

COUNCIL MINUTES

July 27, 2026

The City Council of the City of Mesa met in the Council Chambers at City Hall, 20 East Main Street, on July 27, 2026, at 6:07 p.m.

COUNCIL PRESENT

Mark Freeman
Scott Somers
Rich Adams
Jennifer Duff
Alicia Goforth
Francisco Heredia
Dorean Taylor

COUNCIL ABSENT

None

OFFICERS PRESENT

Scott Butler
Holly Moseley
Jim Smith

Mayor's Welcome.

Mayor Freeman conducted a roll call.

Invocation by Pastor Michael Heiden of La Mesa Ministries.

Pledge of Allegiance was led by James McBride of Boy Scout Troop #54.

1. Take action on all consent agenda items.

All items listed on the agenda with an asterisk (*) are on the consent agenda which means they will be considered by the City Council as a group, without any separate discussion of these items, unless a Councilmember or citizen requests the item be removed from the consent agenda to be considered separately. If a citizen wants an item removed from the consent agenda, a request must be made prior to the scheduled start time of the meeting.

It was moved by Councilmember Heredia, seconded by Councilmember Duff, that the consent agenda items be approved.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Freeman–Somers–Adams–Duff–Goforth–Heredia–Taylor
NAYS – None

Carried unanimously.

*2. Approval of minutes of previous meetings as written.

Minutes from the Study Session meeting held on April 30, 2026, and the Regular Council meeting held on July 20, 2026.

3. Take action on the following liquor license applications:

*3-a. Aldi #173

A grocery store is requesting a new Series 10 Beer and Wine Store License for Aldi (Arizona) LLC, 6853 East Elliot Road - Michelle Wu, agent. There is no existing license at this location. **(District 6)**

4. Take action on the following contracts:

*4-a. Three-Year Term Contract with Two-Year Renewal Options for Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) and Aftermarket Refuse Truck Parts for the Fleet Services Department. **(Citywide)**

This contract will provide for the purchase of OEM and Aftermarket refuse and refuse-related truck parts for the maintenance and repair of the City's waste collection fleet. Fleet Services currently maintains 96 refuse collection vehicles that are critical to providing solid waste services to Mesa residents. Parts purchased under this contract will support ongoing preventative maintenance and repair operations.

The Fleet Services Department and Procurement Services recommend awarding the contract to the lowest, responsive, and responsible bidders, BTE Body Company, Inc.; Haaker Equipment Company; Short Equipment, Inc.; Spartan Truck Manufacturing, Inc.; Wastebuilt Environmental Solutions, LLC, dba Wastequip, LLC; and Western Refuse and Recycling Equipment, Inc., in a combined total amount not to exceed \$1,300,000 annually, with an annual increase allowance of up to 5% or the adjusted Producer Price Index.

*4-b. One-Year Use of a Cooperative Term Contract with Three, One-Year Renewal Options for Instrument Service and Preventative Maintenance for the Public Safety Support Department. **(Citywide)**

This contract provides consolidated maintenance management for laboratory and scientific equipment used by Forensic Services. Specialty Underwriters, LLC, serves as a third-party service contract manager, combining maintenance needs from multiple manufacturers into a single, streamlined program. They negotiate service agreements, coordinate repairs, and track maintenance spending to help reduce overall costs while ensuring equipment reliability and uptime.

The Public Safety Support Department and Procurement Services recommend authorizing the purchase using the State of Arizona cooperative contract with Specialty Underwriters, LLC, in an amount not to exceed \$255,000 annually, with an annual increase allowance of up to 5% or the adjusted Consumer Price Index.

5. Take action on the following resolutions:

- *5-a. Approving and authorizing the City Manager to enter into a development agreement, government property improvement lease, and other deal documents to facilitate the development of an AC Hotel by Marriott on the property located at the northeast corner of Main Street and Centennial Way. **(District 4)** – Resolution No. 12557
- *5-b. A resolution approving and authorizing the City Manager to enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement with the City of Phoenix for Next Generation 9-1-1 Policy Routing Function (PRF) Backup Services for Police, Fire and Emergency Medical Communications. **(Citywide)** – Resolution No. 12558
- *5-c. See: **Items not on the Consent Agenda**

