Meeting Minutes



Tuesday, November 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:

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Chair Paul Johnson Boardmember Jeanette Knudsen Vice Chair Tanner Green Boardmember Scott Thomas Boardmember J. Seth Placko Boardmember Dane Astle Boardmember Justin Trexler

STAFF PRESENT:

OTHERS PRESENT:

Evan Balmer Cassidy Welch Samantha Brannagan Kwasi Abebrese Alexis Jacobs

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

Vice Chair Green welcomed everyone to the meeting at 4:30 PM

1 Call meeting to order.

2 Consider the Minutes from the October 11, 2022, Design Review Board Meeting.

A motion to approve the Minutes from October 11, 2022, Design Review Board Meeting was made by Boardmember Astle and seconded by Boardmember Thomas.

Vote: 7 – 0 Upon tabulation of votes, it showed: AYES - Johnson – Green – Thomas – Placko – Knudsen - Astle – Trexler NAYS – None ABSENT– None ABSTAINED – None

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

3a DRB22-00784 - District 6. Within the 9200 to 9300 blocks of East Cadence Parkway (north side). Located south of Ray Road and east of Ellsworth Road. (4± acres). Design review for a commercial development. Ellie Brundige, Gammage & Burnham, Applicant; PPGN-ELLSWORTH, Owner.

Staff planner Samantha Brannagan presented the case.

See attached presentation.

Boardmember Astle asked for clarification on the color of the wood plank.

Applicant Adriel Karbride responded they went with a more durable material. The material board provided shows what the actual color will be.

Chair Johnson added that it is a nice medium sized project. He asked for more information on the planned circulation on the site.

Applicant Dennis Newcombe responded that they anticipate traffic from all areas.

Chair Johnson commented that it is a really great project with interesting building forms and material combinations. He asked for more articulation on the north façade of the building adjacent to Ray Road.

Applicant Dennis Newcombe asked for clarification on the exact location Chair Johnson was referencing.

Boardmember Astle agreed with Chair Johnson's concern about the north façade.

Applicant Dennis Newcombe added that there is a patio and landscaping on the north façade. He stated that the architecture and the outdoor area will invigorate that area and creates a sense of arrival and interest.

Discussion ensued related to the screening being provided on the site

Boardmember Trexler added that it's very nice and he could tell that a lot of thought and consideration had gone into the composition, the materials and the design. He cautioned that a lot of care should be taken to the detailing on the main entry.

Boardmember Thomas asked if all three buildings are being constructed at the same time.

Boardmember Astle commented that he liked the project overall. He expressed a desire to see the materials shown on the ACE building incorporated into the remaining buildings and let them continue within the whole place, like a placemaking element.

Vice Chair Green asked if Cadence reviewed the project.

Applicant Dennis Newcombe responded Cadence had reviewed this and had given their approval.

Boardmember Knudsen added that overall it is a great project.

Boardmember Placko asked about the elevations of the gathering canopies.

Applicant Ellie Brundige explained the intent of the gathering areas. She stated that they did not have renderings or elevations for those but the intent was to follow the theme and the quality of the rest of the development.

Boardmember Astle added there was an opportunity for a light color.

Vice Chair Green added the parking canopies should be tied into the building in terms of material and color. He asked for a clarification on a note on the site plan and elevations that would move the entry element.

Applicant Arthur Holm responded that ACE corporate had asked for the realignment of the entrance.

Chair Johnson asked for clarification on if the renderings showed the tower in the location that was been approved by corporate.

Applicant Arthur Holm responded they have submitted to ACE for a final approval.

Additional discussion ensued about the placement of the entrance tower.

Boardmember Thomas asked for additional information on the covered merchandise receiving area.

Applicant Ellie Brundige replied they did not have an elevation for that element. She added the idea was to match the ACE, similar to what is shown for the parking canopies.

Boardmember Thomas added he had concerns with the height and placement of the structure.

Applicant Dennis Newcombe ensured that they would work with staff on the structure.

Discussion ensued regarding the architectural features of the merchandise receiving area.

Staff planner Samantha Brannagan summarized comments:

- Construction docs should follow this level of design
- Project should have canopy elevations
- Concern over 16' wall at rear of building possibly different color to hide?
- Appreciated the proposed nighttime lighting for the store
- Project includes "place making" which is good
- **3b DRB22-00920 District 6.** Within the 6900 block of East Southern Avenue south side). Located east of Power Road on the south side of Southern Avenue. (1+ acres). Design Review for a restaurant with drive-thru. Greg Hitchens, Applicant; Winco Foods LLC, Owner.

