

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 19, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

CITY OF MESA

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING

Held in the City of Mesa Council Chambers
Date: September 19, 2012 Time: 4:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Randy Carter, Chair
Beth Coons, Vice-Chair
Vince DiBella
Lisa Hudson
Brad Arnett
Michael Clement

MEMBERS ABSENT

Suzanne Johnson

OTHERS PRESENT

Tom Ellsworth
Gordon Sheffield
Angelica Guevara
Lesley Davis
Jeff McVay
Debbie Archuleta
Margaret Robertson

Ralph Pew
Dave McCord
Diane Deare
Tory Tash
William Phillips
Maratha Phillips
Walter Robertson

Pam Stienstra
Larry Sprechman
John David Quadlin
Amy Wright
Carolyn Robertson
Cindy Lawrence
Michelle Caisse
Others

Chairperson Carter declared a quorum present and the meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. The meeting was recorded on tape and dated September 19, 2012. Before adjournment at 5:23 p.m., action was taken on the following:

It was moved by Boardmember Beth Coons seconded by Boardmember Brad Arnett that the minutes of the August 14, 2012, study sessions be approved as submitted. Vote: 3 - 0.

It was moved by Boardmember Beth Coons seconded by Boardmember Lisa Hudson that the minutes of the August 15, 2012 study session and regular meeting be approved as submitted. Vote: 5 - 0.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Brad Arnett, seconded by Boardmember Beth Coons that the consent items be approved. Vote: 6 - 0

Zoning Cases: Z12-40, Z12-41, Z12-42, GPMinor12-01, and Z11-28

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 19, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z12-41 (District 6)** 6451 East Southern Avenue. Located west of Power Road on the south side of Southern Avenue (1± acres). District 6. Site Plan Modification. This request will allow the addition of a new access drive onto Southern Avenue. (PLN2012-00337)

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

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

That: The Board continue zoning case Z12-41 to October 17, 2012

Vote: Passed 6 – 0 (Boardmember Johnson 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.mesaaz.gov*

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 19, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z12-42 (District 3)** 1235 West Main Street. Located west of Alma School Road on the south side of Main Street (1± acres). District 3. Site Plan Modification and Special Use Permit. This request will allow the development of a fueling station. (PLN2012-00285)

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

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

That: The Board recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z12-42 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan submitted.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Design Review Board.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. The Special Use Permit for the fueling station is approved in association with the grocery anchor on site and does not grant approval for independent operation.

Vote: Passed 6 – 0 (Boardmember Johnson 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.mesaaz.gov*

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 19, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z12-40 (District 3)** 2254 West Main Street. Located west of Dobson Road on the north side of Main Street (3.4± acres). District 3. Rezone from RM-4 BIZ CUP to RM-4 BIZ CUP, Site Plan Review and Preliminary Plat Approval of A New Leaf – La Mesita. This request will allow the redevelopment of a social service facility for A New Leaf. (PLN2012-00312)

Comments: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Staffmember Jeff McVay briefly explained the project. Dave McCord represented the case. Diane Deare of Native American Connections stated they have developed 12 projects, 3 of those projects are along light rail. She stated between 35% and 50% of their tenants are Native American. She stated many of their tenants use public transportation. At one of their projects they have 65 units and 48 parking spaces and they haven't needed all of those spaces. Tory Tash of New leaf stated the building would have 80 units and 84 parking spaces. She stated they anticipate $\frac{3}{4}$ of their tenants will own a car. Child care and counseling services are provided on-site. They will also have a bicycle program.

Boardmember Beth Coons stated this Board looks closely at parking for all projects they review. She asked how many of the parking spaces would be for staff. Ms. Tash stated they have 17 spaces in the rear of the project for staff.

Boardmember Vince DiBella asked about the parking for Phase I. Doug McCord explained the parking for Phase I and how it transitions to Phase II. He explained Phase II would be the shelter units. Phase III would have 68 units. The total parking would be 135 spaces for 148 units. They anticipate $\frac{3}{4}$ of the tenants would need a parking space which would be approximately 100 spaces.

Chair Randy Carter was concerned with the exterior elevations and durability of the building materials. He did not believe the building was residential friendly. Mr. McCord stated the area that is white on the elevations is actually dove gray and the metal panels were dark gray. He stated they chose the material because of it's durability and the fact that it would not need to be repainted in the future. Chair Carter wanted the Design Review Board to look at the architectural elements and materials.

Boardmember Vince DiBella stated he was actually at the Design Review Board meeting when this project was discussed and the Design Review Board had discussed the elevations and building materials extensively.

It was moved by Boardmember Vince DiBella, seconded by Boardmember Brad Arnett

That: The Board recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z12-40 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan submitted.
2. Compliance with all requirements of staff Design Review for Phase 2.
3. Future Design Review approval of Phase 3.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Technical Review Committee.
5. Recordation of cross-access and reciprocal parking easements across all new property lines.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 19, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

6. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.

