

CITY OF MESA

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING

Held in the City of Mesa Council Chambers

Date: May 15, 2008 Time: 4:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Rich Adams, Chair
Pat Esparza, Vice Chair
Frank Mizner
Jared Langkilde
Ken Salas
Randy Carter
Chell Roberts

MEMBERS ABSENT

None.

OTHERS PRESENT

John Wesley
Dorothy Chimel
Tom Ellsworth
Jennifer Gniffke
Joe Welliver
Maria Salaiz

Wahid Alam
Joy Spezeski
MaryGrace McNear
Dave Udall
Ralph Pew
Reese Anderson

Paul Gilbert
Wayne Balmer
Jason Morris
Doug Himmelberger
Mark McLaren
Others

Chairperson Adams declared a quorum present and the meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. The meeting was recorded on tape and dated May 15, 2008. Before adjournment at 7:50 p.m., action was taken on the following:

It was moved by Boardmember Esparza, seconded by Boardmember Mizner that the minutes of the April 15, 2008, and April 17, 2008 study sessions and regular meeting be approved as submitted. Vote: 7-0.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Esparza, seconded by Boardmember Roberts that the consent items be approved. Vote: 7-0

Zoning Cases: Z08-27, *Z08-30, *Z08-31, Z08-32, Mesa Gateway Strategic Development Plan

MINUTES OF THE MAY 15, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z08-30 (District 2)** 3510 East Baseline Road. Located west of Val Vista Drive and north of Baseline Road (53± ac). Site Plan Modification. This request will allow the development of a retail building within Dana Park Village Square. Dannel Drutsch, Triple-Five Development, Inc., owner; Vincent DiBella, Saemisch + DiBella Architects, Inc., applicant; Jeffrey L. Williams, R.B. Williams & Associates, Inc., engineer.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Esparza, seconded by Boardmember Roberts

That: The Board **approve** zoning case Z08-30 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative, as shown on the site plan and preliminary plat submitted, and preliminary elevations as approved by the Design Review Board, (without guarantee of lot yield, building count, lot coverage).
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Design Review Board.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Certificates of Occupancy and/or Completion for individual buildings shall not be granted until Zoning Ordinance required parking and landscaping are constructed for those buildings.
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Technical Review Committee.
6. All pad buildings to be architecturally compatible with the center.
7. 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).

Vote: Passed 7-0.

* * * * *

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.cityofmesa.org*

MINUTES OF THE MAY 15, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

esItem: **Z08-27 (District 6)** 8745 East Warner Road. Located west of Ellsworth Road and south of Warner Road (216± ac). Council Use Permit. This request will allow for two freeway landmark signs as part of the Entrada at the Santan Development Master Plan. Via West Properties, Steven Schwarz, owner; Jason Morris; Withey, Morris, PLC, applicant.

Comments: Jason Morris, Withey Morris, 2525 E. Arizona Biltmore Circle, Phoenix, AZ, applicant, gave a brief history of the site stating they were proposing a self contained mixed-use project that would have business park, retail and a residential component that would allow a combination of live, work, and play on the site; adding that is in accordance with the Williams Gateway Plan and the DMP Plan for the GM Proving grounds. He mentioned that staff and Council believed that residential would hinder the ultimate development and they changed the original plan to eliminate the residential and it was conceptually approved with a mixture of retail and Business Park. He added that the frontage on this site would justify the Freeway Landmark Monument (FLM) signs, continuing that this request does not meet all of the Guidelines; he noted that almost every sign approved in the City of Mesa does not meet the Guidelines and the Guidelines are in a state of flux.

Mr. Morris stated that staff has correctly pointed out that one freeway is not yet built, but it is a planned freeway. He asked that they move forward with at least one sign, the sign adjacent to the Santan Freeway, which is vital to the ultimate marketing and development of this site; adding that they are willing to come back through the Design Review Board (DRB) process. Mr. Morris continued that offering this sign to the user would be important and believed that the success of this site would act as a catalyst for the area. He noted that this request is not at the intersection of any freeway or arterial roadway and needs the identification along the freeway in order to direct motorists to this site.

