

CITY OF MESA

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING

Held in the City of Mesa Council Chambers

Date February 20, 2003 Time 4:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

MEMBERS ABSENT

Mike Cowan, excused

OTHERS PRESENT

Frank Mizner
Dorothy Chimel
Michelle Dahlke
Ryan Heiland
Lois Underdah
Maria Salaiz

Wahid Alam
Sean Lake
Ralph Pew
Stephen Earl
Councilmember Grisworld
Raad Salih

Laura Hyneman
Richard McAllister
Lew Lenz
Dina Higgins
Tom Pielach
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 February 20, 2003. Before adjournment at 6:15 p.m., action was taken on the following items:

It was moved by Boardmember Brock, seconded by Boardmember Adams that the minutes of the January 16, 2003 meeting be approved as submitted. The vote was 6-0.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Bailey that the consent items be approved. Vote 6-0.

Zoning Cases: *Z03-02, *Z03-06, Z03-07, *Z03-08, *Z03-09, *Z03-10, *Z03-11

Chairperson Whalen announced an open house for the Mesa LTD program at the Chamber of Commerce on March 14 from 6-8 p.m.

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-02** The southeast corner of Southern Avenue and Higley Road (2.91± acres) Site Plan Modification. This case involves the development of a Quick Trip convenience store and fueling station. James B. O'Kane, owner; Michael Scarbrough, applicant. **CONTINUED FROM THE JANUARY 16, 2003 MEETING.**

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

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Bailey

That: The Board accept the applicant's request to withdraw zoning case Z03-02.

Vote: Passed 6-0

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-06** 804 North Country Club Drive (1.26± acres) Rezone from R-4 to C-2. This case involves the development of retail shops and car wash. Edward Pole, owner; Raad Salih, applicant.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Bailey

That: The Board recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z03-06 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 yield or 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 Design Review Board.
6. All buildings to be architecturally compatible.
7. Non-conforming and/or prohibited signs shall be brought into conformance prior to the issuance of a building permit.
8. Review and approval of a Special Use Permit by the Board of Adjustment for a car wash and comprehensive sign plan.
9. Review and approval of a Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit by the Zoning Administrator or Board of Adjustment.
10. Retention basins to be 6:1 slopes maximum when adjacent to public rights-of-way or pedestrian walkways.

Vote: Passed 6-0

Reason for Recommendation: The Board felt this proposal was well designed and would be compatible with surrounding development.

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-07** The 8800 and 8900 blocks of East Guadalupe Road, south side (16.68 ± acres) Rezone from R-3 to R-4. This case involves the development of an apartment complex. Ruiz Engineering Corporation, owner; Sean Lake, Pew and Lake, PLC, applicant.

Comments: Tom Pielach (Eastridge Homeowner's Association) stated that the Eastridge community is immediately west of the planned development. He voiced concerns of the Association members regarding 3-story buildings and also traffic. They are all single-family homes. Many of the residents bought their property knowing it was zoned R-3 and they want the zoning to remain.

Sean Lake, the applicant, explained that the Eastridge development would be across the future 202 freeway from the apartment development. He added that this was originally part of a development master plan and had been approved for 308 units. They are now proposing 300 units.

Frank Mizner, Planning Director, stated that it was important to point out that these are not immediately adjacent properties. It will be similar to being across US 60 or the 202 Freeway for comparable distances. This is somewhat of a technicality. This project is part of a masterplan that was approved about two years ago with an entitlement for 308 units. They lost some land to ADOT to plan for the future freeway so their land area was reduced. It needs to be rezoned from R-3 to R-4. The applicant has been very cooperative in working with staff. Staff feels it will be a quality project and an asset to the neighborhood. It is also consistent with the 2025 General Plan. Staff is recommending approval.

Vice-Chair Brock stated his support for the project, adding that it is not very often they propose approving an R-4 density but in this case it is appropriate.

Boardmember Carpenter asked for clarification of what the objections are. Mr. Pielach stated that when they purchased their properties it was zoned R-3 and now it is going to be R-4 with 3-story buildings instead of 2-story.

Vice-Chair Brock stated that the reason it had gone to 3-story buildings has nothing to do with the density. It could have been designed with 2-story buildings. However the Design Guidelines have mandated that there be a greater separation between buildings. In doing that you are forced to go higher.

