

**Tuesday, December 14, 2021  
Virtual Platform  
57 East 1<sup>st</sup> Street  
3:00 PM**

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held at 3:00 p.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Rachel Prelog  
Lesley Davis  
Michelle Dahlke  
Sean Pesek  
Josh Grandlienard  
Jennifer Gniffke  
Alexis Jacobs

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

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

Chair Banda welcomed everyone to the meeting at 3:00 PM

- 1 Call meeting to order.**
- 2 Consider the Minutes from the November 9, 2021 Design Review Board Meeting.**

A motion to approve the Minutes from November 9, 2021 Design Review Board Meeting was made by Boardmember Green and seconded by Boardmember Thomas.

**Vote: 7 – 0**

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Banda - Johnson – Thomas – Placko – Knudsen – Green – Astle

NAYS – None

ABSENT – None

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.

- 3-a DRB21-00791 District 6.** Within the 4900 to 5100 blocks of South Ellsworth Road (west side) and within the 9000 to 9200 blocks of East Ray Road (north side). Located on the northwest corner of Ellsworth Road and Ray Road. (17.04± acres). Requesting review for an Industrial development. Josh Tracy, Ryan Companies Us, Inc., applicant; Mushson Partners LLC, owner.

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard presented the case.

Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak.

**Boardmember Green:** Chair, I'll start. I don't have any concerns with the alternative compliance on these. I'm actually trying to understand why the second one is asking for I mean, there seems to be quite a bit of articulation in the ups and downs on the top. The ins and outs, I guess one clarification on the site plan, when I looked at this, it looks like it's just the thickness of form liner and I want to call it horizontal relief in terms of ins and outs when you're looking at the building. Can you just clarify that? Is there any more depth to the building? On the outside?

**Applicant Nicole Darling:** My name is Nicole Darling. 3900 East Camelback Road, I am a project architect with Ryan companies. Building 9, which does front Ellsworth does have an actual physical projection out in a couple of the locations, we call them the one thirds, two thirds locations. They are accentuated by the form liner texture. And so those come out, I believe three feet from the face of the building. And we also have some layered panels, so you'll see that as well.

**Boardmember Green:** And that depth is about what six, eight inches?

**Applicant Nicole Darling:** The thickness of the panel is actually closer to 10 inches. And then we do have some recessed entries that are on the corners. So, we've got a lot of in and out of both with physical projections in and physical projections out as well as the layering. And then as Josh mentioned, the various textures that we have with the metal panel and the form liner.

**Boardmember Green:** Great. Thank you for the questions or the answers to them. That's all I have Chair, thanks.

**Chair Banda:** Okay, anybody else on the board?

**Boardmember Placko**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm a little bit concerned about the plant palette. There are sweet acacias in there, which are extremely thorny plants. Just make sure that they're not near pedestrian routes or sidewalks. I think I saw them in a couple locations, near sidewalk locations. I like the variation in the ground planes on a project this size. Having the multiple sizes and colors. Granite, I think helps vary the current interest of the project. I'm a little bit concerned that given the size of these buildings, that there's not enough of a buffer between the streets and these buildings, I just don't think the trees are going to be able to do enough of a job screening the mass of these buildings. I'm not

sure if there's anything else we can do about it, though. And the only other comment I guess I'd have is the landscape architect has winter blaze as a ground cover. And that plant will grow up four to five feet. I think they need to be careful using that in any place that would be considered site visibility related. I just would watch that when you're reviewing the planting plants. That's all I have.

**Chair Banda:** Thank you. Hearing nothing else from the board, I guess that's all the comments we have. Josh, you want to provide a summary?

**Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard:** Yes, so it sounds like the board didn't have any issues with alternative compliance Just the location of the sweet acacias due to their thorny nature and make sure they're located off pedestrian travel paths as well as to ensure the winter blaze is maintained at a level or replaced with something that can be maintained as part of ground cover.

**3-b DRB21-00988 District 3.** Within the 1100 block of East Baseline Road (north side). Located West of Stapley Drive on the north side of Baseline Road. (1.75 ± acres). Requesting review of a drive-thru restaurant. Kevin Zenk, Sustainability Engineering Group, LLC, Applicant; Stapley & Baseline, LLC, Owner.

Staff Planner Jennifer Gniffke presented the case on behalf of Staff Planner Chloe Durfee-Sherman.

Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak.

**Chair Banda:** Okay, thank you. Applicant I don't know if you want to add anything else to this or we're okay to go to comments.

**Applicant Kevin Zenk:** No, Chairman, I don't have any comments.

**Chair Banda**

I really appreciate it. I'll open up to the Board for discussion.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** I think we've seen buildings very similar to this. I will say I appreciate the higher end materials on it. And I don't have any other comments.

**Boardmember Thomas:** I just have a couple of quick comments. One of them I made last time, which was the door that comes off the drive thru looks kind of goofy the way the window is off of that. But also, I know that you guys are trying to keep the existing canopy of the existing carwash, it looks like there could be a little bit more update to that. To try to bring that together and there's quite an area toward the north of there. I mean, honestly, if there was some kind of seating area or something, I know that's hard to do, because I believe that runs into a retention area there. I think there could be some opportunity there with something along that. You're aware of the canopy I'm talking about right? Yeah, so those are really my only comments.

**Chair Banda:** Thank you Scott. Any other members of board.

**Boardmember Placko:** I have a question. How tall are the parking lot the light poles in the parking lot? In the center islands, the two center islands. The reason I'm asking is there's two trees in each of those islands and I'm wondering if there's going to be a conflict between the trees and the light pole.

**Chair Banda:** Yes, I was looking at that myself, it looks like it is 25 feet, is that correct? Okay. Yeah, they're 25 feet tall.

**Boardmember Placko:** Okay, the luminaires themselves should easily be over the top of those trees for a good long time. So if that's if that's acceptable. The other thing is in that center island there in the parking lot there's a two-inch water line that looks like the trees are right on top of that two-inch water line so I'm not sure if that line could be relocated to the south so it's not in the planter islands those are my only comments.

**Chair Banda:** Yeah, and I actually was looking at the light issue just making sure this is my comment real quickly about the lighting as well. I know once you go in a plaza, it's hard to kind of mix the lighting but it says they are white. Just want to make sure that this isn't just kind of a far cry different for everything else. Granted, the lighting is going to be different as we're doing LEDs. I understand that so I'm leaving that part alone. But as far as everything else it looks well done. Materials look great. We saw something similar to this, what probably six months ago or a year ago. And nice quality design. So I have no other additional comments. With that I leave it open for a summary. Thank you.

**Staff Planner Jennifer Gniffke:** All right, thank you members of the board. In summary, the Board appreciates the higher end materials. There was a little concern about the drive thru door window or the design of the drive thru door. The canopy design could be improved. And there were potential conflicts with the light poles and the water line conflicting with the trees in the parking lot. And the light fixtures should match those at the center.

**3-c DRB21-00289 District 2.** Within the 4700 block of East Main Street (north side). Located East of Greenfield Road on the north side of Main Street. (6.8± acres). Requesting review of a large-scale commercial recreation center. Katy James, Architectural Collaborative Team, LLC, applicant; Karno Norton S/Roland B Tr Etal, owner.

Staff Planner Jennifer Gniffke presented the case.

Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak.

**Applicant Katy James:** Yes, my name is Katy James. Okay. The only thing I wanted to add is that my client really wanted to make this building be a part of the existing amenity buildings that exist in the back at Mesa Regal. So that that's the reason for the materials palette, it matches what's already there.

**Chair Banda:** Well, thank you for the clarification on that, too. I appreciate that. Okay, open up to the board.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** Did we have any photos of that I missed? Maybe.

**Chair Banda:** I didn't see any.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** Is that the material palette you're referring to with that sort of tannish building?

**Applicant Katy James:** That's a sales office where they used to sell the little park models. And I don't even know that it's being used anymore. But the buildings back on the rest of the site are big masonry buildings that are painted in this color, and the roof tile matches that and any accents that they have are that stack tile.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** Well, so I'll just offer my comments. I don't have an issue with the actual building form. But one thing is difficult to judge when we just get elevations is that when you see the different building massing and forms, that they're actual complete forms, and it looks like you're doing that very well in this design, where for instance, if you have a tower element, if you never read just the 2D facade of a tower, but there's actually returns to it on the side. So it reads as it should and a more authentic way. My only two comments, and these are just suggestions. I think you have really good articulation at the center of the building, when you get out to the very far extents of the wings, those two symmetrical wings that you have, I feel like the articulation sort of falls off there. So maybe consider adding a little bit more detail in some manner on those two far elements.

