

CITY OF MESA

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING

Held in the City of Mesa Council Chambers
Date April 17, 2003 Time 4:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Marty Whalen, Chair
Dan Brock, Vice-Chair
Mike Cowan
Pat Esparza
Lynda Bailey
Rich Adams
Barbara Carpenter

MEMBERS ABSENT

OTHERS PRESENT

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

Harold Decker
Sean Lake
Chanel Garner
Sherman Cawley
James Chase
John Bellerose

Others

Chair Whalen declared a quorum present and the meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. The meeting was recorded on tape and dated April 17, 2003. Before adjournment at 5:25 p.m., action was taken on the following items:

It was moved by Boardmember Bailey, seconded by Boardmember Brock that the minutes of the March 27, 2003 meeting be approved as amended. The vote was 7-0.

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

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

Before approval of the consent agenda, Boardmember Carpenter pointed out that zoning case Z03-17 was continued to the May 15, 2003. She also requested that when the Design Review Board reviews zoning case Z03-18 that the applicant be asked to address the issues of the handicapped access, the visitor's "drop-off" and "pick-up" area at the entrance, and possible additional shaded parking. This is due to those users who would possibly be sick, disabled or elderly.

Zoning Cases: Z03-12, *Z03-15, Z03-16, *Z03-17, *Z03-18, *Z03-19

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 17, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-12** 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; James Chase, applicant. Also consider the preliminary plat of "Bellerose Apartments." **CONTINUED FROM THE MARCH 27, 2003 MEETING.**

Comments: James Chase, applicant, gave a brief overview of the project. He stated they are proposing to develop seven (7) four-plex multi-family apartment buildings on this parcel. He stated that by using the PAD development they would have some flexibility in the design, the aesthetics of the buildings and also gain some management advantages so that a Homeowner's Association could manage the property. He stated all of the areas are landscaped and that there is a large common area in the center with a recreation facility/playground area. He mentioned that there are solid waste issues, which they have been working with the City of Mesa to resolve.

John Bellrose, owner, stated he has no concerns with this property. This is going to be a fantastic development and the type of units being developed are typical – for the Mesa market. He stated the typical Mesa rental unit tends to be 2 bedrooms, 1 bath, and 700-800 sq. ft. and the concept that Mr. Chase has put together is one which he felt would enhance the community. The units in particular are all 3 bedrooms, 2 bath, 1,100 sq. ft. and the quality of the construction has been rather extensive. Mr. Bellerose stated they plan to provide a beautiful, comfortable housing development to the City of Mesa.

Chairperson Whalen mentioned that the owner and applicant are willing to continue this case to allow for further meetings with the neighbors. Mr. Whalen commended the owner and applicant on this continuance.

Paula Demarbiex, 4450 E. Hobart Street, stated they are the adjacent homeowners south of the proposed site. She stated that she along with others in the neighborhood oppose zoning case Z03-12. She stated her concerns are density, building separation, and privacy for the residence. Ms. Demarbiex stated she is aware of at least 15 people who have voiced their opinion, along with those who have left voice messages who are opposed to this development. She stated that the message should be loud and clear that this neighborhood opposes this development.

William Demarbiex, 4450 E. Hobart Street, appreciated the opportunity to express some of his concerns, which he has shared with Mr. Bellerose and Mr. Chase. His concerns include density, common area, traffic, and height size. He stated the neighborhood is already dealing with density issues resulting from existing trailer parks and multi-family residences. He stated that he is not against development of the property but felt the proposed development is not suitable for this site. He mentioned that the site plan approved last year was a good one and now Mr. Bellerose wants to shove three more building on this site increasing the number of units.

Neva Coester, 4439 E. Hobart Street, stated she was speaking to the Board from a landlord's perspective and she along with her husband and partners own one four-plex building and one triplex building in East Mesa. Both properties are located in communities where the buildings are individually owned. The communities share many of the designs flaws present in the project being considered today. Some property owners are responsible and maintain their buildings other do not. She stated that her concerns were density, the potential for crime in the area, increased traffic and that a Homeowners Association could not guarantee that owners, especially absentee owners will maintain their properties. She also felt that there is an over

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 17, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

abundance of high-density multi-family complexes in Mesa. She stated she would like to see the property developed and the proposal offered in 2002, of 4 four-plex buildings would be an asset to the neighborhood and that the proposal today simply asks for too many expectations.

