

**CITY OF MESA**

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING**

Held in the City of Mesa Council Chambers  
Date June 16, 2005 Time 4:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mike Cowan, Chair  
Barbara Carpenter, Vice-Chair  
Rich Adams  
Pat Esparza  
Alex Finter  
Frank Mizner (excused at 5:15p.m.)  
Bob Saemisch

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

OTHERS PRESENT

John Wesley	Jim Smith	Reese Anderson
Tom Ellsworth	Wahid Alam	Wayne Balmer
Ryan Heiland	Sean Lake	Paul Gilbert
Jennifer Gniffke	Dorothy Shupe	Spencer Price
Lesley Davis	Vince Di Bella	Jill Moughler
Kim Steadman	Ariene Trochelman	Dave Marchant
Krissa Hargis	Audrey Burrfiend	Others

Chairperson Cowan declared a quorum present and the meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. The meeting was recorded on tape and dated June 16, 2005. Before adjournment at 6:12 p.m., action was taken on the following items:

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Mizner that the minutes of the May 19, 2005 meeting be approved as submitted. The vote was 6-0 (Carpenter abstaining).

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Mizner that the minutes of the May 26, 2005 meeting be approved as submitted. The vote was 5-0 (Esparza and Carpenter abstaining).

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

There were two consent agendas due to a conflict of interest by Boardmember Saemisch.

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

Zoning Cases: Z05-56, Z05-58, Z05-60, \*Z05-61, \*Z05-62, Z05-63, Z05-64, \*Z05-65, \*Z05-66, \*Z05-67, \*Z05-68, \*Z05-69, \*Pre-Plat "Sunland Springs Village Unit", and \*Pre-Plat "Dobson Plaza"

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

It was moved by Vice Chair Carpenter, seconded by Boardmember Esparza, that the consent item be approved. Vote: 6-0 (Saemisch abstaining)

Zoning Case: \*Z05-63

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z05-56 (District 6)** The 8400 Block of East Broadway Road (south side). Located at the southeast corner of Broadway Road and Hawes Road (9.4 ac). Rezone from C-2 to R-2 PAD BIZ and site plan review. This request is to allow the development of two and three story single-family detached residences. Michael Cawley, Mt. Baldy Ltd. Partnership, owner; Sean Lake, Pew & Lake, PLC, applicant. Also consider the preliminary plat. **CONTINUED FROM THE MAY 19, 2005 MEETING.**

Comments: Boardmember Saemisch stated that, due to a conflict of interest, he would abstain from all discussion and voting regarding this item.

Mr. Sean Lake, representing the applicant, requested to defer his comments until after the residents have spoken regarding this case.

Ms. Audrey Burfiend, 440 S. 76<sup>th</sup> Place, stated that she currently resided in Fountain of the Sun and had concerns regarding three-story homes being located along their east wall. She further explained that there were no three-story homes in the neighborhood and that this area was predominantly senior housing. Ms. Burfiend reported that there were two subdivisions in the area, which had single-story homes. She also stated that Fountain of the Sun has a close relationship with Mesa and they were not notified of this hearing. Ms. Burfiend asked that the Board continue the case to provide additional time for the applicant to properly notify Fountain of the Sun and explain the request to them. She reaffirmed that her opposition towards having three-story homes on the other side of Hawes Road. Ms. Burfiend stated that this community was quiet and peaceful and had previous problems regarding the children in the area. She explained that allowing two- and three-story homes in this area would create similar problems.

Ms. Arlene Trochelman, 455 S. 83<sup>rd</sup> Way, stated that she currently resided in Fountain of the Sun and had concerns regarding the proposed two- and three-story homes. She explained that this community was primarily senior housing. As well, Ms. Trochelman stated concerns that the three-story homes would be able to look into backyards. She explained that this area was surrounded by 55-plus communities and would like it to continue with this type of housing. She discussed her concerns regarding school buses and how this development would disturb their lifestyle.

Mr. Lake stated they have been working with the Planning Division staff for a considerable amount of time making modifications of the design of the project. He further explained that the City Council recently approved a General Plan amendment for this site allowing residential densities. Mr. Lake responded to some of the stated concerns from the neighbors. He explained that the three-story units would only be the internal units and there would not be any three-story units on the perimeter of the site. As well, Mr. Lake described the floor plan of these units. He stated that the height of them would comply with Code requirements and third-story component was only a portion of the residence. Mr. Lake explained that there was a neighborhood meeting regarding this case. Residents and representatives from Fountain of the Sun were present at that meeting. He stated that there were concerns noted at the meeting and they have tried to address them. Mr. Lake explained there would be extensive landscaping and stated it would not be possible for residents to be able to look out of their windows into a resident of Fountain of the Sun's backyard given the distance of landscaping, Hawes Road, and the drainage channel. He reaffirmed that they have been working with the neighbors and there was a well-attended neighborhood meeting regarding this case. Mr. Lake explained that he was willing to continue working with the present neighbors and requested that the Board make a recommendation for this case.

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Mr. Tom Ellsworth, Senior Planner, stated the applicant has requested to re-zone the subject property from C-2 to R-2-PAD-BIZ for an 83-lot subdivision. He further explained that this case was continued from the May Planning and Zoning meeting to allow for the applicant to address some of the staff concerns regarding density, open space, homes fronting on Broadway, and front yard setbacks. The applicant has been able to address these concerns. He stated that staff is recommending this case be approved with conditions.