Tom Ellsworth, Senior Planner, stated that this request is for a Council Use Permit (CUP) to allow two FLM signs for the Entrada at the Santan DMP. He stated that the site was approved with a conceptual site plan and agreed that there are several Guidelines that are not being met and that most FLM signs do not meet all of the Guidelines; adding that staff has significant concerns with the premature nature of the request. He pointed out that one of the freeways does not exist and it's hard to create an analysis for how high the sign should be at this location. He briefly explained that the Zoning Code outlines a specific process that needs to occur and staff cannot introduce an ordinance to City Council without the input from DRB; adding that staff is recommending denial as outlined in the staff report.

Chairperson Adams asked if this request is about the marketability of the property. Mr. Morris responded that it is a large component. He explained that the request for the FLM signs is, not only be able to identify the site, but to be able to differentiate the large users from the office and retail users. He believed that this request is not premature and stated they are moving forward with the conceptual site plan and understood that they are responsible for getting a final site plan approved. Mr. Morris also clarified that his request to add an additional stipulation was not meant to supplement the existing DRB process, but to come back to DRB when they processed their final plans.

Boardmember Mizner stated that the status of a site plan seems to be a major issue and noted that this is not an approved site plan but a conceptual plan, which would still need to come back before this Board and Council. He stated he was unable to support this request because the premature nature of the application. Mr. Morris agreed that they would need to come back through this Board and Council for a final site plan, but having an approved FLM sign becomes a significant inducement.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 15, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Discussion ensued regarding in what land use category the FLM signs could be placed and allowing the signage process before the breaking of ground or roadways.

Boardmember Langkilde stated that this is a reasonable request and adds value to have an approved FLM sign, which will help attract retail and commercial development to this area.

Boardmember Carter agreed with Mr. Langkilde that this is a reasonable request. He stated that if this request passes, as it exists, he would like it to go back through the DRB process to match the architecture of the center. He asked why staff felt that 50' would be an adequate height; adding that 75' would be okay provided that no other interchanges go in. Mr. Ellsworth responded that DRB would still need to review the sign, make their recommendation along with the Board's to City Council. He stated that staff reviews and makes their recommendation against the existing Guidelines. Discussion ensued regarding the FLM Guidelines.

Boardmember Salas asked what the history has been with having signs before the site plan was approved. Mr. Wesley responded that for the most part, the site plans have been approved prior to the FLM signs.

Dorothy Chimel, Principal Planner, explained that every FLM package has a CUP, which is a discretionary permit through Council, and also generates a great deal of discussion and issues. She stated that staff has never had a site plan not associated with a CUP and staff's directive is to uphold the Zoning Ordinance and Guidelines and without a site plan or elevations it's quite a challenge for staff to make a recommendation.

Chairperson Adams commented that FLM signs cause a lot of consternation every time they are discussed, noting that these are Guidelines and probably need to be reviewed. He stated he was a little frustrated that these Guidelines seem to be preventing applicants from attracting quality development and making their property more marketable.

Boardmember Esparza stated that FLM signs are great on a case-by-case scenario and is supportive of two FLM signs at 75' with the stipulation that they go back to DRB for review. She moved to approve zoning case Z08-27. The motioned failed for a lack of a 2nd.

Boardmember Langkilde hoped there would be enough support to move forward with at least one sign and as seen in the last several FLM cases, every one of them have stipulated that tenants will not come unless there is a FLM sign.

Boardmember Carter stated he was concerned with the length of time that it may take to get a site plan approved and asked if it would be possible to put a time limit; adding that it is necessary and important to bring good development to the City.

Boardmember Roberts stated it was not clear to him why the applicant would repeat the process when the Board was going to approve the signs in the future; adding that he was concerned with the kind of precedence this would set. He stated that the sign should be 70' or even higher, but it did not make sense to do it now.

Discussion ensued regarding why an applicant would have to repeat the process once the sign(s) are approved, and the criteria in the FLM Guidelines.

Boardmember Salas asked the applicant what his anticipated timeline was for the development of the property. Mr. Morris responded that the original site plan had a residential component and they planned on moving forward with that site plan but because of changes requested by Boeing and the City, they did not finalize the site plan. He stated they estimate a 24-month process,

MINUTES OF THE MAY 15, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

which is why they are willing to move forward with the FLM signs; adding that they have a DMP with a conceptual plan in place and a list of uses that they are pursuing. Discussion ensued regarding the conditions of approval.

Boardmember Langkilde moved to approve one FLM sign with an additional stipulation that it come back through the DRB process. Seconded by Boardmember Salas.

