

**Tuesday, March 8, 2022
Virtual Platform
57 East 1st Street
4:30 PM**

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held at 4:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair Sean Banda
Boardmember Scott Thomas
Boardmember J. Seth Placko
Boardmember Jeanette Knudsen
Boardmember Tanner Green

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Vice Chair Paul Johnson
Boardmember Dane Astle

STAFF PRESENT:

Lesley Davis
Cassidy Welch
Kellie Rorex
Jennifer Merrill
Josh Grandlienard
Robert Mansolillo
Chloe Durfee Daniel
Alexis Jacobs

OTHERS PRESENT:

(* indicates Boardmember or staff participated in the meeting using audio conference equipment)

Chair Banda welcomed everyone to the meeting at 4:30 PM

- 1 Call meeting to order.**
- 2 Consider the Minutes from the February 8, 2022 Design Review Board Meeting.**

A motion to approve the Minutes from February 8, 2022 Design Review Board Meeting was made by Boardmember Thomas and seconded by Boardmember Green.

Vote: 5 – 0

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Banda – Placko - Thomas – Knudsen – Green

NAYS – None

ABSENT – Johnson– Astle

ABSTAINED – None

- 3 Discuss and provide direction on the following Preliminary Design Review cases:***

This is a preliminary review of Design Review Board cases. That applicant and public may speak about the case, and the Board may provide comments and suggestions to assist the Applicant with the proposal, but the Board will not approve or deny a case under Preliminary Review.

- 3a DRB21-00065 District 2.** Within the 1500 block of North Greenfield Road (west side). Located north of Brown Road on the west side of Greenfield Road. (1.9± acres) Requesting review of a multiple residence development. Tim Boyle, Time Boyle Design, applicant; Johnstar, LLC, owner.

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch presented the case.

Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant Bruce Houghton: I'd like to thank staff for that presentation. That was quite comprehensive. The only thing I might add is that the primary exterior material is stucco, the boxed window frames which don't show too well in the elevations just yet will be metal, in a complementary or contrasting color. So, there will be more articulation in the elevation that is indicated in the preliminary drawings. Thank you.

Walter Holt, 1517 N Orlando: "I am very much opposed to the building of any multi-story development on this site. Having a 3-story apartment complex overlooking my yard is not why we chose to move here. Not to mention the noise, and crime associated with apartment residents. This will kill our property value!!"

Jodi Oakes, 1521 N Orlando: "I live directly behind the proposed project in a 2-story home. I 100% oppose of this project. The building would be 18-30 feet high. My fence line is 8 feet tall. This means the residents would be able to see directly into my yard and home! That is not okay. Part of the reason I purchased my home is for the mountain views and no neighbors directly behind me. The noise and traffic would increase as well. I hope you will respect the privacy and safety of my home and family by not allowing this project to move forward. I would not feel secure knowing that multiple residents can see in my home and yard!"

Chair Banda: Okay, thank you. And then I have one person who wishes to speak on this item. And it looks like it's Janet, if you can come forward and go ahead and state your name and address. The microphone would be wonderful.

Janet Cotie, 1455 N Orlando: "I also back to the canal, which is an absolutely lovely neighborhood. I've been in residence here in that home for 27 years. And this is not my first time before a board as far as development. This particular development would impinge quite a bit on our neighborhood and does not fit within the scope of the landscape right here in this area. If you look at where that property is here, and you look south, we have a lovely office, building, professional building one level, if you look across the street a little bit to the north, we have the same thing there, which are absolutely wonderful. And then down the street, we have the same thing. So what would be best, instead of putting in a dense, multi three level, which of course is going to be looking right over our properties is to consider putting in another one level professional office building, that would be absolutely wonderful. And I would be very happy to see that go in. I am all for Development for the City of Mesa, I have never been opposed to any good development. But this is not the first time that a multi dense structure has come before the board in almost 30 years in the property around here. So, I am opposed

to it, it would decrease my property and also be a safety issue where there would be access, to actually be looking over, if you're going south over a property. Do you have any questions for me?

Chair Banda: We do not. I actually appreciate you speaking today. So, if you want to sit there for just a moment, we can kind of open up the discussion. But the focus of the discussion, you brought up a couple different things. And in fact, the comments read in today, I'm going to say this for everybody in the audience. Our focus is going to be about the design aspect of the project. And one of the design elements that was brought up was the height aspect of it. So, that is something that we do discuss, height, things like that, as far as end use users. The ultimate density is that's not really a kind of our focus of our meeting. But there is a planning meeting, and Lesley can probably tell you when that's going to happen.