Boardmember Mizner asked if Fountain of the Sun was a registered neighborhood association with the City of Mesa. Mr. Ellsworth stated that he was not sure if they were a registered neighborhood association with the Neighborhood Outreach Division. Mr. Ellsworth stated that the City was well aware of Fountain of the Sun. Mr. Lake stated he would need to refer to the mailing labels to determine if they were notified, but he further explained that there were approximately eight residents from Fountain of the Sun present at the first neighborhood meeting. He also stated that one of the residents identified herself as being the spokesperson for that community. He did not verify if the resident was in fact that person. Mr. Lake stated that people from Fountain of the Sun were notified of the meeting because they attended. Chairman Cowan reviewed the sign-up sheet from the first neighborhood meeting from November 18, 2005 and five people that resided on 83<sup>rd</sup> Way were present.

Boardmember Adams asked if a line of sight diagram had been completed to show the distance from one looking through a two-story window for this project. Mr. Lake stated that a line of sight drawing was prepared with the previous plan when the two-story homes were located closer to the residents and it showed that it would not be possible for a person to see into the residents' backyards. Given that the units were moved farther away in the revised plan, an updated line of sight diagram was not done. Boardmember Adams asked if Mr. Lake would be comfortable stating that it would be nearly impossible for a person to look into a resident's backyard across Hawes Road from a third-story window. Mr. Lake stated that it would not be possible given that there would be homes separating the third-story units from the residents to the west. He further stated that he would be happy to meet with the neighbors and show them visual and open space distances.

Vice Chairman Carpenter reported that she had a question for Mr. Lake. She stated, "I had noted, when I was reading the report of your neighborhood meetings, that there were several agreements that had been made with the neighbors informally about providing information, and one was the line of sight drawing for those specifically from the Fountain of the Sun. They were the ones that brought up that question. Another was some traffic information, and that you would use the drought tolerant plant palette, except for the play areas where you would have turf and that you would try to salvage as much of the existing trees on site and transplant them to other areas on-site. There wasn't an indication of whether anyone knows that you are going to do this. And I would just suggest that between now and the City Council meeting that perhaps that's something that the neighbors could be informed of or you could present it at the City Council to make sure they understand there was a response to those concerns." Mr. Lake stated he would be happy to do that and provide that information, specifically the line of sight diagram. He further explained that the landscaping and drought tolerant plant palette was part of the record and they stand by those commitments.

Boardmember Saemisch stated that the reason for abstaining from this case was because he had previously worked on a site plan for the same property owner approximately three years ago, but he further explained that he did not work on the current site plan.

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Boardmember Finter stated that he was confident that Mr. Lake would work well with the neighbors and reassure them that everything had been resolved.

It was moved by Boardmember Finter, seconded by Boardmember Adams

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z05-56 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, preliminary plat and housing product floor plans and elevations as submitted except as follows:
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 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 the Residential Development Guidelines.
7. Adjacent to Superstition Point to the east and south of this project, construct two-story product only.

Vote: Passed 6-0 (Saemisch abstaining)

Reason for Recommendation: The Board felt this proposal was reasonably well-designed and should be compatible with the adjacent neighborhoods.

\* \* \* \* \*

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z05-58 (District 1)** 2245 North Center Street (east side). Located north of the northeast corner of McKellips Road and Center Street (6.5 ± ac). Rezone from R1-43 to R1-9 PAD and site plan review. This request is to allow for the development of a residential subdivision. Nancy Mahr, owner; Kenneth Caldwell, applicant. Also consider the preliminary plat "Pasadena Estates". **CONTINUED FROM THE MAY 19, 2005 MEETING.**

Comments: Mr. Sean Lake, representing the applicant, stated that there had been much discussion regarding the appropriate land use for this site. He explained the history of the site and showed an exhibit of the Mesa General Plan from 1996. The subject property was designated on that General Plan as "Medium-High Density Residential," which allowed for 5 to 15 dwelling units per acre. This was consistent with the surrounding area. Mr. Lake showed another exhibit of the Mesa 2025 General Plan and the designation for the site dropped down in density to "Medium Density Residential 2-4 units per acre". He believed this was done to create a buffer from the adjacent land uses. Mr. Lake further explained that the applicant created a site plan that is believed to be consistent with the General Plan and compatible with adjacent land uses. He described the adjacent land uses surrounding the site. There is an ADOT retention basin to the north of the property and Mr. Lake explained how the properties in this vicinity changed as a result of the freeway. To the west, there is industrial property that owned by the City of Mesa and it is designated on the Mesa 2025 General Plan as industrial. He stated that directly south of the subject site is the "Price Property" and it is similar in size to the subject property. Mr. Lake reported a trailer park farther south from the property. To the east of the property, it is a R1-6 zoned mobile home subdivision that was developed in the 1970's. To the north and east of the property, there is a R1-9 DMP residential subdivision called "Lehi Shadows." He further explained that there was much discussion and opposition regarding that subdivision and the City Council ultimately approved the request. Mr. Lake stated that there have been previous plans proposed for the subject site, including a 35-lot subdivision. The current site plan is proposing an 18-lot residential subdivision, which calculated to 2.8 units per acre. The Mesa General Plan has a target range of 3 units per acre for this particular land use designation. He explained that the proposed use would be a good transitional use for this area.