**Applicant Katy James:** The little ones that have the roof going in the opposite direction?

**Vice Chair Johnson:** No, I'm talking about the simple rectangle forms that are facing to the south. The other thing that's kind of difficult to read is just the utilization of the stone that you have as an arch element. I'm guessing you'll lay that as sort of a radius. Okay. All right. I just want to make sure that that looks authentic in the way that it's stacked and following the form. Okay, that's all I have.

**Boardmember Green:** Chair, I'll just add my comments. I think my comments are related to the palette. I appreciate the clarification. Because honestly, that was the one thing that stood out to me is that this just doesn't feel like it fits with a lot of what architecture we see come through more recently. So the clarification of tying in with the existing certainly helps. The only comment that I have to add to that is the existing is so far back off of Main and Greenfield it feels disconnected enough that I don't know that you need to match it. I think this is an opportunity to actually, I don't know, I don't want to say rebrand, but to liven up the area with a different palette and I'm not hard set that needs to change. I'm not going to be the one to hold this up. That's I guess a comment. That was the thing I saw when reviewing this and all the different other boardmembers if there's any additional input on that.

**Boardmember Astle:** On that note, I'll jump in. I completely agree. If you're looking for a second on that I don't think the palette is what Mesa is looking for, necessarily. And if we

are trying to match, kind of a past, I feel like it would want to be a past that we're wanting to take to the future. Right? So if it's not, then maybe the goal is to get this building to a slightly more light and current palette that maybe the future of the buildings inside come to match over time or work with as they get upgraded. I'm not saying this needs to change form completely. I agree that a lot of this is working. But I would like to see personally a more current color palette with some and material palette with some materials that I think are more in line with our design standards of today.

**Boardmember Knudsen:** I would like to concur with both of you. We drove by the area and from where we were we couldn't even see the existing building. So I didn't realize that this was matching the buildings way in the back. So my comment is I do feel the color palette is dated and it could be lightened up. And it is a good opportunity to make that front facade a little more into the modern age. So yeah, my biggest thing is I think it's a dated color palette and I feel like we're moving into the past. That's all I had. Thank you.

**Boardmember Placko:** Just have a quick question for the applicant. The parking lot here. How long do you anticipate people parking their cars when they're here? Are they just here for an hour or two? Are they here a long time? I'm guessing since this is a fitness center, it's more they're just here kind of for an hour or so, do you agree with that?

**Applicant Katy James:** Yes, they typically have classes that they go to so they'd be coming in and leaving. They wouldn't be staying there all day by any means.

**Boardmember Placko:** Okay. Then I do not have any concerns with the oak trees in the parking lot islands. Thank that's all I have.

**Chair Banda:** Okay, thank you. I just have some basic comments, I don't think the form of the building necessarily is a major concern. I think I get you can have any detail, any form, but I think modernization or some sort of update. You know, there was a commercial developer I've known over the years of doing this, who's told me that every 10 to 15 years they have a refresh. Well, this could be the refresh, that can set the tone for the rest of the plaza. So, as you're going with that opportunity to refresh this area a little bit, the other thing I wanted to do is that it, there's a kind of a rough transition from stone to window. So even if you are doing a more modern stone, it really ends rough and usually you'll have some sort of preform concrete detail, like a Cantera detail or some other detail that can be provided there, that will actually kind of highlight the windows and actually complement the architecture as well. I think that would really help. The other thing too, is when you do these kind of windows, if you create a little more depth, instead of actually having stone flush with the window, depth to those windows will actually really help create this kind of iconic architecture if you're trying to create that. But I am going to agree with the color palette, there's a way to stay on point with this type of architecture. And at the same moment, do a refresh to bring a more modern color palette here. The other thing I saw on here, too, I saw this was the lighting selected. Now you do have different lighting in here. One of the lights that was shown, was highlighted as a 5000 Kelvin light, which is a very bright, almost actually not even bright, it's blue. It

goes on the blue scale, I really recommend especially with this architecture, you have to stay in the 3500 Kelvin range, which is already selected for some of the other luminaires. Make sure you stay consistent on the site. That's the only comments I have. So anyway, anyone else from the board and if nothing staff summary.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** Yeah, I would just like to clarify one thing that we're not saying that this needs to be a modern building right? We're saying this style is acceptable, but should be a little bit more fresh, kind of maybe not so deep and brown?

**Boardmember Green:** Yeah, I think my comment goes to this doesn't feel tied to the existing structures in my mind at all. I mean, I understand from a design perspective, we can see that, but physically on the ground, where these are at, located next to each other, they don't feel like they're relative. Now, if I was driving past this one, going to the next one, I might see that. But this doesn't, I don't know just standing there, you're not going to them at the same time. That's where I'm coming from in that term, which to me allows an opportunity to update the color materials palette, to something that might be more attractive to bring you in. Something that's more if we want to call it modern in the materials and color, as opposed to the form. I don't have any issues with it. And once again, from my perspective, if you know if there's a compelling reason for branding, or something else that this needs to stay the same and tie that in, I understand that narrative as well.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** I think as a Board, we're quite accepting of different architectural styles, we just want to make sure that that within that style we're current and thoughtful as far as how we detail it.

**Applicant Katy James:** Can I make one other comment? One of the things that the ownership, and they own separately, quite a few mobile home parks in Mesa, what they're trying to do is tie everything together. And this is their attempt to start tying everything together, because there's been so many architectural styles going on within all their complexes. So, we were specifically asked to make this building look more like their existing buildings than not. That makes sense?

**Chair Banda:** I don't think we're saying to do a complete redo on design, we're just saying to refresh your color palette to refresh some of the material palette, with this architecture that you have to bring into because this, I'm going to say it has more of a circa 2004 architectural feel to it. If I were looking at the colors, the dark browns, the type of stone being used. I think those details are there. I see these types of Tuscan architecture, Spanish architecture all over the place, that is still being proposed today. And it looks wonderful. I think we got to make sure we capture some of those details, like I've seen things will something as simple as a window. The window grids will be modernized or changed or updated. And I think those are the kind of things that you'll see that'll go a long way on this architecture

**Boardmember Green:** And Chair just to add, and the Board can disagree with me on this, but something as simple as changing the color of the stucco. Changing from stone to brick, changing from Spanish Tile to a flat tile. Something as simple as that changes

the whole feel of the building. Not that you have to change the form but just changing some finishes will totally, totally transform how the building feels. Now, that being said, I understand there's a balance between that and the client's expectations and wishes. And if, at the end of the day, my opinion is, if this is meeting the guidelines of the City of Mesa, in terms of design standards, that comes down to what we're trying to interpret, those guidelines for a specific situation. We're trying to say, this is the direction we see City of Mesa heading in terms of design, this is why we're providing that input. So just my thoughts

**Boardmember Knudsen:** In regards to refreshing the color palette, you can still stay within that warm color palette, but just go lighter in color, so it's not so heavy, because this does read as 2004 and it's just kind of tweaking the palette a little bit, you can still stay with the warm tones, just make it much lighter as opposed to these deep, dark, heavy tones, if that makes sense.

**Chair Banda:** Okay, I think we have it. Jennifer, can you summarize?

**Staff Planner Jennifer Gniffke:** Thank you. In summary, there was mention of good articulation at the center of the building, but there should be details added to the east and west end of the building to provide more articulation and overall, the materials should be updated to a more light, current standard.

**Boardmember Knudsen:** It's called a fresh palette.

**Chair Banda:** Okay, and then I did make a comment on the lighting too as well. The 5000 Kelvin lighting. Stick with 3500 Kelvin on all details, so thank you.

**3d DRB21-00316 District 6.** Within the 5000 block of South 71st Street (west side), and within the 7000 block of East Ray Road (north side). Located west of Sossaman Road on the north side of Ray Road. (2.38+ acres). Requesting review of an industrial building. Brian Moore, BMCA Architecture P.C., applicant; Aei Arizona OZ Fund LLC, owner.

Staff Planner Jennifer Gniffke presented the case.

Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak.