Vote: Passed 6 – 0 (Boardmember Johnson 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.mesaaz.gov*

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 19, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **GPMinor12-01** The 9800 through 10000 blocks of East McKellips Road (south side). Located at the southwest corner of McKellips Road and Crismon Road (40± acres). District 5. Minor General Plan Amendment to adjust the boundaries of the existing Mesa 2025 General Plan Land Use designation from LDR 0-1 to LDR 1-2. This request will allow the development of a single-residential subdivision. US Development Land

Comments: Staffmember Lesley Davis gave a brief description of the request.

The following people submitted blue slips in opposition to this project but did not wish to speak: William Phillips, Martha Phillips, Walter Robertson, Pam Stienstra.

Larry Sprechman 10008 East June Circle spoke in opposition. He stated originally a decision was made and now they want to change it. In two years it might be nice to have the original project.

John David Quadlin 9915 East Jensen Street spoke in opposition. He stated he bought his home 4 years ago when this site was proposed for 36 homes. This changes from semi-custom, custom homes and doesn't fit the character of the area.

Amy Wright 1751 North Cerise Circle spoke in opposition. She stated she moved into her home 4 years ago. She said she was the spokesperson for Whisper Mountain and everyone in Whister Mountain was opposed. This directly affects them in a major way. They were fine with the existing zoning.

Carolyn Robertson 2335 East Pyrite spoke in opposition. She stated Boulder Mountain was in the Desert Uplands. The Board should support the desert. She had 97 signatures when it was proposed to be 80 homes. 56 was still too many. The Board is mandated to protect neighborhoods. This will affect people, plants, and animals. It will create heat, traffic, increased number of air conditioning units. The site is surrounded on three sides by County land. It was the wrong size.

Cindy Lawrence 10031 East June spoke in opposition. She stated they have come a long way. They reside in acre lots or larger. There are 8 homes on 15 acres. She was opposed to this.

Ralph Pew represented the case. Mr. Pew stated it was not their intent to ruin the desert or destroy the neighborhood. He stated they had held 5 neighborhood meetings, and he thanked the neighbors for being nice to work with during the process. He stated that Minor General Plan amendments do not require the detailed findings that Major General Plan amendments require. He stated the subdivision would have 44% open space. This project would allow water to be looped for the entire area. This project would also improve the intersection and widen the road. He confirmed with staff that the main reason for the recommendation was that this site did not promote land use patterns that decrease auto travel from home to work. Mr. Pew stated that all of the land in this area has to drive to work. There are no jobs in this area. He did not believe the site could be developed as currently approved in today's market. He stated there was no other flat land subdivisions with these sizes in this area. Regarding Desert Uplands promoting large lot development, he stated Boulder Mountain, Whisper Mountain, and Mountain Bridge are not large lot subdivisions.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 19, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

The original proposal for this site was for 80 dwelling units, then they proposed 68, they are now proposing 56 dwelling units. The lots would range from 10,400 sq. ft. to over 11,000. This plan preserves open space. The 404 wash will be re-routed. In the old project 7 lots would have the wash running through them.

Michelle Caisse then spoke in opposition and stated that when you live across the street from a park you don't need their open space. She also stated that access to Usery Park is gated and it is illegal to park on the north side of the street so people park on this property. She wanted to know how they were going to accommodate those cars.

Chair Carter asked what the allowable coverage was on the project to the south. Mr. Pew stated it was 53%. He also confirmed that more than half of the southern boundary of this project would be open space.

Boardmember Clement confirmed the true density of Whisper Mountain without the mountains was the same size as this project. The north end of Whisper Mountain the lots were larger because of the non-usable areas. He also confirmed that the proposed subdivision would be production homes.

Boardmember DiBella stated he understood the homeowners. He struggled with the previous plan, and said it wasn't better just because the lots were bigger. What was proposed was better long term. Look at what you are getting for 26 more lots.

Boardmember Arnett confirmed staff was only recommending denial based on the number of homes where there are not jobs or shopping. He stated it would be approximately 3 miles from this site to the University on-ramp to the 202, and it is about 2-1/2 miles from Boulder to the McKellips on-ramp. This project would also complete the loop for water, which seemed to be very important. He did have compassion for the people on June.

Boardmember Coons confirmed that the density including the Butte is 2.2.

It was moved by Boardmember Brad Arnett, seconded by Boardmember Vince DiBella

That: The Board recommend to the City Council adoption of GPMinor12-01

Vote: Passed 6 – 0 (Boardmember Johnson 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.mesaaz.gov

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 19, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

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

Comments: Staffmember Lesley Davis gave a brief description of the request.

The following people submitted blue slips in opposition to this project but did not wish to speak: William Phillips, Martha Phillips, Walter Robertson, Pam Stienstra.

Larry Sprechman 10008 East June Circle spoke in opposition. He stated originally a decision was made and now they want to change it. In two years it might be nice to have the original project.

John David Quadlin 9915 East Jensen Street spoke in opposition. He stated he bought his home 4 years ago when this site was proposed for 36 homes. This changes from semi-custom, custom homes and doesn't fit the character of the area.