6. Discuss, receive public comment, and take action on the following ordinances:

- *6-a. Amending Table 1 entitled Mesa Development Impact Fees in Mesa City Code, Title 5, Chapter 17 to remove the Public Safety Impact Fee Category column to confirm the discontinuation of this fee. **(Citywide)** – Ordinance No. 6020
- *6-b. Amending Sections 10-4-5 and 10-4-6 of the Mesa City Code to modify the existing speed limit from 40 mph to 35 mph on Mesa Drive from Bates Street to Lehi Road and modify the speed limit from 35 mph to 30 mph on Mesa Drive between Bates Street to the north City limits, as recommended by the Transportation Advisory Board. **(District 1)** – Ordinance No. 6021
- *6-c. Amending Sections 10-4-5 and 10-4-6 of the Mesa City Code to modify the existing speed limit from 40 mph to 35 mph on Horne from Brown Road to McKellips Road and modify the speed limit from 35 mph to 30 mph on Horne between McKellips Road to the north City limits, as recommended by the Transportation Advisory Board. **(District 1)** – Ordinance No. 6022
- *6-d. Proposed amendments to Mesa City Code, Title 11, Chapters 5, 6, 7, 8, 30, 31, 34, 43, 67, 81, 86, and 87. The amendments include, but are not limited to: modifying entryway monumentation requirements; refining building material and color standards; updating Employment District use tables and development standards; clarifying lot and land division requirements; modifying standards for Detached Accessory Buildings or Structures and Accessory Dwelling Units; updating Live/Work Unit and residential use standards in Commercial Districts; refining screening requirements for certain specific uses and activities; modifying landscaping and alternative landscape plan provisions; modifying landscape diversity requirements; updating Manufactured Home and Recreational Vehicle Accessory Structure standards; clarifying sign regulations; updating procedural requirements related to written protests, application review, and expirations; modifying definitions of "Home Occupations," "Live/Work Units," and "Indoor Warehousing And Storage"; and adding a definition for "Hazardous Material Warehousing and Storage." **(Citywide)** – Ordinance No. 6025

Staff Recommendation: Adoption

P&Z Recommendation: Adoption with Conditions (Vote: 5-0)

- *6-e. See: **Items not on the Consent Agenda**

7. Discuss, receive public comment, and take action on the following resolution and zoning ordinance related to the development known as "San Antonio Tire Shop":

*7-a. See: **Items not on the Consent Agenda**

*7-b. See: **Items not on the Consent Agenda**

Items not on the Consent Agenda

- 5-c. A resolution extending Falcon Field Airport's landing fee implementation date. The recently adopted landing fees are currently the subject of litigation in federal court as well as a review by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). The FAA has also asked the City to delay implementation of the landing fees. The City retained Anderson & Kreiger LLP, a nationally recognized law firm specializing in airport matters, to represent the City in the lawsuit and to respond to the FAA. Anderson & Kreiger LLP is currently conducting a comprehensive review of the landing fees and has requested that the landing fee implementation date be extended beyond July 30, 2026, to allow time to complete their review. **(Citywide)** – Resolution No. 12559

City Attorney Jim Smith announced that the proposed resolution would delay implementation of the Falcon Field Airport landing fees. He clarified that the fees were proposed and adopted to help make the airport financially self-sustaining by recovering costs associated with airport use. He emphasized that the fees were not intended to reduce noise or flight traffic, discriminate against a particular user, or favor one similarly situated user over another, as such actions are prohibited under federal law. He requested that members of the public keep the purpose of the fees in mind when providing comments.

Justin Judkins, a Mesa resident, questioned the proposed 90-day delay in implementing the landing fees, citing an estimated \$500,000 in lost revenue and noting that federal compliance had already been established.

Mr. Smith pointed out that the 90-day delay would allow outside counsel to independently review the landing fees in response to pending litigation and an FAA investigation.

Councilmember Goforth acknowledged the purpose of the independent review but expressed opposition to any further delay.

It was moved by Councilmember Adams, seconded by Councilmember Heredia, that Resolution No. 12559 be adopted.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Freeman–Somers–Adams–Duff–Heredia–Taylor

NAYS – Goforth

Mayor Freeman declared the motion carried by majority vote.

- 6-e. ZON26-00333 "Faith Christian School," 9.9 acres located at 3761 South Power Road. Council Use Permit for a Private School, and Modification of Conditions of Approval (1-5, 8, 12 & 13) of Ordinance No. 4646, from Case No. Z06-088. Leman Academy of Excellence, Inc., owner; Ganeen Harstick, Faith Christian School, applicant. **(District 6)** – Ordinance No. 6024

Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions

P&Z Board Recommendation: Approval with conditions (Vote: 7-0)

Jason Smithson, a Mesa resident, expressed support for the proposed Council Use Permit. He highlighted the school's educational programs, accessibility, service to students with diverse needs, and the anticipated positive impact on the community.

Councilmember Taylor spoke in support of the Faith Christian School and its relocation to a larger facility due to continued growth.

It was moved by Vice Mayor Somers, seconded by Councilmember Adams, that Ordinance No. 6024 be adopted.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Freeman–Somers–Adams–Duff–Goforth–Heredia–Taylor

NAYS – None

Carried unanimously.