Boardmember Carpenter asked if this is the first plan to be seen with 3-story buildings. Mr. Mizner responded that staff did not have a detailed site plan at that time. It was zoned R-3 and based on the acreage it equated to 308 units. It was simply hard zoned as part of the master plan. He added that the guidelines do have an impact. If you take the same number of units on the same piece of property but are required to have more separation between buildings, the result is taller buildings. There are many apartment complexes in Mesa that are a combination of 2-story and 3-story units.

Boardmember Adams asked if it would have been possible, under the existing R-3 zoning, for 3-story buildings to be constructed. Mr. Mizner stated that R-3 and R-4 zoning BOTH ALLOW 3-story buildings. Mr. Adams asked -- then, if the applicant was proposing ½ the number of units but larger individual units it would remain at R-3? He added that the 3-story issue is relatively moot. Mr. Mizner stated that it is also important to point out that there will be a major freeway between the two neighborhoods so it will not be visually intrusive or a privacy issue.

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Mr. Adams stated that he was struggling to find a reason not to appear unsympathetic to the concerns of Eastridge homeowners, but the rule book is the rule book and he did not see that what is being proposed in 3-stories vs. 2-stories would have been prohibited under the existing zoning had the number of units been lower.

Boardmember Bailey stated that there will be a freeway separating Eastridge from the development. She added that it is a good development and much needed. Properties for apartments are limited and there is a great need for them.

It was moved by Boardmember Bailey, seconded by Boardmember Brock

That: The Board recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z03-07 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 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 Design Review Board, including landscaping, pedestrian connections and elevations.
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 (prior to the issuance of a building permit).
6. Written notice be provided to future residents, and acknowledgment received that the project is within three miles of Williams Gateway Airport.
7. Noise attenuation measures be incorporated into the design and construction of the homes to achieve a noise level reduction of 25 db.

Vote: Passed 6-0

Reason for Recommendation: The Board felt this project conforms to the Mesa General Plan, complies with the new Design Guidelines and helps to fill the need for high-density residential.

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-08** The southeast corner of Southern Avenue and Ellsworth Road (1.89± acres). Site Plan Modification. This case involves the development of an Eckerd's Pharmacy. Unicorn International, owner; Don Andrews, applicant.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Bailey

That: The Board recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z03-08 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 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).
8. Written notice be provided to current and future occupants and acknowledgment received that the project due to their proximity to Williams Gateway Airport, will experience aircraft overflights that generate noise levels which will be of concern to some individuals.
9. Noise attenuation measures be incorporated into the design and construction of the development to achieve a noise level reduction of 20 db.
10. Retention basins to be 6:1 slopes maximum when adjacent to public rights-of-way or pedestrian walkways.

Vote: Passed 6-0

Reason for Recommendation: The Board felt this proposal was consistent with the Mesa General Plan.

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-09** The northeast corner of Thomas Road and Rafriver Street (1.2± acres). Site Plan Modification. This case involves the development of a bakery and restaurant. Dan Janssen, owner; Basilio Coragides, applicant.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Bailey

That: The Board recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z03-09 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 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 Design Review Board, including landscaping, pedestrian connections and elevations.
5. Owner granting an Avigation Easement and Release to the City, pertaining to Falcon Field Airport, which will be prepared and recorded by the City (prior to the issuance of a building permit).
6. Noise attenuation measures be incorporated into the design and construction of the buildings to achieve a noise level reduction of 25 db.

Vote: Passed 6-0

Reason for Recommendation: The Board felt this proposal would be compatible with the neighborhood and surrounding uses.

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-10** 1945 and 1955 South Val Vista Road (2.6± acres). Site Plan Modification. This case involves the development of office buildings. Val Vista Gateway, LLC, owner; Brian Moore, BCMA Architecture, applicant.

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

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Bailey

That: The Board continued zoning case Z03-10 to the March 27, 2003 Planning and Zoning meeting.

Vote: Passed 6-0

Reason for Recommendation: The Board felt this continuance was warranted to allow a newly appointed applicant time to become familiar with this case.

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z03-11** The southwest corner of Southern Avenue and South Longmore (11.5± acres). Rezone from C-2 to C-2 BIZ. This case involves the development of a Target. Target Corporation, owner; Charles Nixon, Val-Tec Incorporated, applicant.

Comments: This case was on the consent agenda, therefore, it was not discussed individually. However, Vice-Chair Brock stated that there would ultimately be another pad installed at this location. It is not known at this time how this would be integrated into the site plan, but it is expected that this change will come back to the Planning & Zoning Board for approval.