There was a neighborhood meeting regarding the request conducted on June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2005. Mr. Lake described, in his opinion, the neighbors' perspectives regarding the request. The Price family was supportive of the request and desire to do a similar use, in the future, on their property. The west property owner, the City of Mesa, does not take formal positions regarding requests, but the Planning Division recommended approval of this case. ADOT is the north property owner and they do not take positions on land uses. The properties to the east and northeast of the site are residential subdivisions. There were three individuals from these subdivisions present at the meeting and were supportive of the request. As well, there were individuals and boardmembers from the Lehi Community Improvement Association present. He believed that their primary concern regarding the site was the belief that this area was within the Lehi Sub-Area Plan and therefore should be governed by the Sub-Area Plan. As part of the Sub-Area Plan, they would like to see all lots greater than one acre. Mr. Lake added that at the end of the meeting, they agreed to disagree that the property was within the Lehi Sub-Area Plan. Mr. Lake stated that it was their position that this site was not part of Lehi. He explained that his evidence was from the Mesa 2025 General Plan map (Exhibit 2.5), which defined the boundaries of Lehi Sub-Area. This exhibit showed that the subject property was not within the Lehi Sub-Area. He added that the land use map designation from the Mesa 2025 General Plan defined the property as 2 to 4 units per acre and this further showed that this area was not indicated to be within the Lehi Sub-Area. In addition, he displayed a map of the registered neighborhoods from the Neighborhood Services Division dated April, 2005. He stated that the Neighborhood Services Division explained to him that each neighborhood or community group

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

registers their neighbor and define their own boundaries. Mr. Lake explained that the map showed the Lehi Neighborhood Organization defined as neighborhood #130. The subject property was not within the Lehi registered neighborhood. He stated that it is the applicant's belief that they are not within the Lehi Sub-Area Plan and, therefore, should be governed by the existing General Plan. Mr. Lake added that the Lehi Community Improvement Association had been working with the City of Mesa to expand the Lehi area. They desire to extend it to the west and include the subject site and Price property. Both the property owners of the subject site and Price property are opposed to being part of the Lehi Sub-Area. He further stated that, in most situations, all of the interested parties are agreeable to being included in the sub-areas, but all parties are not in regards to this plan. The Lehi Sub-Area Plan expansion could potentially be considered at a future date, but this property is not currently part of the Lehi Sub-Area. He reaffirmed that this development was consistent with the current Mesa 2025 General Plan and a good project for this area.

Mr. Spencer Price, 521 East 7<sup>th</sup> Place, spoke in support of the request and believed that the proposed zoning was consistent with the area. He further explained that he was not supportive of having one-acre lots in this particular area given the surrounding zoning and land uses.

Mr. Daniel K. Price, 2211 North Center Street, spoke in support of the request and explained that he had resided in this area since 1960. He further described the changes that had occurred in this area since he has lived on the property. Mr. Price stated that he was in full agreement with the proposed development. He explained that he did not believe the one-acre lots were proportionate given the surrounding area and felt this project would be a good adjustment. Mr. Price stated that Spencer and his brother developed the subdivision, "Lehi Shadows," and explained there was much opposition regarding that case. He reaffirmed that he was in support of the subdivision and felt it would be attractive and good adjustment for the area.

Ms. Susan Frabotta, 212 East Lynwood, indicated support of the request because she believed it was a reasonable request and transition from house trailers to industrial properties.

Ms. Jill Moughler, representing the Lehi Community Improvement Association and Lehi Sub-Area Plan Committee, spoke in opposition to the request. She stated that some time ago the City of Mesa asked the Lehi residents to create a plan of what they desired to see in their community. They have been working with the Lehi Sub-Area Plan Committee for approximately one year to create the desired plan. One year ago, a survey was mailed to the Lehi residents inquiring about what they would like to see in their community. The results indicated that future development of Lehi and the "influenced areas" should be only zoned R1-43. Also, seventy-seven percent (77%) of the returned surveys reported that they did not want less than one-acre lots. As well, the results showed that they desired no gated communities or home-owner's associations. She further explained that this property has been part of Lehi and the Lehi Sub-Area Plan because it was zoned R1-43. Ms. Moughler added that they were aware that the General Plan did not include this parcel as part of the Lehi Sub-Area. She explained this development would not be a good transition due to the lifestyles and characteristics of Lehi. Ms. Moughler stated that "Lehi Shadows" was a mistake and asked the Board not to make the same mistake by changing the zoning.

Mr. Lake stated that they have no "quarrel" with the Lehi Sub-Area and what the community has envisioned. He explained that the only concern was regarding the proposed expansion of the Lehi Sub-Area from what currently exists on the General Plan. Mr. Lake further stated that they believed this would be a good transitional use for the surrounding properties. He added that, in

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

his opinion, the transition from the Lehi area to more urban densities had already been decided by the City Council through the "Lehi Shadows" subdivision.

Mr. Ryan Heiland, Planner II, explained the request to re-zone the property to allow for the development of a gated, 18-lot custom home subdivision. He further stated that the proposed density was less than the target density of the General Plan designation. Mr. Heiland provided the lot sizes and explained that the largest lots of the subdivision were located adjacent to Center and Pasadena Streets. The larger lots would create a buffer from the public right-of-way for the smaller lots towards the center of the site. The main access point for the development would be through a gated entrance off of Center Street and an exit-only gate off of Pasadena Street. He further stated that, according to the current Mesa 2025 General Plan, the subject property was not within the Lehi Sub-Area Plan. He stated that staff was supportive of the request.