Staff Planner Lesley Davis: I was going to ask Cassidy if she could address the process this project is going through, I don't think of a Planning hearing has been scheduled for this project yet. But she can explain next steps.

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch: That's correct. So, Chair, Janet, as a part of this request, it will include a rezone of the property. It will be required to go to the Planning and Zoning Board. And then ultimately on to City Council for final decision, the date of that Planning and Zoning Board Hearing has not yet been determined, but if you received a notification for this Design Review meeting, then you will receive a notification when it is scheduled for the Planning and Zoning Hearing.

Janet Cotie: Very good. So, I guess for me would be to addressing these three levels.

Chair Banda: Absolutely, Janet. So, thank you. We will discuss it more here today. So please take what we're talking about here today. Our discussion does not ensure any type of approval. What it does is it kind of gives a guidance for staff, as well as the future body's looking at it, what discussion we've had here. I'm going to open up to the board for further discussion.

Boardmember Green: Regarding the Alternative Compliance. I don't think I have any real concerns with the Alternative Compliance requests here. I think it fits with the architecture. There's also a lot of in and out movement happening here with the windows, the doorways. To me that that lends itself, I think towards the intent to what we're trying to achieve there with materials and articulation. regarding some of the public comments about height, specifically, I guess a few questions I wanted to clarify from staff. Can you clarify what the distances from across the canal are for the setback on that side? What those distances look like right now?

Boardmember Placko: The landscape plan here says the canal is a 100-foot right-of-way.

Boardmember Green: A 100-foot right-of-way. So, from essentially from fence to fence?

Boardmember Placko: Does that sound correct? Cassidy, would you agree with that?

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch: Yes, I was just pulling up the site plan.

Boardmember Green: Okay. I understand the concerns from the residents about that. Quite honestly, I agree with the concern there. What I don't fully understand and what hasn't really come across here is what their sightlines look like or would look like. From there. Right. So that's, that's something I think that should be taken into consideration is just simply what does that look like? I think from what I'm seeing, it's clear that the developer is trying to step this down as they get closer to the residential area. The question I think becomes, is it enough? Is it sufficient enough there? You know, regarding the end use, that's obviously something we're not going to really comment on, that's going to be more for zoning, you know, for whether it's residential, or whether it's office space. So, I think that's the only concern I would have is just considering that there's sightlines. I know, there is because of the canal, I know there's changes in the level of the grade. I know this particular side, it starts to drop, there's a slope on this lot. So, I think there's, definitely some consideration there. Where does this building sit? Perhaps some working with residents to understand what that really looks like? What's visible, what's not. I am sure there's probably some questions or some discussion that can come up about screening, what opportunities there are for screening with landscaping. Those would be things that I would consider, I think that's all I have for now.

Boardmember Thomas

Yeah, I think that honestly, I love this design. I think that we've seen several projects come out of Tim Boyle Design in the past few months. And this is probably my favorite one that I've seen so far. I would agree with Boardmember Green that it does look like it's being stepped down. It is two story on that backside, from where the actual building is to the canal line, is actually 115 feet because there's a 15-foot kind of patio landscape area behind those yards. So, I can understand some of the concerns there. But at some point, something probably is going to get built here. There is a mobile home park directly across the street from there. So, it's going to look better than probably that. I really do like this design. I think it looks great. I don't have any real design comments. I think that the Alternative Compliance works for an infill project like this.

Boardmember Knudsen: I think it's an interesting building. And I appreciate the usage of that odd shaped piece of land. I think that was a nice way that they filled it in. My question would be, is there enough parking? I always ask this with these developments only because I live near The Allen and I see what happens there. So that would be my one question. I think the color palette is good. And I have no issues with the Alternative Compliance.

Boardmember Placko: Cassidy what kind of power lines are they along the canal there? Do you have a picture? They've got eucalyptus trees, impinging on the powerlines. So, I think that's probably going to be a problem for them. Ok, they're 12 KV,

they're not the huge ones, but they're not they're not locals either. They'll have to watch what trees they have adjacent to the power lines. That's all I have.

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch: Boardmember Placko, do you have a recommendation for an alternative tree that wouldn't grow into this?

Boardmember Placko: If these are SRP lines or APS lines depending on whose lines they are, I would consult with their plant near powerline list.