Tom Vickers, 4545 E. McLellan Road, added that his primary concern along with those already addressed is that the police report had not yet been received. The police report, which was given to Ed Tato, previous Citizen Participation Planner, in 1999 states that an absentee landlord would allow this area to drift into slum areas and increase criminal activities.

Chairperson Whalen read names of those opposed to this case, but did not wish to speak.

Mark Biladeau, 4527 E. McLellan Road, stated he is opposed to this case. He stated there is too much planned for that lot and traffic is already a problem due to the 202 Freeway.

Inez Wortman, 4464 E. Halifax Drive, stated she has been a participant in protesting this multi-unit project since it was first proposed. She agreed with the neighbors on issues already addressed.

Dorothy Chimel, Acting Planning Director, thanked the audience for all their participation in this case. She gave a brief history of this site stating that in March of 1982 this site was approved for a 56-unit apartment complex followed by other zoning cases. The most recent is the one that neighbors were in support of and spoke about today. That case was recommended for approval by the Planning and Zoning Board and approved by the City Council last year. Ms. Chimel mentioned that case never went through the Design Review Board process. There were a number of concerns raised through that process regarding the aesthetics of the building and rather than go back to the Design Review Board for a full hearing and recommendation the applicant decided to withdraw the case and start over with a new project. Ms Chimel thanked the applicant for being agreeable towards a continuance and stated staff also supports the continuance so that dialog can continue.

Boardmember Brock stated there has been five cases heard on this one site since he has been on the Board. The last case was May of last year. He mentioned there are parts of the last case that he liked which this one does not have and in order to get his support some of those characteristics would have to be brought forth. He agreed with comments made by the neighbors and felt it was an appropriate site for an infill development. He stated that the Infill Ordinance would address many of these issues, which would allow sites like this to be developed and hopefully become an asset in the neighborhoods. Mr. Brock stated that if this project, is brought back in its present form, he would probably vote against it. Mr. Brock asked the applicant to work on the privacy issues and mentioned that the open space was adequate.

It was moved by Boardmember Carpenter, seconded by Boardmember Esparza

That: The Board continue zoning case Z03-12 to the May 17, 2003 meeting.

Vote: Passed 7-0.

Reason for Recommendation: The Board felt a continuance was warranted to allow the applicant additional time to meet with neighbors and address their concerns.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 17, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 17, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-15** 6063 East Arbor (1.12 ac.±) Rezone from C-2 to R-4. This case involves the expansion of an existing assisted living facility on an adjacent parcel. Arbor Rose LLC, owner; Ron Genenbacher, Arbor Rose LLC, applicant.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Cowan, seconded by Boardmember Carpenter

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z03-15 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 the landscape palette by the Design Review planner.
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.).

Vote: Passed 7-0

Reason for Recommendation: The Board felt this proposal is consistent with the Mesa 2025 General Plan and is compatible with the surrounding area.

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 17, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-16** The southwest corner of Hawes Road and Guadalupe Road. (15.84 ac.±) Site Plan Review. This case involves the development of a Wal-Mart Neighborhood Market. Also consider the preliminary plat. Hawes and Guadalupe Limited Partnership, owner; Enda Melvin, Kimley-Horn and Associates, applicant.

Comments: Sean Lake, 10 East Main Street, applicant, gave a brief history of this property stating that this property was designated and zoned C-2 in 1990. It was then part of a Master Plan in 1995 at which time the property was again designated C-2 for approximately 15 acres. Mr. Lake quoted from the staff report dated November 16, 1995 (Z95-106) reaffirming the commercial development. Mr. Lake stated it was also designated on the General Plan and again on the recent update of the General Plan for neighborhood commercial, so the history of this property has been commercial. The proposal before the Board is for a grocery store and accessory retail shops as outlined on the site plan and the grocery store is an allowed use in the C-2 zoning district.

Mr. Lake mentioned that they have had two neighborhood meetings and redesigned the site plan to try to address some of the neighbors concerns. He also stated that after meeting with the neighborhood groups they reevaluated the site plan and increased the buffers on the south and west sides. He stated that these are not site plan related issues, but would be happy to continue discussions with the neighbors. Mr. Lake requested that the Board recommend this case for approval because it is in conformance with the General Plan, it's an allowed use in the zoning district, and meets or exceeds all of the City Code and Design standards. He urged the Board's approval and forwarding on to City Council.

Chairperson Whalen mentioned that there are three similar developments in Mesa and that two already have the zoning so will not be coming before the Planning and Zoning Board only to the Design Review Board. Mr. Whalen asked Mr. Lake if his client had a marketing plan?