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Bailey

That: The Board recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z03-11 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the revised plan submitted on February 20th, 2003 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. Compliance with all requirements of the Design Review Board.
5. Provide a copy of the recorded document specifying the no-build easement included with the building permit plan submittal package.
6. Retention basins to be 6:1 slopes maximum when adjacent to public rights-of-way or pedestrian walkways.
7. Dedicate the right-of-way required under the Mesa City Code at the time of application for a building permit, at the time of recordation of the subdivision plat, or at the time of the City's request for dedication whichever comes first.
8. Full compliance with all current Code requirements, unless modified through appropriate review and approval of the modifications outlined in the staff report.
9. Review and approval of a Special Use Permit by the Board of Adjustment for a comprehensive sign plan.
10. Pedestrian walkways shown on site plan, extending from Target to Southern Avenue and South Longmore, shall be revised to be a meandering walkway with landscaping on both sides. Landscaping shall consist of trees that alternate from side to side to provide adequate pathway shading and shrubs. Final design of pedestrian connections and landscape details to be completed with Design Review staff prior to the Design Review Board hearing.

Vote: Passed 6-0

Reason for Recommendation: The Board felt this proposal was well designed and provided an excellent re-use for the site.

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: 3300 - 3400 S. Sossaman (eastside). This project involves the development of a single residence subdivision. Peter Martens, owner; Ralph Pew (Pew and Lake, PLC), applicant. Consider the preliminary plat of "Paloma Estates" (26.42± acres).

Comments: Ralph Pew, the applicant, gave an overview of the project. Mr. Pew reminded Board members that the issue was not whether or not there should be houses there or whether or not it should be zoned single family. That question was answered in 1990 when Council zoned the property R1-43. He added that the General Plan has no impact on existing zoning cases and stated that the plat should be approved because it is existing zoning, all the lots conform to the width and depth requirements, all the streets meet code requirements, they agreed to conditions 1-11 in the staff report, and they would agree to add a condition that a note be placed on the plat indicating the distance from the property to Williams Gateway Airport.

Frank Mizner, Planning Director, stated that there are other residential uses in the area. This is the first significant case, since the adoption of the General Plan, where there has been a conflict in land uses. The property was annexed about 10 years ago and at the time it was granted comparable zoning to what they had in Maricopa County. In this case it was R1-43. It went through the zoning process and ultimately was approved by City Council. Staff did not initiate a rezoning of the property. It was assumed that no one would want to build a home in this area since it was planned for employment land uses. When Mr. Pew contacted staff the first suggestion was that he be required to do a General Plan Amendment. He has submitted a letter which was forwarded to the City Attorney's office. They responded with the legal opinion that we cannot require a General Plan Amendment; existing zoning basically trumps the General Plan. If you have existing zoning then you have a right to rely on that zoning, short of a City-initiated rezoning, and to proceed with development of your property. Staff is reluctantly recommending approval of this case. It meets the technical requirements of a subdivision plat, street right-of-way is adequate, utility easements are shown, the lots are big enough and dimensions are appropriate. The net result would be 21 homes in an area designated for non-residential development. The reason it was designated as non-residential is partly because of existing development in the area (dairies, feed lots, those kind of uses) but more importantly because of overflights from Williams Gateway Airport and the City's desire to provide a job center for Mesa and the whole southeast valley. The power lines have traditionally been used as the dividing line between residential and non-residential uses.

Boardmember Adams asked if Prairie Avenue would continue to the east. Mr. Mizner responded that it would go east approximately ¼ mile to hook up with a ½ mile street that runs north and south between Sossaman and Hawes. Mr. Adams stated that this project does comply with the rulebook and he could find no substantial reason to vote against the project.

Vice-Chair Brock stated that he believes in the General Plan and the process to reach a General Plan. To make an amendment to the General Plan is slow, tedious, time consuming and cumbersome. It was done that way on purpose. He added that in this case it does take precedence over the General Plan if the zoning is in place.

Chair Whalen stated that he would like to see what the Board's options are. He added that the General Plan cannot be ignored. There is a conflict between the old zoning and the new General Plan which is a statement of the developmental policy of the City. The policy is "no residential south of the power lines". There is an obvious conflict. One way to resolve it could be to approve the case and say, "we've got an exception". Another would be to continue and find out from Council what their policy is and what they want to do. If they want to enforce that policy the Board could direct Planning to initiate the rezoning. There has been no input from Economic

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Development or from Williams Gateway regarding this case.

Boardmember Esparza stated that this was not caught in the General Plan process; she does not think it's the fault of the owner or the applicant. She voiced her support of the project.