**Applicant Brian Moore:** I would just like to add a couple of things. One is that we have a setback problem on the south side of. There's a space that is this triangular space that's owned by the airport. They have a fence around it and rather nice landscape inside the fence. We were trying to use some of their landscaping as frontage for ours, because we're going to have to landscape about 15 feet in front of our property, just to make it contiguous. Otherwise, we're going to have 15 feet of no man's land between them and us and a chain link fence. And the other thing is when Jennifer said that we're trying to, match the buildings, we're actually matching the buildings, the buildings to the north of here, you reviewed. A year or two ago, and they, really do match, we're trying to make a complex of these buildings. So that's the reason for continuing the architecture that was approved a year and a half or so ago.



**Chair Banda:** I really appreciate it. You're Brian?

**Applicant Brian Moore:** Correct. I am Brian.

**Chair Banda:** Okay. Excellent. Thank you. For the record, for everybody here in the video, just a clarification from a staff standpoint. So, if we're having a challenge with setbacks, this is nothing that will require a Board of Adjustment case, correct? Sorry, Jennifer, looking at staff out of habit.

**Staff Planner Jennifer Gniffke:** Chair, the site plan review will be heard by the Planning and Zoning Board. And staff is working with the applicant on whatever process is required, to allow for that.

**Chair Banda:** Excellent. So we'll keep it to the design aspect of the site. Perfect. I want to make sure. Thank you. Board any comments.

**Boardmember Astle:** Yeah, I could start on this one. I'm not concerned at all about this project. And I don't have any negative comments or anything that staff needs to hear beyond that I'm comfortable with the alternative compliance. And as it relates, even though unnecessary to comment, I think on that landscape setback, considering this odd triangle is kind of a nice solution for a project like this. Those are my thoughts.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** I'll just concur with that. But I do have a question. Can anything be done about that chain link fence? I mean, as you described.

**Applicant Brian Moore:** I mean we're sort of planning on taking out the chain link fence, because there's a bunch of chain link fence around that little triangular piece, which is 15 feet or so inside of their property. So yeah, we're just talking to the airport, to see if it can be taken down. They have no problem with us landscaping on their property and stuff like that, but it's just been a little bit strange. It's just a very odd piece of property.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** That'd be great to see. Thank you.

**Boardmember Thomas:** My real comment comes down to the west elevation, as you're traveling east on Ray Road, that elevation will be highly visible. And looking at the site plan, and then the elevation, that whole side is very flat and linear. If there's anything that we can do? Some sort of awnings? I'm sure you're working as tight as you can with your site plan there to maximize that side. But it is just something that could come off of that wall to help break that up in some way. Like I said, that's a very visible side as you travel eastbound on Ray Road right there. You talk about the triangle piece that the airport has, and I'm pretty sure that's due to a sign that they have sitting there. So, they have it there for a reason that is visible. So again, I think that that West Elevation, there can be something architecturally done to that to help break up that side a little bit more and clean that up a little bit.

**Chair Banda:** Okay, any other board members? Anything else to add?

**Boardmember Placko:** Mr. Chairman, I've got a question for the applicant. Since there's been some discussion on that triangular piece about blending landscape, have you look to see if the Express Painted Desert blends with the existing granite color that's out there?

**Applicant Brian Moore:** I think we have but we'll have to talk to my landscape architects.

**Boardmember Placko:** Alright, just if your point being that, you should try to pick a color that blends with what they have out there now. My next series of comments are really for Jennifer because they're really kind of critiques of the landscape plan itself. Jennifer at the main entry, there are two big circles with squares in them. But they're not on the plant legend. So, I don't know what they are. Same thing just to left, the main entry there's a circle with a solid triangle again, not on the plant legend so I don't know what it is. There barbara karst staked vine in the plant legend but it's not on the plan. So again, I'm not sure if that is that supposed to be in the plan or is that something that they had in the plant legend that they didn't take out? So if you could clarify some of these things. Reviewing PDFs of landscape plans it's very important that there'd be a scale bar on here so that I can get a gauge on how big some of these plants symbols are. And right now there's no north arrow or scale bar on these plans. So, if you can please have them add that when you review the final I would appreciate that. This landscape architect likes to on his groundcovers, likes to use the same symbol for different plants and it's very difficult to know which plants are which. So the acacia redolens, the Gold Mount Lantana and the Dallas Red Lantern, I have a hard time when I'm looking at it his plans, knowing which ones are which. If I could get that comment back to him to maybe stop doing that. As well, he's got Agave Desmettiana on the legend, but it's not on the plans. So, I'm not sure if that is an oversight? Or did he decide not to use it? Sorry. That's all I have.

**Chair Banda:** Boardmember Placko Just real quickly, I've run into a case similar to this where you have two different sites that run up against each other. And it's going to be difficult to find a blend. So, if this is matching what's existing in the current area, and the only remnant piece is this triangle, the airport piece, I almost recommend that we scrape and match.

**Boardmember Placko:** As I'm looking at the aerial photo and it doesn't even look like that entire triangular piece has granite on it, it looks like it's kind of along the roadway. But as you get kind of in the back part of that triangular piece, I can't tell if it's a different color or granite or if it's just dirt.

**Applicant Brian Moore:** They have only landscaped a small portion of that triangle. So, they really haven't landscape the whole thing.

**Boardmember Placko:** Okay, so you put your granite down there might be this void of no granite?

**Applicant Brian Moore:** That's the whole point. We're going to take out the chain link fences and landscape the area with some landscaping and some granite and to make it contiguous.

**Boardmember Placko:** Certainly, you're never going to get granite to match exactly. I understand that. You just don't want like a pink next to a brown, right? You want something that kind of is in the same tone family. So, I guess that's what I'm saying.

**Chair Banda:** All right. Thank you. That's all we have Jennifer, a summary please.

**Staff Planner Jennifer Gniffke:** Thank you. In summary, the West Elevation seems very flat and could use some architectural enhancement, perhaps awnings, the Painted Desert ground cover, the DG needs to blend in with that on the triangular piece. And overall, the landscape plan needs to be gone over very carefully when they make the resubmittal to make sure that all of the plants that are shown on the legend are on the plan and vice versa. And the symbols are differentiated better.

**3-e DRB21-00324 District 6.** Within the 9400 block of East Cadence Parkway (southwest side). Located east of Ellsworth Road on the south side of Cadence Parkway. (6.96+ acres). Requesting review of a multiple residential development. Amy Weidman, Silver Fern Companies, LLC, applicant; Newport Homes, LLC, owner.

Staff Planner Jennifer Gniffke presented the case.

Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak.

**Boardmember Placko:** Mr. Chairman, can I go first on this one? Can you pull up the landscape plan, please. And after this, I'll be coming in. So I'll drop off after this. It'll be in a few minutes after this. I'd like the applicant to check the mature size of the Chinese Elms. It appears they're drawn way too small in some of these areas, and I think the canopy is going to outgrow the space they've allotted for it. I think the plant palette needs some more shade loving plants, given the heights and tight spaces around some of these buildings. As an example, rosemary, which is in some of those narrow corridors, is once to get about four feet in diameter. And they've got it drawn as near as I can tell about two feet, and then they're very tightly spaced, so they're going to be over growing the space very quickly. Typically, they want full sun, so I'm not even sure Rosemary is the right plant for those locations. As a general comment, I think the site feels over planted. And then on that that south southwest boundary line is that adjacent to ADOT, is that adjacent to the 24 freeway?

**Staff Planner Jennifer Gniffke:** Yes

**Boardmember Placko:** Okay, I think you're going to have to really pay close attention to what trees you have along that property line. Because right now they're showing trees overhanging the ADOT right-of-way line, and I don't think ADOT's going to like that very much. So you may need to look at what trees you have planted there, maybe scoot them further into your property or change your species selection. I appreciate the applicant

providing an irrigation plan. But I realized that's not my purview to go to town on that. So I won't. And with that, I will drop off. And I'll see you guys in a few minutes.