- 7-a. GPA26-00111 "San Antonio Tire Shop," 0.4± acres located at 1609 West University Drive. Minor General Plan Amendment to change the Placetype from Urban Residential to Urban Center. Tres Hermanos, LLC, owner; All Right Builders, Inc., applicant. **(District 3)** – Resolution No. 12560

Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions

P&Z Board Recommendation: Approval with conditions (Vote: 7-0)

- 7-b. ZON25-00110 "San Antonio Tire Shop," 0.4± acres located at 1609 West University Drive. Rezone from Office Commercial (OC) to Limited Commercial with a Bonus Intensity Zone Overlay (LC-BIZ) and Site Plan Review. This request will allow for an approximately 4,015± square foot Minor Automobile Repair facility. Tres Hermanos, LLC, owner; All Right Builders, Inc., applicant. **(District 3)** – Ordinance No. 6023

Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions

P&Z Board Recommendation: Approval with conditions (Vote: 7-0)

Assistant Planning Director Evan Balmer displayed a PowerPoint presentation. **(See Attachment 1)**

Mr. Balmer provided an overview of the proposed requests for a minor General Plan amendment, rezoning, Bonus Intensity Zone (BIZ) overlay, and site plan review for a 0.4-acre property at 1609 West University Drive. He stated that the requests would change the General Plan designation from Urban Residential to Urban Center and rezone the property from Office Commercial to Limited Commercial (LC) to allow the continued operation of a tire shop. He presented images of the proposed site. (See Pages 2 through 6 of Attachment 1)

Mr. Balmer reviewed the proposed site plan and pointed out that based on the anticipated customer volume and operating hours, the applicant had determined that four parking spaces

would be sufficient. He stated that the Planning and Zoning Board unanimously recommended approval, with a condition requiring the applicant to address any on-street parking violations within 30 days, potentially through an administrative use permit or an off-site parking agreement. He discussed the proposed landscaping along University Drive, Longmore, and the south side of the property. (See Pages 7 and 8 of Attachment 1)

Mr. Balmer presented renderings of the proposed project and explained that the existing building, constructed around the late 1950s, would be improved in a manner consistent with its mid-century modern character rather than being redesigned as a contemporary building. He highlighted the proposed color palette and the breeze block wall along University Drive and Longmore, noting that the wall would serve as a required parking screen while also enhancing the site's period-appropriate architectural character. He mentioned a proposed mural facing Longmore, expanded landscaping, and a shaded customer waiting area beneath the canopy with seating for patrons. (See Pages 9 and 10 of Attachment 1)

Mr. Balmer explained that the requested BIZ deviations are due to existing nonconforming conditions associated with the building's age and the site's limited size. He confirmed that similar deviations would be necessary for redevelopment of the property regardless of the proposed commercial use. (See Pages 11 through 16 of Attachment 1)

Mr. Balmer verified that the applicant notified property owners within 1,000 feet and held two neighborhood meetings. He reported that residents raised concerns regarding parking, lighting, noise, public safety, code violations, visual blight, the need for the proposed use, and consistency with applicable area plans. He noted that the Planning and Zoning (P&Z) Board also reviewed the proposed project and recommended approval by a 7-0 vote. (See Pages 17 and 18 of Attachment 1)

Mr. Balmer announced that in response to the request from Council, the applicant withdrew the proposed overnight roadside-assistance service and limited business operations to 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., consistent with a nearby tire shop. He confirmed that compliance with the revised Good Neighbor Policy was included as a condition of approval. He reviewed police and code-compliance activity associated with the subject property and a nearby tire shop and reported that each business had one related police call for service, with no police reports filed. He stated that the subject property had an open code case involving the unpermitted use, which prompted the applicant to pursue the necessary P&Z approvals. He clarified that LC zoning prohibits outdoor storage, restricts light spill onto adjacent properties, and requires noise-generating minor automobile repair activities to occur within an enclosed building. He stated these requirements were also included as conditions of approval. (See Page 19 of Attachment 1)

Mr. Balmer recalled that the request complied with the Mesa 2050 General Plan's Urban Center designation and applicable site plan review and BIZ criteria. He reiterated that staff recommended approval with conditions, and the P&Z Board recommended approval with conditions including the added condition addressing off-site parking. (See Pages 20 and 21 of Attachment 1)

In response to a question from Councilmember Goforth, Mr. Balmer explained that the request would change the General Plan designation from Urban Residential to Urban Center. He noted that the Urban Center designation is generally applied to denser areas with a mix of uses near arterial intersections and transit. He pointed out that the property is located on University Drive near transit in one of the City of Mesa's (COM) denser areas and that applying the designation to this small parcel would not materially alter surrounding development patterns.

Assistant Planning Director Rachel Phillips added that the development of General Plan placetypes involved several factors, including existing character areas, current zoning, and the COM's long-term vision for the area. She stated that placetypes are assigned based on the broader surrounding context rather than on a parcel-by-parcel basis to avoid effectively pre-zoning individual properties. She confirmed that the Urban Residential placetype may include supporting commercial uses, particularly along arterial roadways.