That: The Board **approve** zoning case Z08-27 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the basic development of the northernmost Freeway Landmark Monument (FLM) at 75' maximum height as described in the project narrative and as shown on the DMP Conceptual site plan and FLM elevation drawings.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Building Safety Division with regards to the issuance of building and sign permits.
4. Future review by the Design Review Board of the FLM design after approval of building elevations and Site Plan Review through the public hearing process.
5. Council Use Permit for a FLM for a period of 36 months from effective date of Ordinance.

Vote: 5-2 with Boardmembers Mizner and Roberts nay.

* * * * *

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.cityofmesa.org*

MINUTES OF THE MAY 15, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z08-31 (District 6)** 5341 South Power Road. Located east of Power Road and south of Ray Road (5± ac). District 6. Rezone from R1-43 to C-2 and Site Plan Review. This request will allow the development a retail center. Michael Rose, Across America Real Estate Corp., owner; Scott Lang, SKL Architects, applicant; Julie S. Rayburn, RCC Design Group, L.L.C., engineer:

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

It was moved by Boardmember Esparza, seconded by Boardmember Roberts

That: The Board continue zoning case Z08-31 to the June 19, 2008 hearing.

Vote: Passed 7-0.

* * * * *

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.cityofmesa.org*

MINUTES OF THE MAY 15, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z08-32 (District 1)** East and West of Dobson Road, along the 202 Freeway (south side). Modification of a Council Use Permit (Ordinance #4312). This request is to consider an additional freeway landmark monument sign with a double-sided electronic message display at the Riverview development. DeRito Kimco Riverview LLC – Doug Himmelberger, owner; Young Electric Sign Company – Kelee Walton, applicant.

Comments: Dave Udall, 30 West First Street, applicant, gave a brief overview of the project and added that this is an expansion to add a fifth sign. He noted that staff recommends approval and they agree with the conditions of approval and have support of the surrounding area. He urged the Board for approval. Discussion ensued regarding the need to have an approved Freeway Landmark Monument (FLM) sign prior to having tenants.

Jennifer Gniffke, Planner II, stated that this is a request for an additional 60' high FLM sign at Riverview. She gave a brief history of the project and added that this request involves modification to the original Council Use Permit (CUP) to allow a total of five signs with two having electronic message display, which includes text messaging as well as pictures. She stated that staff has general concerns with the overall number of FLM signs at Riverview, however, staff is in support and recommending approval with conditions.

Boardmember Roberts stated that he pulled this case from the consent agenda to voice his comments. He noted that the Guidelines state, that the display is limited to text message only with no animation or video. He noted that this request goes beyond that and although he is not opposed to this request, allowing pictures on these displays will set precedence. He continued that there is a lot of variance allowed to the Guidelines and mentioned that it may be time to revisit and update the FLM Guidelines.

Chairperson Adams commented that he was disappointed with the FLM signs at Riverview from the beginning, adding that he thought that they were too small and not what he looked for in a FLM sign. He added the Tempe Marketplace is a happening place and hoped that Riverview would start to move in that direction. He stated he supports the request and agreed with Boardmember Roberts that it is time to revisit the FLM Guidelines.

Boardmember Langkilde shared Chairperson Adam's sentiments regarding being disappointed with the Riverview signs because they are too short and there is not enough area to advertise appropriately; he added that if the signs were higher and bigger there would probably be fewer of them.

Boardmember Mizner stated he would be voting in favor of this request and added that there are a couple of major differences from the previous case, noting that this request is not premature and fits in the overall center.

Boardmember Esparza commented that when the Board first saw this proposal, they were divided in their views; adding that she is a proponent of signs and felt they are vital in promoting economic development and was glad to get another sign for this development.

It was moved by Boardmember Esparza, seconded by Boardmember Salas

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council **approval** of zoning case Z08-32 conditioned upon:

MINUTES OF THE MAY 15, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

1. Compliance with Ordinance #4312, except for the following.
2. Compliance with the basic development of the 5th Freeway Landmark Monument with an electronic message display at the Mesa Riverview development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan and elevation drawings.
3. Regarding the electronic message display:
 - a. The display is limited to text and picture messages only, with no animation or video.
 - b. The message change sequence is accomplished immediately or by means of fade or dissolve modes, with each message being displayed for a minimum period of fifteen (15) seconds.
 - c. No continuous traveling or scrolling displays allowed.
 - d. The intensity of the LED display shall not exceed the levels specified in the Freeway Landmark Monument Guidelines.
4. Written certification from the sign manufacturer that the light intensity has been factory pre-set not to exceed the levels specified in the Freeway Landmark Monument Guidelines and the intensity level is protected from end-user manipulation by password-protected software or other method as deemed appropriate by the Building Safety Director.
5. Two, only, Freeway Landmark Monument signs to contain a double-sided electronic message display.
6. Compliance with all requirements of the Design Review Board.
7. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
8. Compliance with all requirements of the Building Safety Division with regards to the issuance of building and sign permits.