**Chair Banda:** All right. Thank you Boardmember Placko. We'll see you soon. Okay, board. Anybody else?

**Boardmember Green:** I'll go ahead and add my thoughts chair. Can you go back to the Cadence guidelines? I guess I'm struggling, Jennifer to understand the justification for not meeting the Cadence guidelines. I think the ones specifically that I would pick on are the AC units and the additional onsite lighting. Those are the two that I would specifically be focused on, to me the AC units in the front patio area? I don't know, I think there could be a more creative way to do that. I think just because of noise. That's, that's my thought. I'm assuming the compressor units are going to be located there. And that's where you're going to get it. I don't know what you know, what specifics, they have specked out for that. But that just seems like a poor place for locating them. And then on-site lighting. I mean, I don't know why we can't have additional onsite lighting for this. In my mind, I don't know. I'm just having a hard time understand justification for not meeting at least those two, I'll see if anybody else has input on it.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** Yeah, Tanner. That's where I was headed as well. And I really feel like honestly, the one that jumps out to me the most is variation and diversity. Can you describe to us what is the Cadence review process? Have they reviewed these plans and elevations?

**Staff Planner Jennifer Gniffke:** Yes, the elevations have been signed off by the master developer.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** And they're approving of these variations from their standards?

**Chair Banda:** Yeah, Michelle did you have something else maybe you can kind of clarify on this for us?

**Principal Planner Michelle Dahlke:** Yeah, I was just going to say that I don't know how far the master developer has looked into this. I mean, you got the sign of on the elevations. But I didn't know if they were aware of the requested deviations.

**Staff Planner Jennifer Gniffke:** Yes, I'm not I'm not sure if the master developer is aware of the request for deviations.

**Principal Planner Michelle Dahlke:** So they were just looking at the architecture itself, not deviations.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** But I think that part of actually the individual forms are nicely done, I don't really have much of an issue with any of that, I could point to a couple detailing things that I would make a comment on. But really, my primary concern is the number of them and the density. That they're all the same height, and just sort of populating the whole site. So, I do think that from a design perspective, the development

would be a lot more pleasing if there was more diversity in sizes of the units. And that's going to be a tough one for them to deal with. But I'll leave it at that and see what can be resolved there.

**Chair Banda:** Thank you Vice Chair.

**Boardmember Thomas:** Yeah, I mean, the AC units is going to be tough with some of this. With it being a pitched roof like that. And having the units in the middle, you're not going to run lines, typically through other units and things like that, it becomes difficult. So, they're going to have some challenges to figure out that. I would agree with Vice Chair Johnson. Even if they broke up a couple of these with some different color palettes and things like that. It could give some different diversity here. Do you know are these purchase or rentals?

**Staff Planner Jennifer Gniffke:** Chair, Boardmember Thomas, I'm not sure if they're for purchase or rentals, but they are individual lots so they could potentially be sold as individually owned units.

**Boardmember Thomas:** I think that there's opportunities there to break some of this up a little bit more too. If I'm looking at specifically the Four-plex A, the two center units, they really just blend together, there in the middle. And I think that there could be something to really change those up a little bit. Whether it's a slight stucco feature or something like that. But again, the biggest finding is that they don't meet some of their own community standards is somewhat disturbing to me.

**Boardmember Knudsen:** I have a question on the shutters I can't tell on the elevations are some of the shutters bigger than the windows? Some of them look smaller than the windows? Typically, shutters should actually, even if they're faux shutters, they should actually, if they were actually going to be closed, and open, they should match. That was one of the little details I had seen. So, I wasn't sure if they were following that rule. Because one of the big windows that doesn't look like they can do it.

**Boardmember Astle:** Yeah, lots to think about on this one. I think overall, the design has some nice things going on with it. And some things that are a struggle, I think the AC units in the courtyards is a mistake overall. And would really jeopardize the living environment of that front area, considering that's really the only private area to hang out, it would be kind of sad to lose that to all of the units running at the same time during the summer. That said, you know, maybe to help articulate a little bit, some of the roof variation, maybe there's a flat section, if it's a five plex, and two of the units where you could house the condensing units on the roof, and then maybe let areas still pitch and other areas be flat and have an access for all of them, I know that these are potentially for sale. And that can pose a challenge. Maybe that just allows for the centralized units to have mechanical on the roof, and then the others on the side, something to think about. But I'd love to see that change so that the living environment could be a little bit more inviting, considering all of the garages cut off the use of the other side of the units. It's really my only comments.

**Chair Banda:** Thank you, Dane. My comments are when you start running into four and five plex's when you run to the single plane roofline. So, this can actually piggyback on a Danes comment that if you go to the five plex right there, it doesn't look bad in rendering. But when you start seeing these things from a side view and when you start seeing several of them, that articulation on the roofline is going to be essential to really break it up. So, it's a big long run, it doesn't look like it, but until you see it built. I think there's an opportunity there to articulate that roofline. You're not having these long runs, especially on the five plex, and maybe the four plex. But the little ones, it doesn't really matter as much considering it kind of fits in there. As far as diversity, that diversity comment, I think you can stick a lot with the same type of architecture and then have some variations within these play in the colors, even on the panels to kind of create some diversity here. It would go a long way.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** I believe the way that the diversity was stated was that there's diversity in unit size and the heights, right? So, you're talking about single floor, or one story units or two story units and three story units, or there's some kind of interplay between those.

**Staff Planner Jennifer Gniffke:** Yes, Chair, Board Member Johnson. That's true, but the site plan has already been approved. So, the variation in height could be more roof style.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** I think that's definitely something to look at. I mean, especially when you do look at five plex, in particular, and there's sort of an alignment of them as you move down the entire length of the development. That ridge line is essentially aligned all the way down. If all we're talking about is diversity in terms of the shape of the roofs and so forth, and not necessarily the density of the units, then do you think we're talking about playing with those rooflines a little bit

**Chair Banda:** The other comment I have, as far as creating visual interest, is to make sure that because you can't tell if this is like a minus two or minus four, but when you have those front windows, if you create a little bit more depth to that front window, it really speaks volumes to the overall architecture. If you're going minus four or more into like a minus eight, it really creates that depth, that shadow line, and really will break up those facades and create a little bit more visual interest along the front facade. Besides, I have nothing else I like to add.

**Principal Planner Michelle Dahlke:** Just to remind you, we will take your comments directly to the applicant and keep working with the applicant on your concerns. And as you know, the Director has the ultimate decision-making authority, but will reiterate what happened tonight to him as well. We should see some good results with them at the end of the day.

**Staff Planner Jennifer Gniffke:** Could I get feedback on the request for alternative compliance regarding the lattice over the garage?

**Boardmember Green:** Chair, if I might, I'll just provide my comments. I don't necessarily have a concern with adding the lattice and that being how they break it up. I mean, from what I see on the site plan, it looks like there's a pretty flat line. I'm going to retract one of the comments I made earlier about the AC. I think if they were to add some depth relief between units and provide space for a compressor to sit outside right next to the electrical panels that would break it up. I mean, I'd like to see that. But it's more of a suggestion, if you're trying to resolve one of the other ones with this. I don't have any other concern with that unless anybody else does.

**Chair Banda:** Anybody else in the board have any other comments on this. I don't think board has any other concerns on that. So, I appreciate that, Jennifer.

**Staff Planner Jennifer Gniffke:** Thank you. In summary, we're going to ask the applicant to check the mature sizes of the Chinese Elms and the other species, including the rosemary to make sure that the materials won't outgrow the spaces that they're designed for, make sure that there are some shade loving plants included on the plan along the southwest boundary line. We want to make sure that the trees overhanging the property line is not a problem. The air conditioning units need to be relocated, they should be relocated, perhaps to the roof if that is feasible. Additional onsite lighting should be added. In terms of providing variation, there could be some stucco features added, the shutters should appear to match the window sizes. So that if they were functional, they could close the windows. And the roofline should have greater articulation instead of being one long line, especially on the four and five plex buildings. And depth could be added to the front windows.

**Chair Banda:** Board does that sound like it covers all of our comments?

**Boardmember Green:** Can I get clarification. So, the guideline, as I understand it, for Cadence for the AC units, says they should be at the side or rear of the dwellings. If it's to the roof, that's not going to meet the guidelines. Still, I just want to make sure there's consensus. I don't have a preference. If it goes to the roof. I think that's a feasible solution. But if there's going to be a question for you in terms of not meeting the guidance, or that particular guideline. I'd like to just get that clarified. I don't have an issue with it being on the roof. Does anybody?

**Chair Banda:** Well, in further clarification, then I think he described it well. It's not just roof mounted, it's going to be screened in the screen on a flat roof. So, this because I've seen this illusion before where they move out and they create the dog sheds around it. That's not what we're saying.

**Boardmember Astle:** No, this is just using a parapet style designed to block them. You shouldn't need to separately screen them. And it could also fall in line with the redesign of the roof alignments. But that said again, it would need to fall within to some standard, but this does screen them. It's not breaking a standard. I don't I don't believe in any way.