Boardmember Adams asked Mr. Heiland if the boundaries of the Lehi Sub-Area Plan had changed or been adjusted since they had been originally established. Mr. Heiland stated that he did not know exactly when the original boundary of Lehi had been established. Mr. Lake stated that the 1996 Mesa General Plan had an "East Lehi Sub-Area," but not a "Lehi Sub-Area." He further explained that he believed that Lehi had always been a "place," but it did not have any specific boundaries until 2002 with the adoption of the Mesa 2025 General Plan. Boardmember Adams asked if the boundaries of the Lehi Sub-Area Plan had changed since 2002. Mr. Lake stated that the boundaries established on the General Plan had not changed, however the residents are proposing to expand the Lehi Sub-Area.

Boardmember Adams inquired about the average square footage of the homes. Mr. Lake stated that they would be custom homes with a minimum of 2,500sq.ft.

Boardmember Adams asked for clarification regarding the registered neighborhood map. Mr. Lake explained that the map was a self-defined registered neighborhood map and it showed that the subject property was within the North Center Street Neighborhood Association.

Boardmember Mizner explained that the primary discussion regarding the site has been related to the boundaries of Lehi. He further stated that a few years ago, he was asked by Wahid Alam, Senior Planner, what the established boundaries of Lehi were. Boardmember Mizner explained to Mr. Alam that Lehi was a "state of mind" and one knew when he/she was there or had been there. He further discussed how some people desire to be involved in Lehi, while others do not. Boardmember Mizner added that this area was separated from the traditional Lehi community by higher density housing. As well, he discussed the "Lehi Shadows" subdivision and the history regarding the zoning case. Boardmember Mizner stated that this area was surrounded by a mixture of uses and described some of the existing land uses. He further discussed that he believed the request was a good land use proposal and reasonable transition. Also, he acknowledged the Lehi residents for their work on the Lehi Sub-Area Plan. Boardmember Mizner stated that he was in support of the request and believed it was consistent with the Mesa 2025 General Plan.

Boardmember Saemisch stated that this subdivision would be an "excellent edge condition" and it would secure the property values of the surrounding communities. He further discussed how the design was clever and an excellent project. He moved that that case be approved with the conditions listed on the staff report.

Boardmember Esparza seconded the motion and stated that she believed this would be a good

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

transition and was supportive of the request.

Boardmember Finter stated that Boardmember Mizner's comment about the fact that Lehi was a "state of mind" was correct. He further discussed the history that he could remember with Mr. Dan Price in the Lehi community. Boardmember Finter stated that he was present and observed the neighborhood meeting on June 15<sup>th</sup>. He explained that he found his "state of mind" as he reviewed the Lehi area and believed he had to follow suit with Mr. Price's position. Boardmember Finter stated he felt that there was plenty of support for the request. He further discussed that he desired to support the Lehi home-owner's group, but it was difficult to argue the exhibits showing the changes that have evolved. Boardmember Finter stated that he was supportive of the motion, but had concerns regarding the proximity to the police firing range. He inquired about providing some type of mitigation for the homes.

Boardmember Mizner asked Mr. Jim Smith, Assistant City Attorney, if a condition could be included to require future residents to be notified about the proximity to the police firing range, so there would not be any complaints in the future. Mr. Smith recommended that conditions #20 and #21 under the "Standard Conditions for Approval" be modified to address both of the concerns noted. Mr. Smith further stated that Mr. Lake was in agreement with the addition of those conditions.

Boardmember Saemisch stated he accepted the two conditions that Mr. Smith read and amended his motion to include them. Boardmember Esparza seconded the amendment. Mr. Lake stated that he was in agreement with the conditions, but he was not sure of the exact distance from the firing range.

It was moved by Boardmember Saemisch, seconded by Boardmember Esparza

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z05-58 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 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. Full compliance with all current Code requirements, unless modified through appropriate review and approval of the modifications outlined in the staff report or on the site plan.
7. View fences on residential lots shall comply with the City of Mesa pool fence barrier regulations.
8. Retention basins to be 6:1 slopes maximum when adjacent to public rights-of-way or pedestrian walkways.
9. Written notice be provided to future residents, and acknowledgment received that the project is within one-half mile of a police firing range.
10. Noise attenuation measures be incorporated into the design and construction of the homes.

Vote: Passed 7-0

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Reason for Recommendation: The Board felt this proposal was reasonably well-designed and should be compatible with the adjacent neighborhoods.

\* \* \* \* \*

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z05-60 (District 2)** The 1600-1700 blocks of South Val Vista Drive (west side). Located at the northwest corner of Val Vista Drive and Baseline Road (14.3 ac. ±) Site Plan Review. This request is for a retail tenant building and future commercial / retail development. Mike Clements, owner; Paul Gilbert, applicant.

Comments: Boardmember Saemisch stated that, due to a conflict of interest, he would abstain from all discussion and voting regarding this item.

Mr. Paul Gilbert, applicant, explained the request for approval of the Site Plan Review for Phase Three of the Dana Park Village. Phase One and Two have been constructed and are currently open. He further discussed that there were concerns when the project was originally approved about whom the operating tenants would be. He stated that they have completed everything that they committed to do regarding the project. Mr. Gilbert explained that the success of the two previous phases had led to this Phase, which includes 170,000 sq.ft. of retail space and potentially 280,000sq.ft. of hotel, condominiums, and offices. As well, there was a four-story parking garage located at the northwest corner of the site. He further explained that in every site plan presented, they have shown the high-rise buildings and four-story parking garage. The parking garage would be constructed concurrently with the Phase Three retail buildings and consistent with the architecture and level of detail as the rest of the development.