Staff planner Kwasi Abebrese presented the case.

See attached presentation.

Applicant Greg Hitchens presented the case.

Boardmember Thomas commented that he was okay with the alternative compliance. He added that he would prefer the SES at the rear to blend in to the building.

Discussion ensued related to the electrical gear box.

Applicant Greg Hitchens stated he would paint it the same color as the Hardy.

Boardmember Astle added a secondary solution of enclosing the equipment within a closet.

Discussion continued regarding the options of screening the electrical gear.

Boardmember Astle expressed a desire to see more façade transition between materials.

Chair Johnson asked for clarification on the shape of the columns.

Applicant Greg Hitchens confirmed the columns will be rectangular.

Chair Johnson stated his preference for rectangular columns. He asked for clarification on color of the door on the front elevation.

Applicant Greg Hitchens confirmed the color of the door shown was correct. He added that he was willing to change the door color.

Chair Johnson added that he preferred the door color to be the same as the mullions.

Boardmember Trexler asked if there is a red LED light on the stainless steel shade canopy.

Applicant Greg Hitchens confirmed.

Chair Johnson asked if the canopy was stainless or chrome.

Applicant Greg Hitchens responded that the canopy is mirrored and what was shown on the material board was accurate.

Vice Chair Green stated he had no concerns on the alternative compliance for the base treatment. He expressed concerns with pedestrian traffic crossing the delivery land and provided potential solutions.

Boardmember Astle contributed a raised walkway as a potential solution.

Discussion ensued about the raised walkway.

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch clarified that there is a requirement in the code that when pedestrian walkways cross drive aisles, they're required to be a separate material and raised three inches to give the indication to a driver that they are crossing a pedestrian walkway.

Boardmember Placko asked if the drive thru needed to have a parking lot screen wall.

Staff Planner Kwasi Abebrese responded that it was not a requirement for this site configuration.

Boardmember Placko commented that the landscape plan was missing information on the decomposed granite size and color. He added there were concerns with the trees near the trash enclosure and recommended they be relocated to the areas south and side of the drive aisle.

Applicant Greg Hitchens replied with concerns complying with the Zoning Ordinance.

Boardmember Placko clarified to keep the southernmost Desert Willow but suggested to relocate the Mesquites.

Staff planner Kwasi Abebrese summarized comments:

- No concerns with alternative compliance
- Change of color of the electrical panel located south of the proposed building to match the exterior color of building.
- Change of color of entrance door at the north elevation of the building to match exterior color of building.
- Distinguishing between pedestrian walkways that cross drive aisles by raising the walkway above the drive aisle.
- Relocation of trees close to trash enclosure at the southwest portion of the site.
- 5 Planning Director Update: Introduction of Mary Kopaskie-Brown, Planning Director
- 6 Adjournment: Vice Chair Green moved to adjourn the meeting and was seconded by Boardmember Trexler. Without objection, the meeting was adjourned at 5:45 PM.



DRB22-00784

Samantha Brannagan, Planner II

November 8, 2022



Request• Design Review


Purpose

 To allow for the development of an Ace Hardware and two retail/commercial shops




Location

- North of Cadence Parkway
- East of Ellsworth Road
- South of Ray Road



Site Photo




Looking north towards the site from E. Cadence Parkway

Site Photo




Looking northeast toward the site from the intersection of S. Ellsworth and E. Cadence Pkwy


Site Plan



Site Plan




Landscape Plan






ACE HARDWARE - WEST (FRONT) ELEVATION





11




(2) ACE HARDWARE - SOUTH (SIDE) ELEVATION

A201/ 1/8" = 1'-0"









RAY SHOPS - WEST ELEVATION

A201 1/8" = 1'-0"

2 RAY SHOPS - EAST ELEVATION (4201) 1/8" = 1'-0"

(15)



ACE HARDWARE-VIEW FROM WEST SIDE



Renderings



ACE HARDWARE-VIEW FROM NW CORNER





ACE HARDWARE-VIEW FROM SW CORNER



5 ACE HARDWARE-VIEW FROM SOUTH SIDE

19



CADENCE SHOPS-VIEW FROM NE CORNER



3 CADENCE SHOPS-VIEW FROM EAST SIDE



4 CADENCE SHOPS-VIEW FROM CADENCE



2 CADENCE SHOPS-VIEW FROM NORTH SIDE





2 RAY SHOPS - FROM SE CORNER 1/4" = 1'-0"






(3) RAY SHOPS - VIEW FROM NORTH SIDE



¹ RAY SHOPS - VIEW FROM SOUTH SIDE

Colors and Materials



SV1 - SILVER ASH OR EQ.