Vote: Passed 7-0.

* * * * *

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.cityofmesa.org*

MINUTES OF THE MAY 15, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: Hear a presentation, discuss and provide direction on the following Mesa Gateway Strategic Development Plan.

Comments: Mark McLaren, HDR Engineering – consultant, gave an overview of the proposed Mesa Gateway Strategic Development Plan.

Key points included:

- The site is nearly 32 square miles and is comparable to the size of the City of Paris, and two-thirds the size of San Francisco.
- One of the key assets of the area is the Phoenix Mesa Gateway Airport, which in land area is equivalent to some of the most complex airports operating in the United States.
- Another key asset is the growth that Mesa has been experiencing in this area and the growth that's forecasted for future years.
- Were given a significant challenge by the City Council and others to focus on developing a Plan, with the goal of creating 100,000 high quality – high wage jobs by 2030.
- Create a job center that's significant in supporting the SE Valley and employment opportunities for the growth of the area.
- With the input of the stakeholder, as well as many other property owners and the surrounding communities, they worked on developing a vision that the stakeholders would like to see created within this area.
- Increase densities and residential developments with a focus on mixed-use opportunities in this area.
- Understanding the changing demographics and interest in housing types and focusing on the opportunity to incorporate continuous open space.
- Listened to concerns raised regarding the protection of the airport and the operations
- The Plan is composed of the "Framework Plan", which basically divides the study area up into "character" areas.
 - Mixed-Use Community, which refers to the Mesa Proving Grounds and some of the immediately parcels around it.
 - Freeway-Oriented Mixed Use, in areas about ½ mile off of the existing or planned freeways within the study areas.
 - Urban Mixed-Use, area principally inside the Loop 202 freeway. An area for the possibility of high-density urban living, as well as a mix of other uses, including Business Park (BP) and high intensity employment.
 - Mixed Employment, an area that would be most compatible for uses that would not feel or have the interference of noise or other activities with the airport and overflights activities.
 - Airport District, the area that is the Phoenix Mesa Gateway Airport property used for airport operation and uses.
- With the input and feedback received, came forward with two Alternatives for consideration.

Alternative A – the area that's inside the Loop 202 and identifies the opportunity to incorporate high-density residential (HDR), urban living, along with mixed-use opportunities and what referred to as the "Village Centers", which creates a better mix of uses and the opportunity to have life/pedestrian activities occurring 24/7 within this area.

Alternative B – does not allow any residential uses inside the Loop 202. This was an alternative that was presented in response to some of the stakeholder's input and concerns in providing adequate protection for the type of operations that occurs at the Phoenix Mesa Gateway Airport.

Couple of elements, which are consistent between both Alternatives:

- Emphasis on regional commercial.
- Projected growth and opportunities between now and 2030, equal in terms of job opportunities within the area.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 15, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

- Job housing balance was important to this process
Alternative A, provides a better balance, by having a better job housing balance.
Alternative B, provide the greatest level of protection for the airport operations.

Mr. McLaren briefly explained the Economic Development “Scorecard”, which are highly rated industries that are looking for opportunities near airports; and the transportation network that creates, not only the implementation of “Complete Streets” but also the use of Couplets, which are one way streets that reduce the number of turning movements. He concluded by briefly explaining the process taken to inform others of the Plan.

Boardmember Mizner asked if the Board recommends either of the two Alternatives, then a General Plan Amendment would be needed to amend the adopted Mesa 2025 Plan; he also asked to elaborate on the efforts made to involve other parties in the process.

Mr. John Wesley, Planning Director, briefly explained the process needed to bring the current General Plan into alignment with the newly adopted Plan; adding that staff will also be looking and considering the need in 2009, to officially and completely amend the General Plan. He briefly explained the process taken to inform others, adding that several meetings were done before this Board and City Council and that it has been available through the City’s website.

Boardmember Carter stated he was very concerned with the speed with which this Plan was moving forward to City Council and was also worried with the interface between the location of the industrial and the Town of Queen Creek.