Mr. Gilbert further discussed the neighborhood outreach that was done in conjunction with this case. Every phase of the development was accomplished with the neighborhood. There have been numerous neighborhood meetings since the beginning of the development and the neighbors have been presented the proposed plan. The Dana Park Ranch Home-owner's Association designated a liaison group to work with this development. There have been annual meetings with the liaison group since the development began in 1998. As well, he stated that everything presented on the site plan had been shown at all of those meetings with the association. He further explained that there was a meeting held on June 8<sup>th</sup> with four of the five boardmembers of the liaison group to discuss the plans for Phase Three. They did have concerns noted at the meeting and Mr. Gilbert stated willingness to address those concerns. The liaison group desired for the development to continue providing adequate screening for the trash dumpsters and loading dock areas. The board was overwhelming in support of the Phase Three plans. He also reported that the board stated they had not received any negative feedback regarding the center. Mr. Gilbert stated that the proposed plans were consistent with the original plans, including the height of the building and parking garage. He further explained that he was in support of the staff's recommendation with the modification of condition #2.

Chairman Cowan asked for clarification regarding the modified wording of condition #2. Mr. Kim Steadman, Senior Planner, read the revised condition #2.

Mr. Wayne Lowe, 3342 East Isabella Avenue, was present in opposition of the case due to the height of the buildings.

Mr. Dan Marchant, 1709 South Citrus Cove, spoke in opposition of the case due to size of the proposed buildings. He further explained that the existing plan was open and spacious, but the proposed plan would not have that appearance. Mr. Marchant discussed that the buildings could be located along the freeway to give the plan a more open and spacious feel. As well, he stated that the neighbors envision a large wall for the parking garage and a ten-story building. Mr. Marchant recommended that the Board consider a more "win-win" solution, rather than a "win-lose" situation by re-location of the parking garage towards the freeway.

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Mr. Dutch Lawson, 1645 South Citrus Cove, spoke in opposition of the request due to the height of the proposed hotel and parking garage. He explained that they have been notified of the proposals, but that does not confirm that the neighbors are in support of them. Mr. Lawson stated that he had been in attendance for the majority of the neighborhood meetings. He further discussed what he thought was going to be originally developed on the property, when he purchased his home. Mr. Lawson explained that the existing buildings were not as close in proximity as the proposed buildings would be to the neighbors. He reported that the park near his residence was approximately 50-60' wide and the parking garage would be within 100' from his home. Mr. Lawson further discussed concerns regarding the safety around that area due to the height of the buildings. He recommended that the plans be re-designed to make the buildings the same height as the existing ones. Mr. Lawson stated that he was opposed to the proposed plan and would like to see a different proposal.

Mr. Dan Copeland, 1717 South Citrus Cove, spoke in opposition of the case due to the height of the proposed hotel and parking garage. He discussed how a previously presented case moved the three-story buildings into the middle of the site and explained that the proposed buildings would be an eyesore to the neighborhood. Mr. Copeland further recommended re-location of the buildings towards Val Vista Drive. As well, he stated that he was previously on the board of the Dana Ranch Home-owner's Association and there were objections regarding the parking garage. Mr. Copeland reported that the residents were not told that the buildings were going to be the height proposed.

Mr. Gilbert stated that immediately behind the proposed four-story parking garage, there would be approximately 100' of landscaping plus a 24' wide driveway. The parking garage would not have any windows and would be architecturally consistent with the surrounding development. He further clarified the location of the eight-story building that would be approximately 500' from the residential property lines. He added that the design and landscaping of the park was done in part with the home-owner's association and they were told where the association wanted the park to be located. Mr. Gilbert reaffirmed that the four-story parking garage had existed on the site plan since the beginning of the development.

Mr. Vince DiBella, Saemich DiBella Architects, Inc., discussed the depth of the buildings along Val Vista Drive had been maximized. The parking garage was created to be act as a buffer for the neighbors because it would be a low impact noise generator. The height of the parking garage would be between 35' to 40' and it would screen the neighbors from the other proposed buildings.

Chairman Cowan inquired about which of the buildings, on the exhibits, was the proposed parking garage. Mr. DiBella clarified each of the buildings to the Board.

Mr. Kim Steadman, Senior Planner, stated that the Planning Division had received a letter from David Stone, President of Dana Ranch Home-Owner's Association, confirming what was stated in the Citizen Participation Report. He further explained that each phase of Dana Park had shown the high-rise and parking garage components in the proposed general location. Mr. Steadman stated that the Design Review Board would review each of the buildings and the neighbors would be notified.

Boardmember Finter inquired about the opportunity for a portion of the parking garage to be located underground. Mr. DiBella stated that it would not be a practical alternative due to the fact that the majority of the people utilizing the garage would not drive underground to park their

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

vehicles. As well, it is more economically feasible to park at-grade, so that the person can easily get to his/her desired destination.

Boardmember Adams stated that he did not wish to be insensitive to the neighbors' concerns, but the applicant had made all parties aware of the intent for this property since the beginning. He further stated that he would be in support of the request.

Vice Chair Carpenter stated, "I would just like to reiterate staff's comment that this can be further reviewed at the Design Review level. I think that that's probably the issue. I was trying to imagine, as these neighbors were speaking, what they would be looking at that would be windowless and, I had a horror of a thought, that we could put public art on it and then we would really have some controversy going. But, I think perhaps, at that level, there would be a compromise and, with my own experience with an office park going over my fence, several years ago, I had a very good outcome from that. When you can't see and can't imagine it, it is really difficult. So I think if there is some additional work done with the neighbors to help them visualize, I think this would be a good project. So, I hope that continues."