Responding to a question from Councilmember Taylor, Mr. Balmer explained that the Urban Residential placetype reflects the broader area rather than the individual parcel. He stated that the four proposed parking spaces would meet operational needs while allowing space for landscaping and site improvements. He added that, although the LC district permits a maximum building height of 30 feet, the parcel's limited size and associated parking and landscaping requirements would significantly restrict future vertical development.

In response to a question from Councilmember Heredia, Mr. Balmer advised that when a business is operating with a nonconforming use, Code Compliance refers the property owner to Planning staff, who work with the owner to bring the site into compliance. He stated that the rezoning and BIZ process was appropriate for this property because it could address existing nonconformities while allowing site improvements and reinvestment. He added that the applicant has been working diligently with staff since 2024 to rectify the code violation through the COM's review and submittal process.

Responding to Councilmember Adams, Mr. Balmer confirmed that the business had operated at the location for approximately 18 months without incidents or complaints beyond those previously discussed. He added that, upon notification of the code violation, the applicant promptly began working with staff to bring the property into compliance.

Alex Hayes, attorney with Withey Morris, PLC, representing the applicant, displayed a PowerPoint presentation. **(See Attachment 2)**

Mr. Hayes stated that, following Council discussion and public comment at the introduction of the ordinance, the applicant revised its operating plan to address concerns regarding hours of operation. He verified that the updated Good Neighbor Policy limits on-site service to the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., prohibits work after 8:00 p.m., and is enforceable through a condition of approval.

Mr. Hayes explained that the property has historically functioned as a commercial site and that the other three corners of the intersection were originally zoned Office Commercial and were later rezoned to LC. He noted that the subject property had previously accommodated uses more commonly associated with LC zoning and reiterated that the business had operated for approximately two years without incident or complaint. (See Pages 2 through 5 of Attachment 2)

Mr. Hayes stated that the entitlement process would bring the property closer to compliance and result in substantial investment and improvements, including enhanced landscaping, removal of two curb cuts to improve traffic safety, site upgrades, and a public art mural along Longmore. He discussed the citizen participation efforts made by the applicant. (See Pages 6 through 12 of Attachment 2)

Mr. Hayes reiterated that the Good Neighbor Policy addresses the concerns that were raised by requiring compliance with lighting and noise standards, requiring all work to occur indoors, limiting operating hours, and providing residents with contact information for questions or complaints. He pointed out that the applicant is committed to using electric equipment rather than air-compressor-powered tools to reduce noise. He highlighted a letter of support for the

proposed project received from the immediately adjacent property owner. (See Pages 13 and 14 of Attachment 2)

Mr. Hayes stated that approval would allow the local business to continue operating, encourage additional investment in the property, and improve the site's appearance. He noted that the request was supported by the adjacent property owner and City staff and received a unanimous recommendation from the P&Z Board. (See Page 15 of Attachment 2)

In response to a question from Councilmember Taylor, Mr. Hayes confirmed that the previously discussed mobile service work would be performed at another site location on Broadway Road that is owned by the applicant.

Discussion ensued regarding the previous uses of the proposed project site.

In response to a comment from Vice Mayor Somers, Mr. Smith suggested a revision to the Good Neighbor Policy to clarify that San Antonio Tire Shop would not perform customer service work or dispatch from the site between 8:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. He verified that any motion to approve would incorporate the revised language.

The following citizens expressed opposition to Agenda Items 7-a and 7-b:

- Tess Taylor, a Mesa resident
- Brent Done, a Mesa resident
- Evelyn Rivera, a Mesa resident
- Carole West, a Mesa resident
- Reed Done, a Mesa resident
- James Adamec, a Mesa resident
- Charmaine McCleeve, a Mesa resident
- Sandi Pierce, a Mesa resident
- Sandi Done, a Mesa resident
- Matt Taylor, a Mesa resident
- Mark Done, a Mesa resident
- Nolan West, a Mesa resident
- Nathan Taylor, a Mesa resident
- Roxy Jetson, a Mesa resident

The above speakers offered a series of concerns with the proposed project including, but not limited to the following:

- General Plan amendment and rezoning could change the residential character of the neighborhood and limit control over future uses of the property.
- Insufficient evidence to justify the requested changes.
- Size limitations of the parcel and insufficient parking spaces.
- Potential noise, tire storage, and increased traffic that could negatively affect the surrounding neighborhood.
- Safety, security, and property impacts.
- Residents opposed 24-hour operations and supported limiting business activity between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m.