**Boardmember Green:** Right. It's not in line with Cadence's which is side or rear. Right. That's it.

**Boardmember Astle:** I think they're probably referencing when we used to set them on the roof visible.

**Chair Banda:** And this particular designer, I've seen them do such. They actually had a separate balcony where they actually mounted the units so they're actually part of the overall design. I've seen them do that. This particular group.

**Boardmember Astle:** If it's not in their standards, it should be just because it's a nice look to get them off the ground too.

**3-f DRB21-00384 District 3** - Within the 1100 block of South Alma School Road (west side). Located north of Southern Avenue on the west side of Alma School Road. (1.67+ acres). Requesting review of a multi-tenant retail building. Mike Hills, PHNX Design LLC, applicant; Fiesta Commercial LLC, owner.

Staff Planner Jennifer Gniffke presents the case.

Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak.

**Applicant Mike Hills:** Yeah, she did a great presentation as always. This is Mike Hills. The only thing I would like to add is this part of the overall multifamily apartment complex that's going up in this project. It's that the apartments are located just immediately west to the parking lot in front of the shops building. And the color materials, the stucco, the specific details for canopy design, closely matches the clubhouse and the multifamily apartments.

**Chair Banda:** Thank you, Mike, I appreciate it. Board. Any comments or questions?

**Boardmember Astle:** Sure, I'm happy to start on this one. Ultimately, there's a lot of great things going on with the articulation and some of the modern moves that have been made here. There are a few things that I struggle with, that I think are minor overall, as I as we discuss adhered masonry, I always tend to want masonry to feel like it's real, you know, and the way to do that is often to bring it back down to the ground. So it's as if it were, you know, coming out of the ground naturally. And here at a few places, it just breaks raw on the wall and I feel like it might be a little hard to see that unless I'm missing it in a different elevation but and maybe it turns a corner but just something to think about making sure that it feels like the Masonry is a little bit more naturally laid, as it would be if it were real, and not just adhered and then another comment probably has to do more with some of the awnings. To me feel a little low like they're going over the window lines. I know that often we want that pedestrian scale, but I think even just a little bit higher so that we're not overlapping the glass. Could be nice and probably a little easier to build. I think there's a good opportunity for signage. I know that's not necessarily our scope here, but I see a very standard alignment of tenant's slots for and maybe that's not representing future signage. But this building has the potential for some neat variation in signage. And I think that will help make this design even more unique. Something to think about at least. That's all my comments.



**Boardmember Thomas:** I will piggyback a little bit off of what Boardmember Astle said. I do have a couple of questions. The underside of the awnings and canopies, what material are you looking at using on there? Looks very shiny from the renderings.

**Applicant Mike Hills:** It's actually just going to be just a toned-down metal deck painted to match that color.

**Boardmember Thomas:** Okay, are you going to roof the top side of it? Or is it just going to be exposed or painted decking? I'm just trying to think of water and things like that that will get through.

**Applicant Mike Hills:** Yeah, it'll be a sealed inch and half metal deck. Okay, for any piece of the solid surface.

**Boardmember Thomas:** I do notice that the SES is fully exposed. If there was a way to enclose that I know that takes up square footage on the inside, typically bump out your fire riser room a little bit and try to bring that around to work in there. The drive thru bump out to me looked like it was an afterthought just from the rendering the way that it looks like it's just put on to the outside of the building there. There's a way to almost bring that up closer to the canopy. I would like to see that. And then my last comment was just with the doors that lead out of the back of the building into the drive thru, you might want to think about that. From a safety perspective. Those leading out into the drive thru lane that those may end up needing a handrail or something as you come out of that, those doors to keep people from walking out of those spaces directly into a car traffic area.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** I'll add a few comments. I think generally the material palette is nice. I like the sort of steel canopies kind of working around the building. There's something about these building forms, though that I find a little like, you know, maybe it's just a personal preference, but they feel like unfinished in a way. And maybe it's mostly those two L shape elements, kind of bracketing the two sides and how they look almost like they're an eyebrow. But then they resolve differently on the other side. I'm having a hard time with it. The other one is, I just want to clarify. Dane, your comment about transitions on a flat surface. So, when we look at the tenant that's second from the left, and the transition from that material to the tenant, that's just adjacent to it to the right. So you have a light tan to a dark brown. I believe the light tan is some sort of adhered brick, and then the dark brown is a stucco.

**Boardmember Astle:** That is the spot I was referencing. Yeah.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** Is there a plain change there?

**Applicant Mike Hills:** So, it's a very slight plane change, there is probably only four to six inches of difference.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** Okay, just be very careful with that. You know, that's so subtle that it falls away. I think it just adds to kind of the oddity of the forms. Anyway, I don't

want to over emphasize my comment about the forms, to me they seem unfinished, but I'll leave it to the rest of the board if they want to reiterate that or let that one go.

**Boardmember Knudsen:** I do have a question. I think it's a nice-looking building and it's a good color palette. But the one thing I was having an issue with, I was concerned in the renderings. I didn't think it gave an accurate reading on the masonry product. These right here, I feel like in reality, it would read busy and bossy. And it would take away from the beauty of the other hard finishes being used in the project. But I can't figure out in the drawings where this particular product, these items are. So, if you guys can kind of look at that.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** I think there was an image of that material as a blend.

**Boardmember Knudsen:** Yeah, it was. And that's what made me think it's going to be real busy and bossy and take away from the overall effect.

**Applicant Mike Hills:** The location of that masonry would be each of the columns. They are each canopy. And then, specifically, the area where the transition piece we're just talking about on the left side of the building, and that whole face would be the masonry.

**Boardmember Knudsen:** I see it, but it's not reading. It's reading more solid in your elevations, which looks really nice. So, I wonder if I'm just thinking it's going to be real busy and bossy.

**Boardmember Astle:** I presume these are the most accurate, right? What we've got here.

**Boardmember Knudsen:** Yeah. And the only reason why I say that is because I had seen a photo in here, somewhere where they had all of the Yeah, see, and that looks super. That's very bossy?

**Boardmember Astle:** What's the size of the masonry being adhered each piece?

**Applicant Mike Hills:** It's the eight by 16. This masonry actually is installed out there, part of the multifamily apartment, so I could possibly provide an actual picture of what the finished product look like?

**Boardmember Knudsen:** Okay, it doesn't look like that.

**Applicant Mike Hills:** It looks very similar to that. But their shades vary.

**Boardmember Knudsen:** But I mean, the color variation, is that how it looks?

**Applicant:** It's very similar.

**Boardmember Knudsen:** Because on your renderings it looks nice, but it reads solid here. And on that picture, we were just looking at, that's really busy. And I'm just thinking

it might take away from it. But it's hard. It's hard for me to see it. I mean, I see the busyness on the very pattern. But I don't see it in the rendering. And I like your rendering. I'm just thinking that it's going to take away from the overall look.

**Chair Banda:** So, Mike, I guess one of the comments I have is regarding that hardie lap sighting, I've seen that application used recently. And it has, a very T1- 11, very faux feel to it. It doesn't have that quality, it's almost more rustic than it is with everything else that's shown here. I like the verticality of that. I think there's an opportunity here to create something a little bit less than that rustic feel that Hardie plank. That brown Hardie plank has, like I said, a very rustic feel and doesn't play well. On a large piece like that I've seen it done. And the other comment I have, and this is regarding something I'm calling the permitting, but I think it would be wonderful where you have some of these signage opportunities here. I some of these canopies kind of lend itself to actually having canopy edge signage. It really would kind of create a more a fun appeal, especially along Alma School, and the Fiesta district and sort of just being tacked onto the building. I think there's an opportunity there, I get it using it in some cases, but in other cases there where there's an opportunity, use those canopy signs really stick out all over the place, and that really bring a little bit more whimsy to the overall building and design. So those are those are my comments. Besides that, I do appreciate you working with the applicant to blend into the overall look, but there's some opportunity here. Anybody else? The board? All right. Hearing none, Jennifer, it's going to be a fun summary.