Boardmember Esparza discussed the difference between notifying the neighbors on paper compared to verbally and on paper. She further stated that she empathized with the neighbors' concerns about a "heat island" possibly over their homes. Ms. Esparza believed that there were opportunities for the applicant to work with the neighbors to discuss the parking garage. As well, she stated that she was not supportive of the close proximity of the garage to the neighbors.

Chair Cowan stated that he could empathize with the neighbors and appreciated the visualizations from Mr. DiBella's exhibits. He further discussed how the developers had worked well in the community. He hoped that the case would move forward to Design Review Board and City Council with a hesitate recommendation and a note that special consideration should be made in regards to the height and view of the parking structure. He stated that he would be supportive of the request with some reservations.

Mr. Steadman discussed the maximum height of residential properties and the proposed height of the parking garage. Staff believed that there was adequate separation between the parking structure and the neighbors given the park area and the drive aisle.

Boardmember Adams stated that line of sight diagrams would be helpful for the neighbors to visualize the structure. He further discussed that the main concern was what the parking garage would look like to the neighbors.

Boardmember Finter stated that he put a reasonable person test to this request and believed there were some valid reservations regarding the height of the parking garage. He further discussed that he hoped there could be opportunities for the applicant to speak with the neighbors. He stated that his vote would be a hesitant vote of support.

It was moved by Vice Chair Carpenter, seconded by Boardmember Adams

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z05-60 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative and design guidelines, and as shown on the site plan and elevations submitted, (without guarantee of lot yield, building count, lot coverage).

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

2. Review and approval by the Design Review Board of all 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. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations.

Vote: Passed 4-1-1-1 (Esparza nay, Saemisch abstaining, Mizner absent)

Reason for Recommendation: The majority of the Board felt this proposal was reasonably well-designed and should be compatible with the adjacent neighborhoods.

\* \* \* \* \*

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z05-61 (District 6)** The 3600 - 4200 blocks of South Mountain Road (west to the Signal Butte Road alignment) excluding parcels 304-33-003B/C. (225 ac.) Rezoning from County Rural 43 and R1-8 PD to City R1-43 and R1-9 Establishment of city zoning. William Ring, GBGM 240 Limited Partnership LLLP, owner; City of Mesa, applicant.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Esparza, seconded by Boardmember Mizner

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z05-61 conditioned upon:

1. Review and approval by the Planning and Zoning Board and City Council of future development plans.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.

Vote: Passed 7-0

Reason for Recommendation: The Board felt this proposal was reasonably well-designed and should be compatible with the adjacent neighborhoods.

\* \* \* \* \*

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z05-62 (District 6)** Northeast corner of Signal Butte Road and Elliot Road (108.43 ac.)  
Rezone from R1-43 to PF (Public Facility) and site plan review. This request is for the development  
of a City of Mesa water treatment facility. City of Mesa, owner; Carrie Hinson, City of Mesa,  
applicant.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Esparza , seconded by Boardmember Mizner

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z05-62  
conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown  
on the site plan, (without guarantee of lot yield, building count, lot coverage).
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 perimeter landscaping to be installed in the first phase of construction.
7. All street improvements to Elliot Road and Signal Butte Road to be developed per the MAG  
Regional Transportation Plan.
8. Compliance with all requirements of the Design Review Board.
9. 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).
10. 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 reasonably well-designed and  
should be compatible with the adjacent neighborhoods.

\* \* \* \* \*

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z05-63 (District 3)** 1720 West Broadway Road (north side). Located north and east of Broadway Road and Dobson Road (15.5 ac. ±) Rezone from M-1 to M-1PAD and site plan modification. This request is for a light industrial and retail complex. Broadway Mesa Commons, LLC (Robert Nutall, Manager), owner; Bob Saemisch, Saemisch & DiBella Architects, applicant.

Comments: Boardmember Saemisch stated that, due to a potential conflict, he would abstain from all discussion and voting regarding this item.

This item was on the consent agenda, therefore it was not discussed individually.

It was moved by Vice Chair Carpenter, seconded by Boardmember Esparza

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z05-63 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. All street improvements and perimeter landscaping to be installed in the first phase of construction.
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. 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 6-0 (Saemich abstaining)

Reason for Recommendation: The Board felt this proposal was reasonably well-designed and should be compatible with the adjacent neighborhoods.

\* \* \* \* \*

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z05-64 (District 6)** The 400-500 block of South Hawes Road (east side). Located south and east of Broadway Road and Hawes Road (3.35 ac. ±) Modification of a previously approved PAD overlay and site plan review. This request is to allow for individual residential building ownership. John Bellerose, owner; Randy Carter, applicant. Also consider the preliminary plat.

Comments: Ms. Dorothy Shupe, representing the applicant, requested to defer her comments until after the residents have spoken regarding this case.

Ms. Arlene Trochelman, 455 South 83<sup>rd</sup> Way, spoke in opposition of the request. She stated that she had not been educated on the project and desired to protect her senior lifestyle. She further discussed concerns in regards to allowing a rental community with children due to the potential noise. As well, Ms. Trochelman inquired about the type of rentals that it would be, such as up-scale, subsidized housing, etc. She further stated that she would not be opposed to a senior rental or ownership community being located on the site.