Boardmember Mizner left the meeting at 5:45 p.m.

Boardmember Salas left the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Wesley explained that there was a presentation by the Urban Land Institute (ULI) and the planning of this area about this time last year. The City Council recognized the need to move forward and Mayor Hawker challenged staff to complete the Plan within one year; he added that this Council has been very involved in the planning of this area and felt that it was important to get it back to them and finalized the work in this area.

Mr. McLaren summarized some of the key points that the Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) raised.

- The need for this Plan to allow flexibility.
- Concern that the area might have too little residential.
- Terms used to defined areas.
- Concern about Queen Creek and the opportunities for employment being absorbed by Mesa.
- Not consistent with the vision and goals that had originally been identified.

The stakeholders felt that: Alternative A was really the one that was more sustainable, although they wanted more residential opportunities. Alternative B was too similar to Mesa’s current General Plan and would result in a “sea of warehouses” given the amount of land that was identified for industrial and employment uses.

Paul Gilbert, 4800 North Scottsdale Road, attorney representing several property owners, noted the his concerns and comments:

- Built in the flexibility that this plan needs.
- Staff has gone out of their way to provide an opportunity for the stakeholders to provide input to this plan.
- Their concern deals with the future implementation and the need for flexibility in interpreting and implementing this plan.
- The Plan is intended to be a guide and not a “regulatory” Plan.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 15, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

- Add some language in the document saying that it's not a "regulatory" plan.
- The plan is too specific, if it's just a guide we don't need to amend the General Plan.
- If the Plan were adopted, it would prevent them from developing their property.
- Inconsistent with the current designation for their property.
- Supportive of the Framework Plan.

Discussion ensued regarding the flexibility with the two Plans, amending the General Plan and incorporating suggestions made by the speakers,

Jill Kusy, 7600 E. Doubletree Road, Scottsdale, AZ, mirrored Mr. Gilbert's comments and clarified that their primary concern has to do with the implementation and suggested language; adding that they have not taken a position on which Plan they prefer. She stated that she represents the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD) and they have expressed concern with the land uses and would like more time to discuss the Plan and asked the Board to delay their action.

Lynn Kusy, Executive Director, Williams Gateway Airport Authority, 5825 S. Sossaman Road, gave a brief history of the Phoenix Mesa Gateway Airport. He also gave examples of the restrictions that the John Wayne Airport currently encounters and noted that if that community had the opportunity that Mesa has today, to plan for the compatible interaction between the Airport and neighboring undeveloped lands, the airport would not be so restricted; adding that Mesa has an opportunity to learn from the missteps in Orange County and make Mesa a better place to live/work/play and fly. He thanked staff and the consultant for their involvement and noted that they prefer Alternative B.

Bill Olson, 431 E. Elgin, Gilbert AZ, landowner, stated that they also have a concern with the lack of flexibility. He stated that they would like to keep the NEC of Hawes and Warner as industrial; adding that they could support mix use employment/residential and would like to see the SEC of Hawes and Warner as Community Commercial (CC). He noted that would like to slow this process down and get flexibility into the Plan. He stated they prefer Alternative B.

Boardmember Carter asked Mr. Wesley how much time there was for the stakeholders to see the two Alternatives. Mr. Wesley responded that Alternative A has been available since March 2008, and Alternative B just came out on Friday, May 9, 2008.

James Boyle, 19645 E. Elliot Road, Mesa, dairy farm owner, stated they also have concerns with the speed in which this process was moving forward and noted his concerns with the timeframe of Alternative B. He pointed out that there are nine dairy farms in the area and it's not just vacant land. He noted concern with the change of the HDR back to BP/LI and added that they were not part of any stakeholders meetings. He stated there are in favor of Alternative A.

Fred Baker, City of Apache Junction, Planning Manager, stated he was here to observe the process; adding that the City has not taken a position on which Alternative they prefer. He thanked the City of Mesa for inviting them to set on the Stakeholders meetings and noted there was lots of outreach done.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 15, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Wayne Balmer, Planning Manager, Town of Queen Creek, 22350 S. Ellsworth Road, commended staff and the consultant for putting this Plan together. He stated that the Town of Queen Creek has three concerns: 1) modify the definition of General Industrial (GI), he gave revised language; 2) add an additional arterial connection between Germann and Power/Ellsworth Road, he briefly explained the area and the need for the additional arterial connection and; 3) GI transitional areas, add additional emphasis on the transition and the use of the LI, separating the GI from the Town of Queen Creek.

