemisch, seconded by Boardmember Carpenter

That: The Board recommend denial of zoning case Z03-38.

Vote: Passed 5-2 (Carpenter, Esparza voting nay)

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-39 – (District 6)** The 11300 block to the 11500 block of East Warner Road (south side) and the 4500 block to the 5000 block of South Meridian Drive (west side) and the 4500 block to the 5000 block of South Mountain Road (east side). (198 ac ±). Rezone from R1-9 and R1-35 to R1-6 PAD – DMP, R1-6 DMP, R1-7 DMP, and R1-9 DMP. This case involves the development of the Gila River Springs development master plan. Gila River Ranches, LLC, owner; Sean Lake, Pew & Lake PLC, applicant. Also consider the preliminary plat of “Gila River Ranches”.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Cowan

That: The Board approve preliminary plat of “Gila River Ranches” and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z03-39 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, preliminary plat and elevations submitted, (without guarantee of lot yield, building count, lot coverage) except as noted below.
2. Compliance with the Residential Development Guidelines.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic Engineering, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.).
5. 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.
6. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Technical Review Committee.
7. Full compliance with all current Code requirements, unless modified through appropriate review and approval of the modifications outlined in the staff report.
8. Owner granting an Avigation Easement and Release to the City, pertaining to Williams 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).
9. View fences on residential lots shall comply with the City of Mesa pool fence barrier regulations.
10. Retention basins to be 6:1 slopes maximum when adjacent to public rights-of-way or pedestrian walkways.
11. Rear yard setbacks in lots backing up to an arterial street shall be at least 30-feet (30') in depth.

Vote: Passed 7-0

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-40 – (District 5)** Northwest corner of 93rd Street and McLellan Road. (2 ac. ±)
Rezone from Maricopa County Rural-43 to City of Mesa R1-43. This case involves the establishment of City zoning on recently annexed property. Owners, various; City of Mesa, applicant.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Cowan

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z03-40 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.

Vote: Passed 7-0

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-41 – (District 6)** Southeast corner of Broadway Road and the Roosevelt Water Conservation District Canal (55th Street). (11.7 ac. ±) Rezone from Maricopa County Rural-43 to City of Mesa R1-43. This case involves the establishment of City zoning on recently annexed property. Owners, various; City of Mesa, applicant.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Cowan

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z03-41 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.

Vote: Passed 7-0

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-42 – (District 5)** The 8600-8700 block of East Culver Street (north side) (5 ac. ±) Rezone from Maricopa County R1-35 to City of Mesa R1-35. This case involves the establishment of City zoning on recently annexed property. Owners, various; City of Mesa, applicant.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Cowan

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z03-42 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.

Vote: Passed 7-0

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-43 – (District 5)** The northeast corner of Greenfield Road and McLellan Road, Tract "A" Mesa Commerce Center (8.6 ac ±). Rezone from M-1 to M-1 PAD. This case involves the development of offices and warehouses. Mesa Land Partners, LLC, owners; UTAZ Development Corporation, applicant. Also consider the preliminary plat "Greenfield Professional Village" and "Falcon Commerce Square".

Comments: Craig Coty, the applicant, explained that this case involves an 8-acre parcel that is larger than the usual UTAZ development but the majority of it will be in line with what UTAZ has developed throughout Mesa in the last five years. He added that they are proposing eleven office buildings and three office/warehouse buildings. Mr. Coty stated that he believed the reason staff is recommending denial is there is a VNAE that runs along approximately 500' of the southern boundary from a 1985 case that contemplated the entire Mesa Commerce Center. When Mesa Commerce Center was platted every lot was given an opportunity to have direct access onto Ivy or other streets except "tract a" which has no ingress or egress other than Greenfield Road or one outlet 213' off the corner. The depth of the property is what kept it from being developed all these years. The proposal is to allow one access point to intersect or cross over the VNAE. He stated that they had received the support of the Real Estate Department and the Transportation Department but neither had the authority to grant that access point to the warehouse.

The other issue is an interpretation of the "campus setting". Mesa 2025 considers the property in Mesa Commerce Center as a campus setting. A campus setting is usually held for larger tracts, 20 acres, 40 acres and larger. This is primarily for a for-lease property where everybody shares four walls and you can do a lot more.

Boardmember Finter asked what types of vehicles would be coming out of the area. Mr. Coty responded he would expect a UPS-type and size of truck, he does not expect any tractor-trailer trucks.

Boardmember Saemisch asked if there would be outdoor storage on the site. Mr. Coty responded that there will be outdoor storage allowed and clarified that there will be a closed yard on each of the three buildings. They will have 6 ft. CMU walls, but could limit the height if required. Mr. Saemisch asked about any shops, such as cabinet shops with dust collecting machine outside or welding shops? Mr. Coty stated that the depth of the yard would probably disallow anyone setting up any type of shop area that is useable to any extent. He added that they would establish CC&R's and not allow outside uses that would be considered "nuisance". When asked if he would be willing to include that in the CC&R's, Mr. Coty responded yes.

John Perkinson (4222 E. McLellan Road) stated that he is the landowner and also a neighbor and has had many opportunities to sell over the years. He spoke in favor of the project and stated he thought it would be an enhancement to the area.

Neva Coester (4439 E Hobart) stated that she and other neighbors felt this would have minimal impact on the neighborhood. She spoke in favor of the project.

Chair Whalen asked if there would be a conflict between curb cuts for this project and those of the proposed Bellerose Apartments.

Steven Beck, applicant, stated that he had spoken with Mr. Bellerose regarding the access point and he had indicated that he supported the location of the proposed access points and actually prefer that they are offset. He stated that Mr. Bellerose felt it would be safer for his

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

neighborhood and not have a negative impact.