Ms. Audrey Burfiend, 440 South 76<sup>th</sup> Place, spoke in opposition of the request. She discussed criminal activities that have occurred in the past with children in the area. Ms. Burfiend further explained that she was not educated about the project and wanted to know more about what type of housing the project would have. She stated that she was on the board of Fountain of the Sun and desired more information regarding the request.

Ms. Shupe discussed the request to allow one-story buildings with basements. The individual four-plex buildings would be owned and could be rented out to whomever. She stated that she would be happy to provide information to Fountain of the Sun regarding the request. The gentleman that went door-to-door notifying the surrounding property of the request was present. The buildings would be set back from Hawes Road and have individual front doors and short screen walls for each of the units. She further discussed the amenities that would be provided on-site for the residents.

Mr. Tom Ellsworth, Senior Planner, discussed the site and zoning of the property. He stated that the site was zoned R-3 PAD and had proposed 11 four-plex buildings. The overall density was approximately 13.09 dwelling units per acre. He further stated that the City did not regulate the ownership of individual projects or the age of who could reside on the property. The applicant had proposed individual ownership of each of the buildings with four units that could be rentable. Staff recommended that this case be approved with conditions.

Boardmember Finter stated that the property owner had provided a letter, which stated that the development would participate in the Crime Free Multi-Housing Project and was designed with CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) standards in mind. He discussed that he believed this would help make this development a good project.

Boardmember Adams asked to hear from the gentleman that went door-to-door as part of the Citizen Participation Plan.

Mr. Jose Lamboglia stated that he worked for the property owner as a project manager. He reported that he delivered letters on East Clovis Avenue, East Carol Avenue, and approximately 25 homes in the subdivision west of Hawes Road (Fountain of the Sun). He further stated that they provided more letters than what was required. He discussed that there was no opposition noted and a phone number was provided to the residents if they had any questions. The only comments received were positive ones for the project.

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Boardmember Adams inquired about how those comments were received. Mr. Lamboglia stated that the comments were received primarily from going door-to-door. Two phone calls were received and those individuals reported that they were in support of the request. He believed that the phone calls were from residents either off of Clovis or Carol Avenue.

Boardmember Adams asked if the City was aware of the organization within the adult community and wondered why they were not contacted regarding the request. Mr. Ellsworth stated that the City was aware of Fountain of the Sun. Boardmember Adams inquired as to the reason why they were not contacted. Mr. Lamboglia stated that, to his knowledge, they did contact Fountain of the Sun. Boardmember Adams asked who was contacted within that association. Mr. Lamboglia reported that he could not recall.

Boardmember Saemisch asked the applicant about the success regarding the previously approved sites that had showed similar facilities and wondered how the sites were being maintained. Ms. Shupe stated that they just began construction on the first site and do not have a site that was operational. Boardmember Saemisch inquired about who would be renting the units and the ownership of the buildings. Ms. Shupe stated that each four-plex building would be owned and the units could not be sold. There would be a home-owner's association that would take care of the community amenities, such as the pool and play area.

Boardmember Saemisch stated that he did not believe the project would be a low-scale community and appreciated the design.

Vice Chair Carpenter moved that the Board recommend this case be approved, subject to the conditions outlined in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Boardmember Esparza.

Boardmember Adams stated, "I am not going to be supporting the motion because, maybe I just don't see the big picture here, but I think that maybe the Citizen Participation process was followed to the letter, but, I'm not so sure the spirit of the intent. I will not be supporting the motion for that reason."

Boardmember Saemisch stated, "Is Mr. Adams saying that it was not properly done based by the Code, the Citizen Participation Report? And can staff say, was it accurately and per the requirements of the City so executed?"

Mr. Ellsworth stated that the applicant provided a mailing list of the properties notified, copy of the sample letter, and report of the door-to-door efforts and their results. Boardmember Saemisch inquired about the distance that applicants are required to notify the property owners. Mr. Ellsworth stated that the City generally requires 300' for individuals and any home-owner's association or registered neighborhood within a half-mile. Boardmember Saemisch asked about the size of the sign posted on the property and when they are posted on the site. Mr. Ellsworth reported that the signs are 4' by 4' and posted two to three weeks prior to the Planning and Zoning hearing.

Boardmember Saemisch stated, "So, Mr. Adam's issue is the way that it was reported, not that anything was not done wrong per the Ordinance. Just that the, I'm putting words in your mouth now, that the essence of the report was not satisfactory to his understanding of what he would like to see."

Chair Cowan asked Boardmember Adams if that was correct. Boardmember Adams stated,

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

"Well, Mr. Adams will let his comments stand."

It was moved by Vice Chair Carpenter, seconded by Boardmember Esparza

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z05-64 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.
7. 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).

Vote: Passed 5-1-1 (Adams nay, Mizner absent)

Reason for Recommendation: The majority of the Board felt this proposal was reasonably well-designed and should be compatible with the adjacent neighborhoods.

\* \* \* \* \*

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z05-65 (District 6)** The 2850-2900 block of South Power Road (east side). Located north and east of Guadalupe Road and Power Road (2.3 ac ±) Rezone from R1-7 (conceptual C-2) to C-2. This request is to allow for the development of a gas station with a convenience store. Karl Kohlhoff, owner; Craig Boswell, applicant.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Esparza, seconded by Boardmember Mizner

That: The Board continue zoning case Z05-65 to the July 21, 2005 meeting as requested by the applicant.