**Staff Planner Jennifer Gniffke:** Thank you, Chair Members of the board. In summary, the adhered masonry should be placed naturally. And there's a concern that it could take away from the other materials. It is too busy and bossy. And the other material that was mentioned was the hardie plank lap siding. It could be too rustic and it doesn't play well in the large sections. Materials in general need to be transitioned at a change in plane to make sure the change in plane is very evident. There is some concern with the unfinished look of the L shaped eyebrows. The drive thru pickup window pop out should be better integrated in the building architecture. The awnings seem low and could be raised a little bit. And signage could be used to further enhance the design perhaps along those canopies. And the SES could be better screened. And one more thing the handrail could be added at the rear doors for safety.

**Chair Banda**

And one more question for Mike. I apologize. The finished detail especially along the top. Is there going to be a metal coping along the tops of these?

**Applicant:** The parapet tops. Yeah, there will be.

- 3-g DRB21-00457 District 6.** Within the 7200 block of E Ray Road (north side), within the 7100 block of East Seaver Avenue (south side) and within the 4900 to 5100 blocks of South 71st Street (east side). Located East of Power Road on the north side of Ray Road. (10.8± acres). Requesting review of an industrial development. Omar Cervantes, XCL Engineering, LLC., applicant; Theresa Corral, Phelan Development Company, LLC., owner.

Staff Planner Sean Pesek presented the case.

Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak.

**Boardmember Green:** Chair, just a question and I think to staff, is this in any way related to the project we reviewed earlier? That's across the street towards the south end towards Ray. Is it? I know the comment was made earlier that they're trying to make all these buildings matching together. Is this related to that or not?

**Staff Planner Sean Pesek:** I don't I don't believe it's related directly to it.

**Chair Banda:** Close but not related. Okay.

**Boardmember Placko:** I have some questions for the applicant here. Around in the landscape plan, there are these squares. I don't know what else to call them. Well, shaded squares. And if you could bring up the landscape plan, Sean. I couldn't tell what they were. If you could zoom in, like by the southwest corner of Building B. Right there, right where your hand is? Zoom in right there. So I'm not sure what those are?

**Staff Planner Sean Pesek:** Oh, the squares? That's the amenity space for employees?

**Boardmember Placko:** Do we have anything on that? They miss it? As far as detail? Yeah. What is it?

**Staff Planner Sean Pesek:** I believe it's a ramada and seating under I don't think the applicant provided a detail on that. Okay.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** I think you can see it in the back of the rendering. Back corner.

**Boardmember Placko:** Okay. I guess my other question would be, are people going to be parking in these parking lots all day? Are these going to be you know, like, the last project asked this question about where people park. It's a fitness center. So they're in and out.

**Staff Planner Sean Pesek:** Good question Boardmember. I don't know. I don't have any information about potential tenants. That's a question for the applicant.

**Boardmember Placko** Okay, they've got oak trees in the parking lot islands. And the oak trees, if you park under it for four to eight hours will exude a sap that will get all over your car. And then people generally get kind of upset by that and then want you to clean it. I think they might, if that is the kind of development this is, they might want to rethink their parking lot Island trees. And again, the ground covers. There's the same symbol for three different ground covers on the planet legend. I'll keep harping on that. That's all I have.

**Boardmember Green:** I appreciate the clarification on the question I had. But the only comment I have I think is related to the entries. Looking back to the design guidelines or the standards for design, it talks about having a visual focal point there, this just doesn't

quite do it for me. I mean, I don't know what to do about it. But I think you could liven up this entrance a little bit. I know a lot of the places we see, you know, either windows come up a little bit higher, you have a little bit more. And something that kind of decorates that up a little bit. I don't know if anybody else has inputs on that, but that's my thought is I think the entry could use just a little bit more pizzazz, something, liven it up.

**Chair Banda:** Like definition, further define the entrance.

**Boardmember Green:** Or give it a little bit more of a visual focus. Okay.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** I think that signage is going to help that quite a bit. But I agree. I mean, you have essentially a wide flange that supported on standoffs over the entrance if you were to incorporate maybe some of the more shade intensive detailing that you see at those trellises at the Ramada that you were pointing out earlier that that may be something that would be worth considering otherwise, I don't really have any issues with this development.

**Boardmember Astle:** Oh, I agree. I think the developments nice ultimately not many comments I completely agree. My first thought was maybe a few more windows on the lower level but I think the entrance if we were to raise the focus a little and again, just a little with some signage, I think that could become much more prominent. We take away that big blank wall. Again, there's only so much signage we're allowed so ultimately. Mixing and blending a bit, some of the architectural features in that entrance with signage would help this project and all buildings.

**Chair Banda:** Hearing other comments, I'm going to go ahead and just wrap up with my basic comments. I think the overall site is well designed. I would agree with Boardmember Tanner Green, I think there's an opportunity to maybe give a little bit more definition to the entrance areas of these of these buildings. Because we're seeing this, you know, of course, this very plain facade, I think there's an opportunity there to further define it somehow. I think, as both Dane and Paul said, just minor tweaking can really go a long way in the signage. It will really further define that area as well, too. So, that being said, I have nothing else to add, and we're going to go ahead and ask for a summary from Sean.

**Staff Planner Sean Pesek:** In summary, staff will work with the applicant to fine tune the landscape plan some of the inconsistencies with the legend, and then replace the vegetation in the landscape islands. And then for the building architecture, we'll work with the applicant to maybe replace the proposed metal awning with one that provides more of a focal point at that corner entrance.

- 3-h DRB21-00658 District 2.** Within the 5600 block of East Albany Street (south side), within the 100 block of North 56th Street (east side), and within the 100 block of North 57th Street (west side). Located west of Recker Road and north of Main Street. (1.5± acres). Requesting review of a multiple residence development. Tim Boyle, Tim Boyle Design, applicant; Craig Ahlstrom, owner.

Staff Planner Sean Pesek presented the case.

Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak.

**Chair Banda:** Okay, wonderful. I'll go ahead and open up the discussion to the board. I did want to say I do appreciate the renderings because they speak volumes to understanding the drawings here. So, board?

**Vice Chair Johnson:** Do we have any? I noticed that the garages are pushed back every fourth garage. So that's in compliance. Do we have anything in the code that limits the number of contiguous units?

**Staff Planner Sean Pesek:** Garages, like garage doors, you need some sort of break after every I believe it's third garage door. So you can if you go back to the elevations, you can see. I'm not sure what to call them, vines some sort of vegetation that's coming down to provide that break, we found that it meets the intent of that requirement, although it isn't a break that you would normally associate like a change in mass or recess.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** So my personal feeling on this is there are some really nice moments within this design. But there are a couple of things that just really concerned me. And the major one is that that alley that exists between the units, and it's really long and really narrow. My preference would be to somehow break up and actually detached these forms, in some way and incorporate some green space at the midpoints of those long stretches of units. Now, I don't know if there's anything within our code that would allow us to ask for that. But I feel like the experience within that that motor court is going to be pretty rough. Leave it at that, as far as the materials and articulation of the individual units, even the rhythm that set up on the front side of the units. It's beautiful.

**Chair Banda:** Thank you, Vice Chair.

**Boardmember Astle:** I guess I'll go. Ultimately, I like the project. I have equally the question, not necessarily a concern. But there's that question of how many is too many, right? But at the same time, the design for me and an infill project located where this one is. You know, I generally like the design, the design solution that's presented guest parking, maybe staff you can help me. We're confident we have guest parking surrounding in the street, plenty of room that can accommodate more than just their two per unit like to have in the garages. There are no other interior guest parking stalls that I see. It's all exterior, correct?

**Staff Planner Sean Pesek:** Correct. The applicants work with our transportation division about the on-street parking, it is county right of way, but we have no concerns with parallel parking as long as it's not striped along Albany.

**Boardmember Astle:** Yep. Okay. I'd love to see the signage also turn out kind of like we have here, I'd worried that it might not. And therefore, that elevation to me, starts to get less exciting if you shrink the signage. I would at least say that that's something to evaluate. Because I think it's helpful now, but it could, change depending on how much

they're allowed. And maybe that's been determined. Have you done that? No. Okay. Otherwise, I like the development. I like the design. I like unique designs like this, that address interesting sites that bring more people to neighborhoods and in a variable product for them to use. So, thank you.