Boardmember Bailey stated that there is an option to deny the case and send it on to City Council who has the authority to ask for more information and input. She added that she believes this will set a precedent and if she were a homeowner on that property with nothing there but a brand new home she would be so destroyed when all the mixed uses were all around her. Also of concern was the flight patterns. Ms. Bailey mentioned that just because you make a mistake doesn't mean you have to continue making that mistake. She told the applicant that she truly believes putting homes in this area will be a mistake and she doesn't want to be responsible for putting her name on it. She added that she would prefer to have the City Council determine what happens with this case.

Boardmember Carpenter stated this is not a perfect world and this is certainly not a perfect situation. She asked Mr. Mizner if City Council had changed the "Mixed-Use" designation to exclude residential.

Mr. Mizner responded that there were two mixed-use categories, one in residential – which allows for a high-density component, and a mixed-use employment with no residential component. He added that was the designation applied to this area. The City Council was specific during the public hearings in applying that designation to this area because they saw the overflights from Williams Gateway Airport and didn't want residential in that area. It was a conscious decision by City Council to not encourage residential in this area.

Ms. Carpenter stated that if this goes forward and there are a lot of negative consequences, she does not think there will be a lot of sympathy from the City but she thinks the Board could go forward and say, "we feel you should proceed with great caution". She added that she would be in favor of sending it forward with concern.

Mr. Adams stated that he would not want to live in this subdivision; however, he does not think the Board should subject this particular applicant to denial.

Chair Whalen stated that the City Council, General Plan Committee, the Joint Committee all spent hours and hours establishing a policy that there was not going to be residential there. He added that he would not be the one to change that.

It was moved by Boardmember Bailey, seconded by Boardmember Whalen

That: The Board deny the preliminary plat of "Paloma Estates".

Vote: 3-3 Motion failed (Esparza, Carpenter and Adams nay)

Boardmember Brock stated it might be best to continue the case to allow for input from Williams Gateway Airport and City Council.

It was moved by Boardmember Brock, seconded by Boardmember Bailey to continue this case to the March 27, 2003 meeting.

Vote: 4-2 (Adams, Esparza voting nay)

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: The northwest corner of Baseline & Lindsay Roads. This project involves the development of a Wal-Mart Neighborhood Market (5.68± acres). Joel Bramaweth, owner; Enda Melvin, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., applicant. Consider the preliminary plat for "NWC E. Baseline Road and S. Lindsay Road".

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

It was moved by Boardmember Adams, seconded by Boardmember Bailey

That: The Board approved the preliminary plat for "NWC E. Baseline Road and S. Lindsay Road" conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the basic development as shown on the preliminary plat and grading and drainage plan submitted, (without guarantee of 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 Design Review Board, including landscaping, pedestrian connections and elevations.
6. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Technical Review Committee.

Vote: Passed 6-0

Reason for Recommendation: The Board felt this project was compatible with adjacent development.

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: Citrus Sub-Area Plan

Comments: Frank Mizner, Planning Director, provided an overview of the Plan and introduced Wahid Alam, the City's Long-Range Planner who headed the effort to develop the Plan. He explained that this is an outgrowth of the 2025 General Plan which identified seven unique areas of Mesa due to economic development potential, topographic conditions, or environmental conditions. These included the citrus area, Lehi, the Desert Uplands, Williams Gateway Area and a few other existing areas. The policy stated that the City would work to develop a unique sub-area plan for these areas which would provide direction for future development. The process began last Fall and many meetings were held with the neighbors who developed a Core Working Group with seven representatives. This Plan is resident-driven. Staff was there as a technical resource but it was basically developed by the residents.

Mr. Mizner stated that the Plan would be adopted by Resolution, not Ordinance, and that staff had recommended approval. He also mentioned that although Boardmembers had had an opportunity to read the Plan, a last-minute memo had been presented by Lew Lenz and Dina Higgins (Core Group members) outlining suggested changes to the Plan. He suggested a continuance of this case would allow Staff time to meet further with the neighbors, evaluate the changes, and perhaps revise the Plan.

Chair Whalen agreed a continuance would be in order.

Bill Burke (3450 E. Menlo) stated he supported the Plan and wished to yield his time to the writers of the memorandum.

James Jenkins (3660 E. Pomegranate) asked for Boardmembers, staff, and residents to be more proactive in preserving the citrus in Mesa as a unique factor and promote it.