PT2

._____





MU1 - MIDNIGHT BLACK INTERSTATE BRICK



MU2 - STANDARD BLOCK INTERSTATE BRICK



GL1 - SOLARBAN 70 STONE TILE (SIM. TO EXPOSED CMU)

EXTERIOR FINISHES

- PT1 FIELD PAINT EIFS MFR: DUNN EDWARDS COLOR: DEC795 GRAY PEARL COLOR FINISH: MATTE/FLAT MATERIAL FINISH: SAND NOTES: APPLY SEMI-GLOSS FINISH TO METALS.
- ACCENT PAINT MOLDED TRIM MFR: DUNN EDWARDS COLOR: DE6368 WALRUS COLOR FINISH: FLAT/MATTE MATERIAL FINISH: SAND NOTES: APPLY SEMI-GLOSS FINISH TO METALS.
- PT3 ACCENT PAINT - STEEL MFR: DUNN EDWARDS COLOR: DE6378 JET COLOR FINISH: SEMI-GLOSS NOTES: APPLY SEMI-GLOSS FINISH TO METALS.
- PT4 ACCENT PAINT MOLDED TRIM MFR: DUNN EDWARDS COLOR: ACE RED COLOR FINISH: SATIN MATERIAL FINISH: SMOOTH/SAND NOTES: APPLY SEMI-GLOSS FINISH TO METALS.
- MT2 METAL WALL PANEL (PAINTED) MFR: AEP SPAN TYPE: BOX RIB, 24ga COLOR: DE6034 RAISIN IN THE SUN COLOR FINISH: SEMI-GLOSS
- MT3 METAL ROOF/WALL PANEL MFR: AEP SPAN TYPE: SPAN-LOK, 24ga COLOR: HAIRLINE SILVER OR EQ.
- MT4 ALUMINUM STOREFRONT MFR: ARCADIA COLOR: STANDARD DARK BRONZE
- MU1 BRICK VENEER ALL HORIZONTAL JOINTS RAKED MFR: INTERSTATE BRICK COLOR: MIDNIGHT BLACK
- STANDARD MASONRY BLOCK MU2 BLOCK FILLED PRIMER AND PAINTED - ALL HORIZONTAL JOINTS RAKED MFR: INTERSTATE BRICK COLOR: DE6368 WALRUS
- SV1 STONE TILE MFR: CORONADO OR EQ. COLOR: SILVER ASH OR EQ. STONE TILE (SIM. TO EXPOSED CMU)

Special Use Permit – Outdoor Display





Special Use Permit – Outdoor Display

- #1 Approval of the proposed project will advance the goals and objectives of and is consistent with the policies of the General Plan and any other applicable City plans and/or policies;
- #2 The location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed project are consistent with the purpose of the district where it is located and conform with the
 General Plan and any other applicable plans and/or policies;
 - #3 The proposed project will not be injurious or detrimental to the adjacent or surrounding properties in the area, the greater neighborhood, or the general welfare of the City; and

#4 Adequate public services, public facilities and public infrastructure are available to serve the proposed project



Summary

Findings

 Staff is seeking your review and recommendation on the following:
 Proposed building and landscape architecture

•Staff welcomes any feedback





DRB22-00920

Kwasi Abebrese, Planner I

November 8, 2022



RequestDesign Review


Purpose

 To allow for the development of a restaurant with drivethru

Location

 South of Southern Avenue

• East of Power Road



Site Photo





Looking south from Southern Avenue



Site Plan

- 1,073 SF building
- Outdoor patio with seating for twenty patrons
- Vehicle access from East
 Southern Avenue
- Parking spaces provided on site





Landscape Plan

• Trees include palo brea, thornless mesquite and desert willow

 Shrubs and accents include red yucca, natal plum, baja ruellia and dwarf bottle brush

Elevations



North Elevation

East Elevation

Elevations






South Elevation








Materials Board



Lighting





Alternative Compliance

Section 11-6-3



Base treatment of building





Findings

Staff is seeking your review and recommendation on the following:

- Proposed building and landscape architecture
- ✓ Alternative compliance for base treatment

Staff welcomes any feedback