In response to questions from Councilmembers, Mr. Balmer explained that the proposed rezoning to LC-BIZ would remain subject to the approved site plan, elevations, landscaping, breeze block wall, Good Neighbor Policy, and other conditions of approval. He stated that Code

Compliance would enforce both the zoning ordinance and the property-specific conditions. He added that a future use substantially different from the approved proposal could require additional Council review if it triggered applicable zoning or site plan criteria; however, another tire shop or similar use operating within the approved site plan and conditions might not require the same level of review. He noted that, although the LC district permits a range of commercial uses, the conditions of approval would serve as guardrails for future development of the property.

Mr. Smith stated that zoning could not automatically revert if the tire shop ceased operations. He advised that Council could continue the case and consider a development agreement if the desire was to limit the property to the tire shop use, although he acknowledged that future proposals would require additional review if they could not operate within the existing building and approved site plan.

Additional discussion ensued regarding the potential future use of the subject property.

Responding to Councilmember Taylor, Mr. Balmer explained that the BIZ overlay was requested to address existing nonconforming site conditions associated with the approximately 60-year-old building, including current setback and landscaping standards. He stated that the overlay would allow deviations while supporting adaptive reuse and higher-quality infill development.

Councilmember Taylor expressed concern regarding the uncertainty of future uses but also acknowledged the applicant's investment in the property, the revised operating hours, lighting and noise restrictions, and enhanced landscaping. She also acknowledged the potential for vacant property contributing to blight and public safety concerns if the business decides to cease operations.

Mr. Hayes emphasized that the property was already commercially zoned at an arterial intersection and stated that the General Plan encourages adaptive reuse and reinvestment in underdeveloped areas. He stated that the amount of parking spaces was expected to be operationally sufficient because most customer visits last approximately 20 minutes. He explained that an added condition of approval would require the applicant to obtain an alternative parking compliance plan if parking, queuing, or traffic impacts occurred on University Drive, Longmore, or nearby residential streets.

Mayor Freeman discussed the property's historic commercial uses and stated that, although the proposed improvements would enhance the building and landscaping, he was concerned with the number of stipulations required, potential overflow parking, noise, outdoor storage, and neighborhood concerns. He indicated that he did not support the General Plan amendment and related request.

Councilmember Goforth stated that the General Plan had recently designated the property as Urban Residential and that no significant change in the surrounding area had been demonstrated to justify an amendment. She pointed out that the proposed improvements did not meet the threshold of unique, innovative, or superior quality necessary to justify the BIZ overlay.

Councilmember Heredia stated that the applicant had responded to concerns by improving the landscaping, architecture, and overall appearance of the site. He expressed concern that denial could result in vacant property that would be difficult to redevelop and could negatively affect the surrounding neighborhood. He supported the Good Neighbor Policy as an enforcement tool and stated that the applicant had made the necessary adjustments to improve the site. He expressed support for the proposed project.

Councilmember Adams agreed that denial could result in a vacant building and unattractive nuisance on a difficult-to-develop corner. He acknowledged that the business had not initially followed the proper approval process but stated that the applicant appeared to have acted in good faith and was willing to make a substantial investment in the property. He added that no acceptable alternative use had been identified and expressed support for the requests.

It was moved by Councilmember Heredia, seconded by Vice Mayor Somers, that Resolution No. 12560 and Ordinance No. 6023 be adopted.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Somers–Adams–Duff–Heredia

NAYS – Freeman–Goforth–Taylor

Mayor Freeman declared the motion carried by majority vote.

8. Discuss, receive public comment, and take action on one of the following ordinances pertaining to Zoning Ordinance amendments for Fleet-Based Services and Service Stations:

- 8-a. Proposed amendments to Chapters 6, 7, 8, 31, and 86 pertaining to Fleet-Based Services and Service Stations. The amendments include, but are not limited to: adding definitions for Fleet-Based Services, Heavy Fleet-Based Services, and Accessory Electric Vehicle Charging; modifying definitions for Light Fleet-Based Services and Service Stations; adding Heavy Fleet-Based Services, Accessory Electric Vehicle Charging, and related footnotes to land use tables; modifying Section 11-31-25 titled, "Service Stations"; and adding Section 11-31-40 titled, "Fleet-Based Services." **(Citywide)** – Ordinance No. 6026

This ordinance is a modified version of the ordinance discussed at the July 16, 2026, study session modifying the required separation of Fleet-Based Services and Service Stations from residential uses and zoning districts from 100 to 150 feet and modifying the land use process for Light Fleet-Based Services in the LC District from permitted to requiring a Council Use Permit.