Mr. Lake stated that his client thinks there's a need for a Wal-Mart in this area and that this is not going to be a Wal-Mart Super Center. He stated they believe there is a niche for shoppers who want to still shop at a Wal-Mart grocery store but who do not want to go to the Super Center and Wal-Mart desires to enter into a grocery market with a smaller scale retail store. He stated he did not know how far apart these markets were going to be but that they have done a market study, to which he was not privy to that information.

Anna Reinwand, 3133 S. 82nd Circle, stated her concerns were with the size of the project and that the streets were too small for the traffic going into that area. She also pointed out the site built on Sossaman and Guadalupe was empty so she had concerns that there was going to be another huge store with no tenant in the area.

Beverly Selvage, 2627 S. Hibiscus, stated that she is the Public Awareness Chairman for Sunland Village East and thought that a small grocery store would be convenient for the area but did not think that a neighborhood grocery store needs to be open 24 hours a day. She stated she is definitely opposed to the store being opened 24 hours and did not care for the fueling station because she felt that will create more traffic in the area.

Carol Yellick, 2735 S. Zinnia, stated she did receive a letter from Mr. Lake, however, she noted that many of her neighbors were not present today because they were not aware of this meeting. She mentioned that there is already an Albertson on Ellsworth and Baseline and that a Safeway is coming to the opposite corner and that a new drug store is being built at Power and

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 17, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Guadalupe with lots of shops, which have not been filled. She felt the Wal-Mart on Southern near the Superstition Springs Mall is very convenient to this area and that another Wal-Mart was not needed at this site.

Dorothy Chimel, Acting Planning Director, gave a brief history of the site stating that this was a Master Plan approved in 1990. The General Plan notes this site as neighborhood commercial and just as the entire area was master planned that neighborhood commercial component was part of the master plan, which is typical for a subdivision and mixed used development. Ms. Chimel mentioned that the developer has worked very carefully and closely with the Planning staff in order to meet all of the City Code criteria and design standard that were adopted June of 2002. There has been a close coordination with the Design Review staff to ensure that the plant pallet will provide a good buffer as well.

Ms. Chimel showed a map of those people in opposition of this case who live within 150 feet of the site, which means that there will be a legal protest when it's forwarded to City Council and would require a $\frac{3}{4}$ vote. Ms. Chimel responded to a question asked by one of the speakers stating that there is a petition that was sign by some residents of Sunland Village East and Bolder Creek that is included in the Board's packet of materials.

Ms. Chimel noted that the tools staff had to analyze this case was the Master Plan that was approved by Council when the subdivisions were designed and the neighborhood center identified as a convenience. She also pointed out that this site is an arterial intersection and that traffic volume will increase in the area. As the Chair has pointed out there is a kiosk for fuel dispensing at this location as well as a drive-thru facility which is a little bit unusual with this type of center, however, staff is not opposing it but finds it to be a convenience in keeping with the size of the overall center. This is not one of the larger grocery stores but designed to be a neighborhood market. Staff feels the layout is appropriate for this intersection and staff is supporting the case with the conditions outlined.

Mr. Lake stated that Ms. Chimel has done an excellent job in addressing a lot of the issues raised by the neighbors. He stated he empathizes with some of the neighbor's concerns but things are changing and will change at this intersection. We are just trying to follow through on the commercial development that was originally anticipated in 1990.

Boardmember Esparza commented on the 24 hours operation of this Wal-Mart and had concerns with pull-through, trailer and RV's staying over night and asked if that is something Wal-Mart will still be accepting? She also asked Mr. Lake how Wal-Mart would use those parking spaces to possibly avoid having people stay there as it gets into the winter schedule.

Mr. Lake responded that the issue of the RV's parking overnight, Wal-Mart does not anticipate that happening at these neighborhood grocery stores. You are correct that Wal-Mart's all over the nation do have people pull-off freeways and park overnight at their Super Center, which is difficult to regulate. This will not be a permitted use in the neighborhood markets. As for the 24 hours of operation, Wal-Mart's position is they want to have the flexibility to provide the same level of service and hours of operation that all the other grocery stores in Mesa are currently allowed to do.