Vote: Passed 7-0

\* \* \* \* \*

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z05-66 (District 6)** 11611 and 4011 South Power Road (east side). Located south and east of Elliot Road and Power Road (24.73 ac.) Rezone from R1-43 to C-2 and M-1. This request is to bring the existing zoning into conformance with the Mesa 2025 General Plan. Joe Vertuccio, owner; Wayne Balmer, City of Mesa, applicant.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Esparza , seconded by Boardmember Mizner

That: The Board approve recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z05-66 conditioned upon:

1. Site Plan Review and approval by the Planning and Zoning Board, Design Review Board, and City Council of future development plans.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic Engineering, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.).
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Owner granting an Avigation Easement and Release to the City, pertaining to Williams Gateway Airport, which will be prepared and recorded by the City.
5. Dedicate the right-of-way required under the Mesa City Code as part of the future site plan approval, building permit and/or subdivision/plat approvals, or at the time of the City's request for dedication, whichever comes first.

Vote: Passed 7-0

Reason for Recommendation: The Board felt this proposal was reasonably well-designed and should be compatible with the adjacent neighborhoods.

\* \* \* \* \*

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z05-67 (District 6)** 18515, 18525, 18501 East Ray Road (south side). Located south and east of Ray Road and Power Road (3.43 ac.) Rezone from R1-43 to C-2. This request is to bring the existing zoning into conformance with the Mesa 2025 General Plan. City of Mesa, owner; Wayne Balmer, City of Mesa, applicant.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Esparza, seconded by Boardmember Mizner

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z05-67 conditioned upon:

1. Site Plan Review and approval by the Planning and Zoning Board, Design Review Board, and City Council of future development plans.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic Engineering, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.).
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Owner granting an Avigation Easement and Release to the City, pertaining to Williams Gateway Airport, which will be prepared and recorded by the City.
5. Dedicate the right-of-way required under the Mesa City Code at the time of application for a building permit or at the time of the City's request for dedication whichever comes first.

Vote: Passed 7-0

Reason for Recommendation: The Board felt this proposal was reasonably well-designed and should be compatible with the adjacent neighborhoods.

\* \* \* \* \*

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z05-68 (District 6)** 14031 South 185<sup>th</sup> Street (east side). Located south and east of Ray Road and Power Road (1.2 ac.) Rezone from R1-43 to C-2. This request is to bring the existing zoning into conformance with the Mesa 2025 General Plan. Craig and Vickilyn VanSickle, owner; Wayne Balmer, City of Mesa, applicant.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Esparza, seconded by Boardmember Mizner

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z05-68 conditioned upon:

1. Site Plan Review and approval by the Planning and Zoning Board, Design Review Board, and City Council of future development plans.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic Engineering, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.).
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Owner granting an Avigation Easement and Release to the City, pertaining to Williams Gateway Airport, which will be prepared and recorded by the City.
5. Dedicate the right-of-way required under the Mesa City Code at the time of application for a building permit or at the time of the City's request for dedication, whichever comes first.
6. Frontage onto a dedicated public street, with uninterrupted access to an existing public right of way, or combination with an adjacent parcel which does have frontage, is required at the time of application for a building permit.

Vote: Passed 7-0

Reason for Recommendation: The Board felt this proposal was reasonably well-designed and should be compatible with the adjacent neighborhoods.

\* \* \* \* \*

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z05-69 (District 5)** The 2900 block of North Sericin (east side). Located north and west of McDowell Road and Power Road (1.04 ac ±). Rezone from C-2 to R-2 PAD and site plan review. This request is to allow for the development of a residential subdivision. Robert L. Schultz, owner; Gary Johnson, Archicon, L.C., applicant.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Esparza, seconded by Boardmember Mizner

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z05-69 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan and elevations as submitted.
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. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Technical Review Committee.
5. Compliance with the Residential Development Guidelines.

Vote: Passed 7-0

Reason for Recommendation: The Board felt this proposal was reasonably well-designed and should be compatible with the adjacent neighborhoods.

\* \* \* \* \*

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: The 10800 Block of East Guadalupe Road (south side) **(District 6)**. East of Signal Butte Road, south of Guadalupe Road (47.82 ac.). This request is to allow for the development of Unit 6 in the Sunland Springs Village Development Master Plan. Craig Ahlstrom, owner/applicant. Consider the preliminary plat of "Sunland Springs Village Unit 6."

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

It was moved by Boardmember Esparza, seconded by Boardmember Mizner

That: The Board approve the preliminary plat of "Sunland Springs Village Unit 6" conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the preliminary plat.
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. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Technical Review Committee.
5. 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).

Vote: Passed 7-0

Reason for Recommendation: The Board felt this proposal was reasonably well-designed and should be compatible with the adjacent neighborhoods.

\* \* \* \* \*

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: 116 South Dobson (west side) **(District 3)**. West side of Dobson Road, south of Main Street (6.13 ac.). This request is to allow for the Dobson Plaza parcel to be subdivided into three parcels. Dobson Plaza L.L.C., owner; David S. Klein, applicant. Consider the preliminary plat of "Dobson Plaza."

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

It was moved by Boardmember Esparza, seconded by Boardmember Mizner

That: The Board approve the preliminary plat of "Dobson Plaza" conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the site plan and preliminary plat submitted (without guarantee of lot yield, building count, lot coverage), except as noted below.
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. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Technical Review Committee.
5. Full compliance with all current Code requirements.
6. 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 reasonably well-designed and should be compatible with the adjacent neighborhoods.

\* \* \* \* \*

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2005 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

---

John Wesley, Secretary  
Planning Director

KH:  
I:\P&Z 05\Minutes\jun05.doc