Amy Wright 1751 North Cerise Circle spoke in opposition. She stated she moved into her home 4 years ago. She said she was the spokesperson for Whisper Mountain and everyone in Whister Mountain was opposed. This directly affects them in a major way. They were fine with the existing zoning.

Carolyn Robertson 2335 East Pyrite spoke in opposition. She stated Boulder Mountain was in the Desert Uplands. The Board should support the desert. She had 97 signatures when it was proposed to be 80 homes. 56 was still too many. The Board is mandated to protect neighborhoods. This will affect people, plants, and animals. It will create heat, traffic, increased number of air conditioning units. The site is surrounded on three sides by County land. It was the wrong size.

Cindy Lawrence 10031 East June spoke in opposition. She stated they have come a long way. They reside in acre lots or larger. There are 8 homes on 15 acres. She was opposed to this.

Ralph Pew represented the case. Mr. Pew stated it was not their intent to ruin the desert or destroy the neighborhood. He stated they had held 5 neighborhood meetings, and he thanked the neighbors for being nice to work with during the process. He stated that Minor General Plan amendments do not require the detailed findings that Major General Plan amendments require. He stated the subdivision would have 44% open space. This project would allow water to be looped for the entire area. This project would also improve the intersection and widen the road. He confirmed with staff that the main reason for the recommendation was that this site did not promote land use patterns that decrease auto travel from home to work. Mr. Pew stated that all of the land in this area has to drive to work. There are no jobs in this area. He did not believe the site could be developed as currently approved in today's market. He stated there was no other flat land subdivisions with these sizes in this area. Regarding Desert Uplands promoting large lot development, he stated Boulder Mountain, Whisper Mountain, and Mountain Bridge are not large lot subdivisions.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 19, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

The original proposal for this site was for 80 dwelling units, then they proposed 68, they are now proposing 56 dwelling units. The lots would range from 10,400 sq. ft. to over 11,000. This plan preserves open space. The 404 wash will be re-routed. In the old project 7 lots would have the wash running through them.

Michelle Caisse then spoke in opposition and stated that when you live across the street from a park you don't need their open space. She also stated that access to Usery Park is gated and it is illegal to park on the north side of the street so people park on this property. She wanted to know how they were going to accommodate those cars.

Chair Carter asked what the allowable coverage was on the project to the south. Mr. Pew stated it was 53%. He also confirmed that more than half of the southern boundary of this project would be open space.

Boardmember Clement confirmed the true density of Whisper Mountain without the mountains was the same size as this project. The north end of Whisper Mountain the lots were larger because of the non-usable areas. He also confirmed that the proposed subdivision would be production homes.

Boardmember DiBella stated he understood the homeowners. He struggled with the previous plan, and said it wasn't better just because the lots were bigger. What was proposed was better long term. Look at what you are getting for 26 more lots.

Boardmember Arnett confirmed staff was only recommending denial based on the number of homes where there are not jobs or shopping. He stated it would be approximately 3 miles from this site to the University on-ramp to the 202, and it is about 2-1/2 miles from Boulder to the McKellips on-ramp. This project would also complete the loop for water, which seemed to be very important. He did have compassion for the people on June.

Boardmember Coons confirmed that the density including the Butte is 2.2.

It was moved by Boardmember Brad Arnett, seconded by Boardmember Mike Clement

That: The Board recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z11-28 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative and exhibits provided (without guarantee of lot yield, building count, lot coverage).
2. Full compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
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. All offsite street improvements and street frontage landscaping to be installed in the first phase of construction unless otherwise approved by the City of Mesa.
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Technical Review Committee.
6. Compliance with the Residential Development Guidelines.
7. View fences shall comply with the City of Mesa pool fence barrier regulations.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 19, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

8. Lots 46 through 56 inclusive shall be limited to single story in height. A minimum of 17 lots in the entire project shall be restricted to single story, including Lots 46 through 56 inclusive.
9. Perimeter view fencing adjacent to open space areas and block walls on rear lot lines will be built on the southern boundary of the development in order to assist the Whisper Mountain subdivision in maintaining the security of its gated community environment.
10. The proposed park area that was previously located in the southern corner of the property has been relocated to the interior of the subdivision.
11. The area west of the reconfigured wash on the western edge of the property shall be maintained in a natural desert environment. The proposed reconfigured wash will be re-vegetated with desert plant species consistent with the City's Desert Upland Guidelines.
12. The minimum livable square footage of single story homes shall be 2,600 square feet. The minimum livable square footage of two-story homes shall be 3,000 square feet.
13. The applicant will comply with all desert sky lighting requirements of the City's Desert Uplands Guidelines. Additionally, the applicant proposes that the subdivision not be required to install street lights on the interior private streets, similar to the Whisper Mountain subdivision. Attached to this letter is language that will be included in the design guidelines for the project concerning the lighting requirements for the future homes on the property.

Vote: Passed 6 – 0 (Boardmember Johnson 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.mesaaz.gov

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 19, 2012 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

John Wesley, Secretary
Planning Director

DA:
I:\P&Z\P&Z 12\Minutes\9-19-12.doc