**Boardmember Thomas:** This project looks a lot like the one that we saw last month from same architect in the sense that it's a lot of the same cookie cutter that looks like it's just one after another. I will say that I do appreciate an infill project. But again, at some point is where is too much of one after another after another. I too, like Boardmember Johnson said, the alley is concerning to me. That that's basically what that is, is just straight down the middle an alley. There was a way to break that up a little bit with some sort of greenspace more than what we have right here. But I understand from a developer perspective, that you're trying to make your performer work and to maximize the amount of units that you can get in here. I don't have a lot of comments on the overall architecture. I would have liked to see the HVAC units incorporated into the renderings. Because looking at just the straight colored elevations, the HVAC units do look just like that. HVAC units sit on top there. I understand we try to screen those and try to cover those up. But it's still going to look just like an HVAC unit set on top of that roof structure. Outside of that, I don't have a lot of comments on this.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** Just a question, do we know how close the building is off the setbacks? The road that runs lengthwise, I'm just curious, are we right up against the setback?

**Staff Planner Sean Pesek:** Approximately eight feet from the front property line adjacent to Albany.

**Chair Banda:** But what is the setback for that area? Is that eight feet? Are they on the on a zero there?

**Chair Banda:** It's eight feet from Albany to the front of that structure. But what is the required setback?

**Staff Planner Sean Pesek:** It's much more so the applicant is going before Planning and Zoning board for site plan review and is requesting a PAD overlay. And that's one of the requested deviations is a reduced front setback.

**Boardmember Astle:** So this goes to the Council and Planning and Zoning still, correct.

**Staff Planner Sean Pesek:** Yeah, so it's site plan and rezone.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** I mean, I would almost like to see that even reduced further. If, in fact, they could buy some space into the alley to maybe add some trees, add some, some more greenery in there. I think that that would be a worthwhile kind of trade off.

**Boardmember Green:** I'll just add a couple comments. I think my minds a little bit more concerned with parking. I realize this isn't the zoning meeting, but I think just looking at

some of the guidelines about the parking, where guests in handicapped parking evenly and conveniently distributed throughout the multiple residence projects. I understand this as infill the comment I have is just, to break up the building massing to even add parking, for example. And some of those locations, I think could help. But my concern is just north of this, there's another development that is residence on top of garages, and you take a look at the streets and they're already fully parked. My concern is this is going to start spilling over into neighborhoods. And so anyway, it's a comment, I think we should be a little bit more concerned about parking on site, as part of design, with something like this.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** I think that the length of these buildings is actually going to further complicate that issue. Right? What's going to happen is people are going to park in front of these garages and then clog up that whole artery. And it's going to be, it's a tough issue.

**Chair Banda:** I know it's a little bit out of our purview. But I'm telling you, one thing I've learned from multifamily over the years is, if there's fire restrictions, and CC&R's are well enforced, I don't think that's going to be the major concern of people parking there. I see people unloading stuff but not parking there. I think it's a little different. So, I think if board has concern about overall, kind of breaking up the I is one thing. But parking in front of garages, I think is way different. Because that's the applications use over and over and 'ow we're starting to get to the point in time where we're starting to see a lot more multifamily like this. I think enforcement is one thing, but also CC&R enforcement are pretty good about it. I've seen it and my wife's from Northern California, I see it a lot. So anyhow, I'd like to hand time over to Boardmember Placko too because I know he had some comments as well.

**Boardmember Placko:** I'm curious if the applicant has checked into the availability of ghost gums, Eucalyptus Papuana, great tree, I understand why you're using them, but the availability of these trees is suspect. And so, I'm wondering what your fallback plan might be?

**Applicant:** The landscape planting plan is flexible. We can adapt as required.

**Boardmember Placko:** Okay, I see that you're on the legend you have Texas Mountain Laurel, but there aren't any on the plans.

**Applicant:** Ah, yeah, we initially had in-ground planters along the alleyway. They were in ground to grow up the side of the walls, but we were asked to remove them.

**Boardmember Placko:** Okay. And I also see that you've got purple leaf plum and purple orchid trees along the north side of the of the playground area, you could certainly put them in, I'm a little suspect on them, I don't think they're going to do very well surviving in our sun. I would suggest use the Texas Mountain Laurels in those locations. I also might suggest you use Texas Mountain Laurels where you have oak trees, underneath your signage. Because a 36-inch Heritage Live Oak is going to come out of the box 15 feet day one. And I thought I'd be blocking your sign right out of the gate. And then as



they grow their dense trees, they're evergreen trees that you might have submitted. So you might want to select something a little shorter underneath your sign.

**Applicant:** Well, we'll certainly look at that we don't want to block our signage.

**Staff Planner Lesley Davis:** Just to clarify, Chair, if I may, on the signage. That will have to go to the Board of Adjustment for a Special Use Permit as a Comprehensive Sign Plan based on the size of it. They'll have to have that considered. So it's not necessarily a guarantee that it will have a sign that looks like that. I just wanted you to be aware of that.

**Boardmember Astle:** And that is their intent to go through the Board of Adjustment for a sign that size

**Staff Planner Lesley Davis:** In order to have a sign that size they would need to.

**Boardmember Astle:** Oh so you are letting us know.

**Chair Banda:** I think as a board, I think we all like that sign is being part of that it's integral to the design. So it's not just a sign at this point in time. It's integral to the breaking up that facade, it creates that unique façade.

**Staff Planner Lesley Davis:** Which is why I wanted to bring it up.

**Chair Banda:** Yeah, I'm glad you are. So, if they know that this a board is saying that is kind of an essential to this overall design. I'm going to say that's just me and Dane at this point in time. And Paul, everybody, I guess.

**Applicant:** We are aware of the signage permit requirements, and we want the sign big like that as well.

**Chair Banda:** Yeah, it gives a uniqueness and an eclectic flair to the overall design. Yes.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** Is there opportunity to add maybe like a picture window? Somewhere along those facades? I'm not sure. I haven't looked at the interior planning of the units.

**Applicant:** On the east side, possibly as we're set back from the property line. On the west side? I think it's unlikely because building code doesn't like openings on property lines. Looking on to the amenity spaces, certainly.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** Yeah, I mean, as a fallback, I think that you should look at those, a well-placed singular window could be enough.

**Applicant:** Yep, the walls are relatively small, the angles are relatively small compared to the overall scope of the project. And they're broken up by the by the driveway through

the middle of the project. And they are screened by trees. So they won't read as big flat white walls when it's built. They look like that on the elevations, but they won't read like that in real life. Okay, thank you.

**Boardmember Placko:** So I was going to ask what is your neighbor to the south? It's a vacant lot, two vacant lots. Okay. Yeah. I mean, because having those tall columnar ghost gums is a good selection, a good tree for that South property line. But if you chose something different, you could be growing on into your neighbor's property very quickly.

**Applicant:** So, we'll look at that.

**Boardmember Placko:** I think you need to stay in the in the columnar family, especially on the south property line.

**Chair Banda:** Okay, I would like to add, I agree a lot with the overall design is agreeing with Dane as well as Paul and everybody else here that this is a unique infill area. And as you have these unique infill areas, I think this is a lot more interesting to see something like this than it is to see, you know, garden style multifamily, and this is you could work there. Anyway, there is a uniqueness there. And I think as we're going forward, and we're talking to our approving bodies, that I think what Paul is saying to create an additional request to reduce that setback is going to really help this overall site become developable. So, I think there's a lot of interesting movements here. I stated earlier in the meeting that the design had that nine plex or that five plex had a very planular roofline and here that planular roofline makes sense with the design that's presented. So I agree with a lot of the statements that were made here today. And I think this is a wonderful project. Sean summary?

**Applicant:** If I may jump in for one second, Sean. The eight-foot setback on Albany Street is a public utility easement. We're not allowed to encroach on it.

**Chair Banda:** Thank you for the clarification. So that is not something we can adjust.

**Applicant:** So we can't reduce the eight feet no. Thank you.

**Staff Planner Sean Pesek:** Staff will work with the applicant with landscaping, maybe incorporate the Texas Mount Laurel under the signage and then possibly replace the species along the south property line. So, trees as they grow, don't encroach, based on availability. And then it sounds like there was some concerns with the buildings and maybe working with the applicant to break them up with greenspace adding more green space, maybe furthering that separation between buildings, A and D and B and C. And that's all I have.

- 3-i **DRB21-00673 District 6.** Within the 5500 block of South Power Road (east side). Located South of Ray Road on the east side of Power Road. (0.92+ acres). Requesting review of a coffee shop with a drive thru. Mike Hills, PHNX Design LLC, applicant; Avalon Power, LLC, owner.