Boardmember Esparza commented that she lives a couple miles away from a Wal-Mart that is not a Super Center and there are a number of RV's that stay overnight during the winter months. She thought this issue should be addressed and her concerns were for the neighbors.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 17, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 17, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Boardmember Bailey stated that she was excited to see what a Wal-Mart market is going to look like and how it's going to differ from the Albertsons or Safeways. She stated that the 24-hour issue didn't bother her that much and if the market isn't there during those odd hours, then Wal-Mart would be one of the first to cut their losses and go to regular hours. Ms. Bailey brought up the concerns from the neighbors at their April 4, neighborhood meeting and asked Mr. Lake if he could state for the record what those hours are.

Mr. Lake responded that delivery of grocery store items could happen at all hours. Wal-Mart's position is they don't want to be put at a competitive disadvantage by limiting them when the City has not limited other stores.

Boardmember Brock stated what excites him about this project is that it's designed under the new guidelines with the rear and side setbacks doubled under the new design standards. He applauded Mr. Lake's effort to increase that buffer and also applauded the amount of plant material along the two arterial streets and the intersection. Mr. Brock stated he did not feel that there was enough of a buffer between the landscaping and drive approach at the gas station canopy and hoped that issue would be addressed by the Design Review Board. Mr. Brock stated that nighttime deliveries could be troublesome and hoped that would be restricted but stated he was not in favor of restricting the hour of operation. He asked Mr. Lake for the timing for the buildings.

Mr. Lake responded that the timing for the PAD buildings and retail would be tenant driven. They will not be built until they have a certain percentage of the retail shops signed and committed. The PAD themselves will be developed at the time retail users are ready.

Boardmember Brock asked Ms. Chimel if there was a requirement on landscaping the west side when the first phase goes in. Ms. Chimel responded to ensure landscaping is put in with the first phase of development staff could add that as a condition, which would make sense given the number of concerns expressed with providing that buffer.

Boardmember Brock stated that he would prefer to see at least one row of trees go into the west side of the property to allow them to grow and mature with the balance of the site and asked Mr. Lake if that was a stipulation that they could agree to. Mr. Lake responded that they could live with that stipulation. Mr. Brock added he was pleased with this project and recognized the concerns of the property owners. Mr. Brock recommended that this case be forwarded to the City Council for approval with the added stipulation.

Ms. Chimel clarified the language for the added stipulation to read: One row of trees along the west property line and at the southwest corner of the property in the first phase of development to be reviewed and approved by the Design Review Board. She stated that with this wording staff can assure that the canopy and the type and selection of trees are appropriate for a buffer.

Boardmember Adams added that his view on this case was not without consideration of the opinions addressed by the homeowners; however, both the Master Plan and the General Plan are in agreement with the proposed use. He commented that it should not come as a surprise to anyone that a commercial use would be proposed for this parcel. Mr. Adams stated that he appreciated the 24-hour issue and generally when there are lights, people and activity you don't find as much crime. He stated that he understood the safety concerns seen with RV's and overnights at Wal-Mart and didn't think it that would be an issue here. Mr. Adams did

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 17, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

mention that Wal-Mart would be subject to standard city noise ordinances and if noise become a problem there is a channel for expression of that grievance. Mr. Adams stated he supports the project.

Boardmember Cowan mentioned that he is a member of this Council District and in looking at the retail options in this part of the City, that's growing, he welcome this project. He stated he recognized and empathized with those that have concerns in the immediate area. He commended Mr. Brock on his recommendation to add trees to the west area and reiterated comments addressed by the other Boardmember. He stated that this is a valuable addition to our Council District and will provide another retail option for shopping in this part of the community.

Boardmember Carpenter noted that one of the concerns she has been hearing from neighbors is the proposed lighting. She mentioned that she wanted the public to know that at photometric study will be done as part of the conditions and what that means is, they are going to be able to tell the Design Review Board exactly where that light will go, how bright it will be and will not be to intrusive to the neighbors and still cover those safety concerns. She encouraged the neighbors to attend the Design Review Board meeting and hear about those issues. She stated she would like the Design Review Board to take a close look at the pedestrian crossing and the handicapped access.

Boardmember Esparza stated she supports this Wal-Mart neighborhood market and reiterated her concerns about the pull-throughs and the overnight parking. She stated she would like to see some type of median with landscaping on every other row in the parking lot or possibly some concrete buffers to avoid any pull-throughs or overnight parking.

Ms. Chimel commented that prior to this being forwarded to City Council that staff have some clarification from the applicant regarding the overnight parking, the delivery issue, and the methods of addressing the pedestrian connections and design. Ms. Chimel stated staff would likely have this case forwarded to the Design Review Board prior to Council so some of those design issues could be clarified. Mr. Lake agreed to get a letter to the staff addressing those issues.