Albert Thomas (3817 E. Minton Pl.) requested that notice be given to future developers regarding the flood irrigation system. Mr. Thomas stated that without access to the valves residents cannot irrigate and cannot support the citrus.

Trayce Harper (3615 E. Omega Cir.) stated that appropriate design of some offices would be all right in the area. She also stated that the Plan was well written.

Julee Brady (3044 N. 38th) requested preservation of the natural areas, especially horse trails. She emphasized wanting a safe trail system, no commercial, and that Val Vista Drive be a scenic route.

Scott Miritello (2575 N. Val Vista) stated his support. He thanked Messrs. Alam and Mizner for their work on the Plan. He noted that he did not want to continue having to come to meetings without a plan and battle each development that comes through the area.

Lew Lenz (3717 E. Pomegranate) stated that he had listened to the neighbors and with that many people a unanimous decision would never be reached. He made reference to the memo provided by himself and Ms. Higgins and went over the contents. Mr. Lenz said most of the "errors" came to light two nights ago in a meeting with other homeowners, adding that he doesn't want another "Commons" (a nearby industrial project) in this area. He asked about the area north of the Citrus Sub-Area and stated that citrus would still be favored in that area.

Chair Whalen stated that there were eleven additional residents who had submitted slips in favor of the Plan who did not wish to speak.

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Boardmember Bailey asked Mr. Lenz if there were CC&R's for this area. Mr. Lenz responded that there were 33 subdivisions within this area, some with and some without. He added that the Citrus Area Homeowners Association is an umbrella organization that covered the entire area. When asked if there were any dues to this umbrella organization, Mr. Lenz responded that some have dues and some don't. Ms. Bailey mentioned that in Chapter 4 of the Plan it states that there must be trees within these developments. She asked the hypothetical question that if she moved in to the neighborhood and removed the trees, would she be responsible for putting new ones in? Mr. Lenz responded that would be reflected in the CC&R's for her particular subdivision. Ms. Bailey noted that dues normally would go to attorneys if there was a problem within the subdivision. Mr. Lenz noted that he and other homeowners have been to this Board numerous times battling bad development plans and that this Plan would help to eliminate that problem. He said he wanted these rules to go to the developers before development occurs so they know the design concepts.

Ms. Bailey asked what percentage of the residents had seen the Plan. Mr. Lenz responded that he had contacted the City regarding a mail-out for the Plan. He said the City did not have the financial resources to mail these out to each homeowner but about 80-90% had seen some part of it. Ms. Higgins clarified some confusion regarding implementation, stating that these design standards would only go to new developments and their CC&R's, and not to existing developments.

Boardmember Adams asked if the intent was to preserve what was not yet built. Mr. Lenz responded yes.

Chair Whalen stated that the language would need to be clarified, adding that this resolution would not be for everyone.

Boardmember Adams asked Mr. Mizner if this was for new development. Mr. Mizner responded yes.

Boardmember Esparza stated that she really likes this special area of Mesa and thanked Mr. Mizner, Mr. Alam, city staff, and the residents of the area for their work on the Plan. She added that she would be comfortable with the changes submitted and would like to see a revision submitted at the March meeting.

Boardmember Carpenter stated she wanted time to study the Plan and work on the language of the document. She added that she felt some of the language had a tone of enforcement which the City cannot do.

Mr. Mizner stated that some of the residents wanted this plan to be approved by the Board at this meeting. The initial concern was that a development would come through before the Plan was approved and it would not follow the design standards. He added that there was only one project, still in the preliminary design stages at Val Vista Drive and Brown Road, and Mr. Lenz was aware of that proposal. Mr. Mizner then recognized the efforts of the area residents on this Plan.

Vice-Chair Brock stated that the area has changed; Val Vista Drive was once a two-lane street through citrus groves. He noted the incredible expense to a residential developer for infrastructure costs at the intersections. He asked if the City had a masterplan for horse trails. Mr. Mizner responded that the Park Division would be meeting with neighbors in response to this. Mr. Brock stated that he does not agree with everything in the Plan, however he would also like a continuance to correct a few errors.

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

It was moved by Boardmember Esparza, seconded by Boardmember Bailey

That: The Board continue this item to the March 27, 2003 meeting.

Vote: Passed 6-0

Reason for Recommendation: The Board felt a continuance was warranted to allow staff and Boardmembers the opportunity to consider changes proposed in a memo submitted at the meeting.

* * * * *

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2003 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

Frank Mizner, Secretary
Planning Director

LU/MS:ckg
I:\P&Z 03\Minutes\02-03.doc