Mr. Wesley responded that some language proposed would be appropriate and can be done. He continued that staff can address the Town's concerns about the appearance and uses that would happen along Germann Road, but would not be inclined to change what's shown on the Plan; adding that the "Framework Plan" states this should be employment and any of those uses are appropriate in these areas.

Mike James, Transportation Division, stated that they would take Mr. Balmer's suggestion and look at the impacts; adding that they are continuing to meet with the Town of Queen Creek.

Boardmember Roberts asked if the Town of Queen Creek was involved in the stakeholders meetings and if these issues were raised at the meetings. Mr. Balmer responded they were involved in the meetings and they just received the definition for GI on Friday, May 9th. He continued that the Town of Queen Creek is not opposed to the Plan, and the Town's concern is that the front door is Ellsworth and Germann Roads and they don't want to be on the south side of all of the GI uses. The idea of having LI on the north side is so that the Town of Queen Creek has an attractive area across the street

Rich Lee, Boeing Co., 5000 E. McDowell Road, stated that no residential should ever be planned under the "Fly Friendly Corridor" because of noise and recommends that the Board adopt Alternate B.

James Timm, Executive Director of the AZ Pilot Association, 220 E. Ellis Drive, Tempe, AZ, recommends Alternative B, which would minimize the overflight of residential areas, adding that the development of the Gateway Airport is very important to the City of Mesa.

Ralph Pew, 1930 E. Brown Road, representing three property owners, Ross Fransworth Family, stated the Fransworth's do not care which Alternative is approved because both of them are bad for them and they are moving their wholesale facility to Mesa, which is in the heart of an area that is designated for HDR. He asked that they amend the General Plan to include a BP designation on their property. Warren and Lela Steffey, feel their property should have a residential designation and he briefly explained the reasons and stated that the Steffey prefer Alternative A. Nelson Stewart, asked that the Board approve Alternative A, which provides more opportunity for residential.

Douglas Cook, 40 N. Center Street, #110, Mesa, property owner, stated that this Plan needs to be very carefully considered before it is approved; he added that he prefers Alternative A.

Tim Spahr, 4215 S. Antonio, Mesa, resident, mentioned that the Airport has done a great job of letting the public know what is going on in the area and should be commended; adding that the Airport has been driving development to this area.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 15, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Mr. Wesley briefly explained and gave specific examples of how Sub Area Plans and the General Plan work together with one another.

Boardmember Langkilde stated that there are legitimate concerns with the Plan and asked Mr. Wesley if the Board were to grant a continuance if some of the issues could be addressed. Mr. Wesley mentioned that Council would be meeting on Thursday, May 22, 2008 to get additional information with regards to how they can balance and protect the airport and still provide for a viable, sustainable development that can occur in the area.

Boardmember Roberts stated he would like to attend the meeting with Council before making a recommendation, and added that he's heard a lot of comments and concerns about flexibility and doesn't see the reason for this Plan to be rushed.

Boardmember Carter stated that this Plan is premature and there needs to be a Plan C that blend all the different comment/suggestion together. He added he would support a continuance.

Boardmember Esparza, stated that she heard three major issues: 1) Alternative B was given at the 11th hour; 2) a number of stakeholders were either not included or notified and, 3) flexibility. She echoed Boardmember Langkilde and Roberts' comments that there are lots of concerns and would be in support of a continuance.

Chairperson Adams agreed with comments made by fellow Boardmembers and noted his greatest concern was the letter received from the ASLD; adding that there are conflicting messages and he is not comfortable with the speed at which this is progressing. He continued that everyone has worked in good faith and has attempted to meet the timeline that Mr. Wesley mentioned but there are significant concerns that exist and he cannot make a recommendation on these Alternatives.

Discussion ensued regarding holding a special meeting to discuss this Plan, why the need to rush this Plan, and adding an Alternative C to incorporate comments and concerns brought up today.

Boardmember Esparza agreed with Mr. Wesley that this is an important Plan. She moved that the Board continue the Mesa Gateway Strategic Development Plan to the June 19, 2008, hearing. Seconded by Boardmember Roberts.

Vote: Passed 5-0 with Boardmembers Mizner and Salas absent.

* * * * *

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.cityofmesa.org*

MINUTES OF THE MAY 15, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

John Wesley, Secretary
Planning Director

MS:
I:\P&Z\P&Z 08\Minutes\May15-08.doc