- 8-b. Proposed amendments to Chapters 6, 7, 8, 31, and 86 pertaining to Fleet-Based Services and Service Stations. The amendments include, but are not limited to: adding definitions for Fleet-Based Services, Heavy Fleet-Based Services, and Accessory Electric Vehicle Charging; modifying definitions for Light Fleet-Based Services and Service Stations; adding Heavy Fleet-Based Services, Accessory Electric Vehicle Charging, and related footnotes to land use tables; modifying Section 11-31-25 titled, "Service Stations"; and adding Section 11-31-40 titled, "Fleet-Based Services." **(Citywide)** – Ordinance No. 6027 - RESCINDED

This ordinance is a modified version of the ordinance discussed at July 16, 2026 study session modifying the required separation of Fleet-Based Services and Service Stations from residential uses and zoning districts from 100 to 150 feet, modifying the land use process for Light Fleet-Based Services in the LC District from permitted to requiring a Council Use Permit, and modifying the maximum height of fleet vehicle parking, charging, and storage from 30 feet to located at grade, except for in the GI and HI Districts where the maximum height would be 30 feet.

It was moved by Councilmember Duff, seconded by Councilmember Goforth, that Ordinance No. 6026 be adopted.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Freeman–Duff–Goforth–Heredia

NAYS – Somers–Adams–Taylor

Mayor Freeman declared the motion carried by majority vote.

9. Items from citizens present.

David Winstanley, a Mesa resident, recommended the 2012 film Still Mine that might help the viewers understand the relevance of tonight's recommendation.

10. Adjournment.


Without objection, the Regular Council Meeting adjourned at 8:14 p.m.

ATTEST:




HOLLY MOSELEY, CITY CLERK





Vice Mayor
for MARK FREEMAN, MAYOR

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the Regular Council Meeting of the City Council of Mesa, Arizona, held on the 27th day of July 2026. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.



HOLLY MOSELEY, CITY CLERK

City Council

ZON25-00110


Mary Kopaskie-Brown, Planning Director
Evan Balmer, Assistant Planning Director

July 20, 2026

Request


- Rezone from OC to LC-BIZ
- Site Plan Review
- Minor General Plan Amendment
(CPA26-00111)






Location

- 1609 W University Dr
- 0.4± parcel
- South of University Dr
- West of Alma School Rd



General Plan

- Current Placetype – Urban
- Residential, Evolve Growth Strategy
- Proposed Placetype – Urban
- Residential, Evolve Growth Strategy
- Convenience Services




Zoning

- Existing – OC
- Proposed – LC-BIZ
- Minor Automobile Repair is permitted in LC district

Site Photos



Looking southwest from University and Longmore



Site Plan


- Existing 4,015 SF Minor Auto Repair Facility and canopy
- 4 parking spaces
- Enter from University and exit to Longmore

Renderings




Looking southwest from University and Longmore

Renderings



Looking south



Customer Area

Bonus Intensity Zone

Development Standard		MZO Required	BIZ Proposed
<u>Minimum Building and Parking Area Setbacks – MZO Table 11-6-3.A</u>			
Front and Street-Facing Side		15'	10' (east property line to building) 14' (east property line to parking area)
Interior Side and Rear		25'	23' (west property line to building) 5' (west property line to parking area) 22' (South property line to building)



Bonus Intensity Zone

Development Standard		MZO Required	BIZ Proposed
<u>Auto Service Bays</u> – <i>MZO Section 11-30-9(C)(2)(d)</i>	When bay doors are less than 200 feet from an adjacent street and the bay doors are less than perpendicular to a street, screening shall be provided at least 6' high		3' screen wall
<u>Parking Areas</u> – <i>MZO Section 11-30-9(H)(7)</i>	A setback of at least 10 feet shall be provided between the screen wall and the right-of-way		0'
<u>Automobile/Vehicle Repair</u> – <i>MZO Section 11-31-6(A)</i>	Minimum lot size is 1 acre, unless part of a larger group commercial center		0.4± acres
<u>Size of Parking Spaces and Maneuvering Aisles</u> – <i>MZO Section 11-32-2(J)</i>	One-way drive aisles that do not provide access to parking or lading spaces shall be at least 12-feet wide		11'



Bonus Intensity Zone

Development Standard		MZO Required	BIZ Proposed
<u>Required Parking Spaces by Use – MZO Table 11-32.3.A</u>	11 spaces	4 spaces	
<u>Setback of Cross Drive Aisles – MZO Section 11-32-4(A)</u>	Parking spaces along main drive aisles connecting directly to a street and drive aisles that cross such main drive aisles shall be set back at least 50 feet from the property line abutting the street	18'	
<u>Perimeter Landscaping – MZO Table 11-6-3.A</u>	15'	12' (minimum north property line) 11' (minimum east property line)	
Front and Street-Facing Sides shall be Landscaped According to Ch. 33			

Bonus Intensity Zone


Development Standard	MZO Required	BIZ Proposed
<u>Required Number of Plants by Street Type</u> – MZO Table 11-33-3.A.4		
1 Tree and 6 Shrubs per 25 Linear Feet of Street Frontage	Two 36-inch box trees and three 24-inch box trees	Two 36-inch box trees and two 24-inch Ocotillo (east property line)
<u>Required Landscape Yards</u> – MZO Section 11-33—(B)(1)(a)(i)	20'	5' (minimum west property line) 6' (minimum south property line)
Landscaping for Non-Single Residence Uses Adjacent to Single Residence Uses less than 5 Acres		
<u>Landscape Islands</u> – MZO Section 11-33-4(B)(2)	Landscape islands shall be a minimum of 8' wide and 15' in length for single-row parking	Sizes vary; minimum 3' wide