Chair Banda: I was actually asking Boardmember Thomas about, you know, what's the likelihood of them being buried and those power poles and he said not likely due to the fact it's so close to the canal. So, they can't do anything that work on that right-of-way there so it will stay. So that will actually be part of this overall site plan. I do want to commend the architect for designing something on a remnant parcel. I think that's one of the most difficult things to do. What we're starting to see is the city grow up and one of the parts of the city growing up is the infill uses, as you're starting to see. And that starts, that's an organic development that starts going across here and the entire valleys, land, you know, raw land becomes less and less available, you're starting to see creative uses now what the uses are, that's something that you guys can discuss at the planning meeting that's coming up. But from a design perspective, I think this is a well-designed building and meets the intent of the articulation. There is that uniqueness of the metal awnings in the plays with the whites and the blues and the shadow lines are very creative and fun on the small piece of land. Not speaking to anything else that was discussed here today. I just wanted to keep it to that design. I would hope that the architect is also part of the design of the sign as well because this architect has presented other signage that has been really fun. I think it would be really nice to see that unique sign as opposed to just a standard sign that doesn't quite fit the development being proposed. So with that, I think we can ask for a summary, Cassidy.

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch: Thank you, Chair. So going off Boardmember Greens comments. I think it would be helpful to have the applicant provide some sightline studies to show the various grades. When we look at the landscape plan, the landscaping was specifically omitted on that western boundary with those private yards. But maybe there's a way where we could do some pockets in those private yards to include some additional trees to provide screening for the residences, while still complying with SRPs plant palette underneath those 12 KV lines, as well as looking at the current trees that are proposed the eucalyptus under those 12 KV lines. Those were all the comments that I had.

Chair Banda: Bored, does that cover all the comments here today?

Boardmember Green: Something I'll just add one. One last comment. I think the comments from the citizens regarding the safety, I think that's really the intent that we want to achieve here. Right. So from the sightlines part, I think also that the park that's up there on the I guess it's going to be the north west corner of the site, making sure that this isn't a place to hide. That's something I've brought up before but making sure that

there's enough lighting or other things there so this doesn't become a place to hide in such a small site.

- 3i DRB21-01233 District 5.** Within the 5600 to 5800 blocks of East McDowell Road (north side) and within the 2800 block of North 58th Circle (west side). Located west of Recker Road on the north side of McDowell Road. (14.5± acres). Requesting review of two office warehouse buildings. Ryan Short, Cotton Architecture + Design, applicant; Dover Associates, LLC, owner.

Staff Planner Chloe Durfee Daniel presented the case.

Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant Taylor Earl: So, just wanted to walk through things and not repeat what Chloe said, but maybe just highlight a few different things. So here we have the site. And one of the things that is pretty significant that Chloe mentioned I'll just highlight is the significant landscaping that we have off of the South side in addition to the deep setback, much deeper than would be required, but by putting in the landscaping, and then the drive aisles and the parking we're able to push that building quite a bit away. And we know that there's folks who live kind of on the south side of McDowell, so this pushes that building significantly away and make sure that there's significant landscaping and then of course we have that surrounding the site. Just wanted to kind of point of clarification there off of 58th Circle. That would be as Chloe said, an entrance that's the only entrance for the trucks, but they have an exit option back on to 58th Circle or on to the southwest corner of the site. And then vehicles would be permitted to enter into that 58th Circle or through the center of the site. But the Southwest is exit only just to clarify that circulation. Next slide, please. So, as Chloe mentioned, these are the elevations that are sort of officially part of the submission. I tried to provide a zoom in here. But as you mentioned, which we've worked with staff coming up with a different material to put into that. And so that would be CMU. So again, it's not just breaking up the plane, but also provide the different materiality. And so, we had provided that to staff. And that's something we're definitely willing to do. But it may not be sort of officially part of the submission. But know that that's what we're willing to do. So, I would just note that the different movement that's in the building, and I'll highlight that on a site plan, where you can see a little bit more of where the buildings pop, kind of in and out. And then also just the difference in, there's the materials and glass and then also the way that the building moves. And so, we go down a couple of slides that can show kind of some other ones we looked at. And of course, these facilities are a little different than maybe small office complexes and in terms of their size. Meeting the Alternate Compliance, we looked at some of the other facilities that had been approved and felt like we were comparable, or we believe better than some of the ones that we'll walk through here. This is the Amazon building, go to the next slide. So, this is at the 202 and Sossaman, again, is sort of just put them next to each other, they kind of speak for themselves to give you a sense of how these buildings, because of their size and the construction type, they are a little bit different. And so, we try to make sure that we're providing good compliance. Of course, this is what's looking towards the street. So, it has the extra Gingerbread if you will. And then of course this office component, you're off to this immediate side. Next slide. Elliott Tech Center, this is Elliott and Signal Butte site to see