Dorothy Chimel, Planning Director, stated that immediately across the street is C-1, R-3 and R-1 zoning. These are a combination of residential and light commercial. Likely the development will be apartments. The vacant property will be seen by the Board at the September meeting. The question about the non-access easement is such that at the time the subdivision was defined there was an alignment with the C-1 property across the street so that the controlled access in and out of this subject site would be across from the commercial property. The question tonight is not so much "can that be deleted and more access points be given?" but rather what makes sense as far as immediately adjacent and across the street from residential – current and proposed. Staff would suggest that the office development wrap McLellan Road frontage rather than have the office/industrial and have the office/industrial located to the interior of the site. There have been changes to this project so that one curb cut, which is still shown on the concept site, has been deleted. That is a huge improvement, but staff would like to see the type of articulation that occurs on the office to be carried forward to the office/warehouse. Staff does not think this is a desirable land-use to have immediately across the street from residential. For that reason staff is recommending denial or continuance for redesign. Staff does not support the industrial. The UTAZ development for the office portion is quite nicely designed and will be a tremendous asset to the neighborhood. Staff would like to continue that office development along McLellan and so does not have the potential of creating an objectionable land use next to those residences.

Boardmember Finter asked with regard to traffic control devices or signage, what is available to prevent traffic exiting or traveling through the neighborhood. Ms. Chimel stated that there are tools but no guarantee that people would follow them. She mentioned a similar configuration on Hermosa Vista Road where there would be an encouragement to turn right out of the project, very easy to maneuver.

Boardmember Carpenter stated that there was an issue about "campus setting" in the staff report and she was unable to determine if there was a definition of "campus setting" in the zoning ordinance or other guide. Ms. Carpenter said that if everyone was agreeable about the third drive being removed then she had no issue. She mentioned she was concerned with a trash truck meandering through the whole project and wondered if it would be possible to put a gate with limited access at some of the drives. She asked for a clarification of where the NVAE would be abandoned. Ms. Chimel explained that the abandonment would be done by City Council through a separate action after the zoning case was approved, if it were. She further explained that when a project goes through the Subdivision process an application would be made through Real Estate Services for the abandonment of that portion of the NVAE. Currently the easement occurs where it would be immediately across the street from the alignment with the C-1 parcel and from there on toward the intersection corner would be a controlled vehicular access easement.

Chair Whalen stated that his understanding is that it is only feasible for the City to abandon only as much of the easement as is necessary to make the curb cut. The rest of the buildings now backing on the street would not be the beneficiaries.

Regarding the campus setting Ms. Chimel explained that there is no definition or expansion as to what makes a campus setting either in the zoning ordinance through a policy or in the General Plan, but it is identified in the General Plan that there should be campus settings.

Boardmember Adams stated he did not have much of a concern about the industrial traffic on

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

McLellan as he would if this were a lumberyard or a concrete plant or something that would have semi trucks in and out all day long. He added that he had visited another project by this developer and thought it was more pickup trucks and cars rather than 18-wheelers. Mr. Adams stated that although he understood the concern he did not see it as industrial traffic, and it may be close to the best and highest use of the property.

Chair Whalen concurred with Mr. Adams, adding that this was a good transition from the properties to the north.

Boardmember Cowan agreed that this was an appropriate use for an M-1 property, but he would like to see more pedestrian walkways and connections between the three rows of buildings. He added that he felt it was an appropriate use.

Boardmember Saemisch stated that the main drive coming in ends in a storage yard. He stated he would like the fence to stop behind the office/warehouse and not continue out and be the focal point at the end of the drive. He mentioned that there should be pedestrian linkages to the entrances to the office/warehouses. He asked if design issues could be worked out (storage height, visibility of storage, types of uses that could create air or noise pollution) in a narrative to present to Design Review.

Ms. Chimel responded that there could be a condition stating compliance with all requirements of the Design Review Board. Height of storage could be limited to the height of the walls surrounding the outdoor storage.

Boardmember Carpenter stated that there is opportunity with the open access to this project where families could enjoy walks and bicycle rides through there during the off hours, which is a nice amenity to the general neighborhood.

It was moved by Boardmember Finter, seconded by Boardmember Saemisch

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z03-43 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, preliminary plat and elevations submitted, (without guarantee of lot yield, building count, lot coverage) except as noted below.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
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, at the time of recordation of the subdivision plat, or at the time of the City's request for dedication whichever comes first.
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Technical Review Committee.
6. Compliance with all requirements of the Design Review Board including design of pedestrian connections, storage yards and surrounding walls.
7. Full compliance with all current Code requirements, unless modified through appropriate review and approval of the modifications outlined in the staff report.
8. Owner granting an Avigation Easement and Release to the City, pertaining to Falcon field 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).
9. Outdoor storage limited to height of wall.
10. Revised narrative presented prior to City Council regarding restriction to objectionable uses.

Vote: Passed 7-0

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **3300 - 3400 S. Sossaman (eastside)** – (Council District 6). This project involves the development of a single residence subdivision (26.42± ac). Peter Martens, owner; Ralph Pew, Pew and Lake, PLC, applicant. Consider the preliminary plat of “Paloma Estates.” **CONTINUED FROM THE FEBRUARY 20, 2003, MARCH 27, 2003, MAY 15, 2003, JUNE 19, 2003 AND JULY 17, 2003 MEETINGS.**

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

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Cowan

That: The Board table the preliminary plat of “Paloma Estates”.

Vote: Passed 7-0

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 21, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

Dorothy Chimel, Secretary
Acting Planning Director

ms

I:\P&Z 03\Minutes\Aug03.doc