Bonus Intensity Zone

Development Standard		MZO Required	BIZ Proposed
<u>Landscape Island Plant Material – MZO Section 11-33-4(D)</u>		1 shade tree and 3 shrubs shall be provided for every 15-foot parking island	0 Trees
<u>Foundation Base – MZO Section 11-33-5(A)</u>			
Exterior Walls with a Public Entrance	15'		5' minimum (north elevation) 4' (west elevation) 0' minimum (south elevation)
Exterior Walls without a Public Entrance, not Adjacent to Parking Stalls	5'		


Bonus Intensity Zone

Development Standard	MZO Required	BIZ Proposed
<u>Landscape Area in Foundation Base – MZO Section 11-33-5(B)(1)</u>		
1 Tree Per 50 Linear Feet or Less of Exterior Wall Length	6 trees	0 Trees
<u>Plant Material Within Foundation Base – MZO Section 11-33-5(B)(3)</u>		
Exterior Walls Visible from Public Parking or ROW with Public Entrances	33% Landscaped	0% (north elevation)



Notification

- Notified property owners within 1,000', HOAs, and registered neighborhood
- Neighborhood meeting held June 12, 2025, no attendees
- Neighborhood meeting held April 29, 2026, questions and concerns with parking, light, noise, use



Comments - Planning and Zoning Board Hearing

- Parking Concerns.
- Concerning 24-Hour Operations, Noise, Light, and Operational Disruption.
- Public Safety.
- Existing Code Violations and Visual Blight.
- Failure to Meet the Burden of Proof, Public Necessity, or Market Demand.
- Failure to Demonstrate Need for a General Plan Amendment and Consistency with Area Plans.



Findings

- Complies with the 2050 Mesa General Plan
- Complies with Chapter 69 of the MZO for Site Plan Review
- Complies with Chapter 21 of the MZO for a BIZ Overlay

Recommendation


Staff recommends Approval with Conditions

Planning and Zoning Board recommends Approval with Conditions (7-0) with an additional condition of approval related to off-site parking.



mesa.a.n




TOTAL LAND AREA:	16,911 S
ZONING:	LC (C-2)
CONSTRUCTION TYPE:	8' BLOCK
MCR:	89-05
SUBDIVISION:	CASA W
LOT:	
BUILDING SIZE:	4,015 S
BUILDING SETBACKS:	15 FRO
LANDSCAPE SETBACKS:	5 FRO
BUILDING HEIGHT:	MAXIM
LOT COVERAGE:	13,050 / 6,911 SF = 1




Elevations



Elevations



WEST ELEVATION



EAST ELEVATION

MATERIAL/ COLOR LEGEND

A  FINISH: STUCCO
PAINT COLOR: KILIM BEIGE (SW 6106)

B  FINISH: STUCCO/MASONARY PAINT
PAINT COLOR: DOVER WHITE (SW 638S)

C  FINISH: PAINT
PAINT COLOR: CLOAK GRAY SW 6278

D  FINISH: EXISTING CANOPY
PAINT COLOR: BLUE BAUBLE (SW 6942)

- # Materials & Colors
- Existing building and canopy
 - Stucco



WITHEY
MORRIS
BAUGH

San Antonio Tire Shop

ZON25-00110 / GPA26-00111

City Council

July 27, 2026
<https://www.wmbattorneys.com/>
<https://www.wmbattorneys.com/>

2



General Plan Map

Existing General Plan: Urban Residential




Proposed General Plan: Urban Center



Zoning Map

Existing Zoning: Office Commercial (OC)




Proposed Zoning: Limited Commercial (LC)




Longstanding Commercial Corner

- Annexed in 1958 with commercial zoning
- Small infill site (0.36 acres)
- Originally developed and operated as a gas station
- Eventually became carpet wholesale operation
- Applicant acquired property for tire shop based on understanding of historical commercial uses



Existing Site Conditions





Proposed Development

San Antonio Tire Shop – Supports quality local small business

- Adaptive reuse of existing site
- Substantial improvement to existing commercial corner
- Enhanced landscaping and building aesthetics improves relationship to the street
- Improved site circulation / safety
- Small infill site requires deviations from modern code




3



Parking

parking spaces provided -
efficient for operational needs

- Quick service operation – customers wait on site during vehicle service
- Business is currently operating– no off-site parking has been needed
- Additional location at 1345 W Broadway (2.8 miles)
- Alternative parking plan required if adverse impacts (**Condition 8**)