Chairman Whalen commented to Mr. Lake that he might want to include that this is a much smaller store and agreed with Ms. Bailey on the issue of delivery time.

Mr. Lake stated that this grocery store is about 2/3 of the size of a new Albertsons or Fry's and will not have the amount of truck or delivery traffic that they have at a Super Center. He noted that the issue on when they are going to have delivery is tough because that is hard to regulate.

Chairman Whalen stated he didn't think it would be appropriate to make it a condition of zoning or that Mr. Lake's client should be penalized. Mr. Whalen welcomed the concept of a neighborhood scale retail as opposed to consolidating them into huge stores.

Mr. Adams asked Mr. Lake if there are plans for similar security arrangement at this site as the Super Center on Stapley and maybe knowledge of that information would give the neighborhood some comfort. Mr. Lake responded as far as security goes they will have security cameras and a manager on site 24 hours but that there will not be a security guard patrolling this center.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 17, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

It was moved by Boardmember Brock, seconded by Boardmember Cowan

That: The Board approve the preliminary plat and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z03-16 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 and elevations.
3. Submittal of a photometric study for review by the Design Review Board.
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. Owner granting an Avigation Easement and Release to the City, pertaining to Williams Gateway Airport, which will be prepared and recorded by the City (prior to the issuance of a building permit).
7. Review and approval of a Special Use Permit by the Board of Adjustment for a comprehensive sign plan.
8. Review and approval of a Special Use Permit by the Board of Adjustment for the gas kiosk.
9. One row of trees along the west property line and at the southwest corner of the property in the first phase of development to be reviewed and approved by the Design Review Board.

Vote: Passed 7-0.

Reason for Recommendation: The Board felt this proposal was compatible with surrounding development.

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 17, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-17** The southwest corner of Pueblo Avenue and Crismon Road. (33 ac. ±) Rezone from R1-43 to R-2 PAD. This case involves the development of a 184-lot single residential subdivision. D. R. Horton; Sean Lake, applicant.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Cowan, seconded by Boardmember Carpenter

That: The Board continue zoning case Z03-17 to the May 15, 2003 meeting.

Vote: Passed 7-0

Reason for Recommendation: The Board felt a continuance was warranted.

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 17, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-18** The 200 block of South 63rd Street, west side through to Arbor Avenue, (2.4 ac ±). Rezone from AG to C-1 PAD. This case involves the development of office buildings. Michael Hamberlin, owner; Sherman Cawley, applicant.

Comments: This case was on the consent agenda, therefore, it was not discussed individually. Before approval of the consent agenda, Boardmember Carpenter requested that when the Design Review Board reviews this case that the applicant be asked to address the issues of the handicapped access, the visitor's "drop-off" and "pick-up" area at the entrance, and possible additional shaded parking. This is due to those users who would possibly be sick, disabled or elderly.

It was moved by Boardmember Cowan, seconded by Boardmember Carpenter

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z03-18 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. All street improvements and perimeter landscaping to be installed in the first phase of construction.
6. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Technical Review Committee.
7. Compliance with all requirements of the Design Review Board.
8. Full compliance with all current Code requirements, unless modified through appropriate review and approval of the modifications outlined in the staff report.
9. Retention basins to be 6:1 slopes maximum when adjacent to public rights-of-way or pedestrian walkways.

Vote: Passed 7-0

Reason for Recommendation: The Board felt this proposal was compatible with the surrounding developments.

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 17, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-19** The 5400 to 5600 block of East Inverness Avenue, north side (17 ac ±). Site Plan Modification. This case involves the development of a UPS distribution facility. Michael F. Diessner, owner; Chanel Garner UPS, applicant.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Cowan, seconded by Boardmember Carpenter

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z03-19 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. Review and approval by the Planning and Zoning Board, Design Review Board and City Council of future development plans.
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. All street improvements to be installed in the first phase of construction.
7. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Technical Review Committee.
8. Compliance with all requirements of the Design Review Board.
9. Retention basins to be 6:1 slopes maximum when adjacent to public rights-of-way or pedestrian walkways.

Vote: Passed 7-0

Reason for Recommendation: The Board felt this proposal was in conformance with the previously approved use as a multi-use employment center.

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 17, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

Dorothy Chimel, Secretary
Acting Planning Director

MS:
I:\P&Z 03\Minutes\apr03.doc