Citizen Participation

Notice letters sent to property owners with 1,000' of site / HOAs within 1 mile

1st Neighborhood meeting held June 12, 2025 – NO ATTENDEES

- 2nd Neighborhood meeting held April 29, 2026 – 12 attendees

- Comments / concerns:
 - Commercial zoning
 - Parking
 - Noise and light pollution
 - Potential for uses beyond tire repair
 - 24/7 operations
- Letter of support from adjacent property owner



Good Neighbor Policy

No 24/7 Operations – Limited to 8am-8pm

All noise generating operations (i.e. tire installations and repairs) will be conducted within the fully enclosed building

- Building construction meets or exceeds 25 dB sound attenuation requirement
- Electric tools instead of air compressor-based tools
- Shielded, downward directed light fixtures
- No outside storage of tires or equipment
- Contact info provided to community for questions or comments

San Antonio Tire Shop

SWC University Drive and Longmore
ZON25-00110

Good Neighbor Policy

Purpose:

The purpose of this Policy is to establish the Good Neighbor guidelines for the San Antonio Tire Shop proposed at the southwest corner of University Drive and Longmore.

Operations:

The San Antonio Tire Shop provides tire services for a variety of vehicles, including tire sales, installations, rotations, and repairs. It is anticipated that during business operations there will be anywhere from 2-4 employees on site at any given time. The site will be maintained per the City of Mesa code at all times. Typical business hours are 8:00 am – 8:00 pm. The San Antonio Tire Shop agrees to not perform any customer service work on site between the hours of 8:00 pm and 8:00 am. On-site management will be present during all hours of operation.

San Antonio Tire Shop also provides mobile tire repair services, which significantly reduces the need for vehicles to be transported to the site. The addition of this mobile service component minimizes tow truck traffic and limits the need for on-site vehicle staging.

Noise Control:

All noise generating operations, including tire installations and repairs, will be conducted within the fully enclosed building to mitigate potential impacts to adjacent properties. The building construction meets or exceeds the minimum 25 dB sound attenuation requirement per Section 11-30-9(F)(4) of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance. Additionally, on-site operational tools have been upgraded to electric-powered equipment, which results in significantly reduced noise impact compared to traditional air compressor-based tools. This transition further reduces operational noise at the source and enhances compatibility with nearby residential uses.

Lighting:

Exterior lighting will be designed and installed in compliance with City of Mesa standards and will incorporate shielded, downward-directed fixtures to minimize light trespass onto adjacent properties.

Litter Control Measures:

Maintaining a clean outside appearance not only provides a higher level of customer service, it also is an effective tool for employees to continuously monitor onsite activities. No used or discarded tires, automotive parts or equipment or disabled, junked, or wrecked vehicles will be stored outside of the building. New tire inventory will be stored off-site and within the enclosed building.



Supported by Adjacent Neighbor

April 28, 2026

City of Mesa Planning Division
55 N Center Street
Mesa, AZ 85201

Re: Letter of Support – ZON25-00110 (San Antonio Tire Shop)
1609 W University Dr (SWC University Dr & Longmore)

Dear Planning Staff,

I am writing as the adjacent property owner directly west of 1609 W University Drive regarding the proposed rezoning application ZON25-00110.

As the directly affected neighboring property, I want to clearly state that I have no objection to this project or the requested rezoning.

After reviewing the submitted materials, including the Good Neighbor Policy, I am confident the applicant has taken appropriate steps to ensure the business will operate in a manner compatible with surrounding properties.

The commitment that all noise-generating operations will occur within a fully enclosed building meeting or exceeding the City of Mesa's 25 dB sound attenuation requirements provides strong reassurance that impacts to my property will be minimal.

Additionally, the operational plan—including on-site management, adherence to City code, and prohibition of outdoor storage of automotive parts or vehicles—demonstrates a clear intent to maintain a clean, controlled, and professional site.

I also appreciate the inclusion of a direct complaint response process, ensuring any concerns can be addressed quickly and professionally.

Based on these considerations, and as the property owner most directly impacted by this project, I am comfortable with the proposed use and support approval of this rezoning request.

Sincerely, *PHILIP ROMERO*

Phone Number *480 495 3931*

Owner – Property West of 1609 W University Dr
1617 W University Dr
Mesa, AZ 85201



Project Benefits and Summary

- Revitalizes dilapidated commercial parcel
- Adaptive reuse of challenging infill site
- Significantly improves site aesthetics and relationship to street
- Compatible with existing uses around intersection
- Supports small business in Mesa
- Project supported by adjacent neighbor / Good Neighbor Policy
- Recommendation of approval from planning staff
- Unanimous recommendation of approval from Planning and Zoning Board





Get In Touch



Phone Number
(602) 230-0600



Email Address
info@wmbattorneys.com



Office Address
2121 E Highland Ave
Phoenix, AZ 85016

Questions?