Staff Planner Jennifer Gniffke presented the case.

Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak.

**Boardmember Astle:** Yeah, I think it's a nice project. I think Dutch Brothers typically builds a nice building, simple building. And I think the material palette works. Nice color palette and looks good. I like it. Thank you.

**Boardmember Green:** Chair. I'll make a comment. Please tell me that red arrow was staying. I'm kidding. Actually. No, I don't know if it is or not. I just I don't know if that's a design element or not. It looks like it's probably just part of the rendering. The giant red arrow directing traffic. I think that's great. No, other than that the only comment I had is about the shade structure. So I guess I just want to get a clarification. It looks like the triangular pieces on the south side look like they're shaded. They're screened, but the ones on the north side are open. Is that true? And Is that intentional?

**Applicant Mike Hills:** That is true and intentional.

**Boardmember Green:** I don't know how much it bugs me. I guess the only thought was be consistent on adding additional shade on that South side because of the exposure. But to me, it feels like it should match on the other side. I don't know how critical that is. Yeah, maybe don't worry about that unless anybody else has strong opinion about it,

**Boardmember Astle:** It could have just been a flat structure all the way across. So there's something unique going on.

**Boardmember Green:** It's true. Anyway, that's the only thoughts I had.

**Boardmember Thomas:** Just a couple quick comments, I actually liked the shade structure, the deflection in it, one thing that I would request is it looks like, in the rendering, the columns are very square. I'd like to make sure that they're incorporated into the design of the overall building. And it looks like they could be matching the drive through canopy columns. Unfortunately, the shade structure rendering was done by the shade company and not the same as the Dutch Bro rendering. So I would like to make sure that those kind of blend together. My only other comment was on the site plan. The pedestrian walk path looks like it's just shown as being striped, I believe it has to be a differentiating material. So just want to make sure that that is noted.

**Chair Banda:** Thank you, other members?

**Boardmember Knudsen:** I just wanted to say that I do like the shade canopy and that I don't have any issues with this project.

**Chair Banda:** Okay, and nothing else from Seth, hearing nothing else. I do have a request from the Representative Bill Kateri. Did you like to add anything else to it? Bill? Are you on the line? I actually can see you right now Bill, would you like to add anything else?

**Applicant Mike Hills:** I am with the architect right now. And yes, we just greatly appreciate the opportunity to present the shade canopy along with the main building structure at the same time. And as the planner said, yes, it is primarily for protection of the staff that is, you know, standing outside, in the sun in the summer and so it does provide shading for those two sidewalks that they're on. And per the earlier question. Yes, the columns will be the same color material and texture as the main building.

**Chair Banda:** Excellent, I appreciate it. Bill. One common I actually I left with Dutch Brothers last time, and I'm going to say the same thing this time is that because the canopies in this case, the canopies up in the building being as simple as they are, plays a major role for all the walkup customers. One of the things I liked is that a couple times I've seen it where Dutch Bros have actually added a wood underlay under there and did the lighting integrated into it looks extremely sharp, it looks really nice. As opposed to being unfinished on there. I've seen other stuff where it's more simple, but that that wood tongue and groove under there and that finished lighting there, it was very finished and very nice. I will leave it at that; besides that I leave it up to staff Jennifer for a summary. Thank you.

**Applicant:** We do actually have a wood canopy underneath that can be in this location that is called out on our drawings.

**Chair Banda:** Fantastic. Thank you.

**Staff Planner Jennifer Gniffke:** All right, in summary, the shade structure is well liked. There was a little bit of concern not the sides not matching but I don't think that's something that we need to keep as a comment. Okay. And there was confirmation that the columns for the shade structure will match the columns for the drive thru canopy. The pedestrian path needs to be a different material from the regular drive surface and wood underlay or wood soffit under the canopy would look really nice and it sounds like that's what they're doing.

- 3-j **DRB21-00883 District 6.** Within the 4400 to 4700 block of South Ellsworth Road (West side) and within the 8700 to 9200 Blocks of East Warner Road (South Side). Located west of Ellsworth Road and south of Warner Road. (165.7± acres). Requesting review for an Industrial Development. Sean Lake, Pew & Lake, applicant; BD218 LLC, Owner.

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard presented the case.

Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** Yeah, I think in general, I don't have any concerns with this development. It looks nice. If I could ask one thing, I would say that, similar to a comment that was on a similar project earlier in the evening. Feels like the entrances could be amped up a little bit more. Maybe the canopy, if you can toggle to one of those renderings that shows if I could, if I could have this just the way I would want it, I would probably pull that canopy out a little bit more just to further emphasize it, possibly wrap it

around the corner to really highlight those corner entrances. But otherwise, I think you've got really good articulation and a nice project there.

**Boardmember Thomas:** So I think is a great building. Ware Malcolm, you guys do a great job with these. I was actually super excited when I saw building 1 and 2. They didn't have quite as many dock doors. And now, I was okay with the contrasting white for that. And then I looked at buildings, three through nine, and they all had the white doors and I just I can't get on board with the white doors. I'd love to see them painted to match everything. I know I've heard the comment that it's a safety issue, but it's really not a safety issue. It's a painting issue and they can be painted and I've done painting on them. So, to have them blend a little bit more with as many dock doors as there are. That's really what I want to see. But other than that, I think the project looks great. I think that wrapping that entry would look a little bit better with that awning. But outside of that, I think it's a great looking project. Go ahead.

**Boardmember Placko:** I like the plant palette for the project. I like the way that the trees are used in the parking lots and I like the way that the landscape mitigates the mass of the building. That's something you'll hear me talk a lot about on these kind of warehouse projects. And I think there's been some really smart use of Chilean Mesquites on this project. That said, you know the landscape is very structured, very repetitive, which works in a big warehouse parking lot type project until you get to the retention basin, I think in the retention basin is where it falls apart. In the retention basin, it's very repetitive, it's very rigid, so I am not on board with the planting style, I think that the planting in the retention basin needs to be loosened up to be more naturalistic, I think it would help to vary the ground planes. And it probably would help to know, because I looked through the site plans, I can't tell how water's getting into these retention basins. So somehow waters getting in, there's going to be riprap, there's going to be ways to mitigate the erosion. And then you can start expanding on that heavier ground plane to kind of start creating places that you can start massing your trees to create a little more naturalistic planting in the retention basin. For a basin this size, I've almost wondered if seeding isn't the way to go. So, it's, your bigger basin for this entire area, if maybe you don't just throw, too many shrubs, not enough trees, and maybe seeded. I mean, that would be another possibility. So that's what I had. You know, maybe you could shape the bottom to get some water harvesting, work with your drainage too and your riprap to create some interest in the in the basin. I'm not saying do a massive amount of grading, I realize the retention volume is probably very tight. But again, knowing how water gets in this basin would be helpful. So that's all

**Chair Banda:** Okay, any other members of the board?

**Boardmember Green:** I'll just make a comment. I appreciate the ins and outs of the building on the pedestrian side as opposed to the dockside. I know that's something we talked a lot about as a board, just moving it in the plane. I really appreciate it. My one comment is on what I'm going to call the wing walls. Basically, the tilt up that's right there, there's a pop out. And then it looks as if the tilt up is extended beyond the return that I know a few feet is what I'm seeing. I don't know if it's easier to see, I think in the renderings if you go to the renderings. Yeah, here's a great example here on the left side

of that image. It looks like that tilt up is extended beyond the top from the perspective, but from what I'm seeing, it looks like that actually is coming towards the page, if you will, it's a few feet. To me. I don't know that I I'm really particular about that. But I know something that we've always talked about is the returns. A great example is on the right side as it returns right. So once again, I don't know that that's a huge detail. It's probably a little bit nitpicky, I actually kind of like the wing off. I think it adds some dimension there. So overall, I'd say just say great job and be careful that it doesn't feel like it's just hanging out there.

**Applicant Tom Briggs:** Typically, we'll extend that a little further past, so as a front plane overlaps the back plane.

**Boardmember Green:** That's what I was thinking. Okay, great.

**Chair Banda:** As far as comments I have real quickly. I agree with that wrapping that canopy. I really liked the use of glass. It really brings a lot of unique look to this building. I think it's well done. It's well articulated. I really like those wing wall returns. I think it's well, well stated. I like your comment too Boardmember Green on that as well. Besides that, I have no other comments, board. You're all good on colors with your comment.

**Boardmember Knudsen:** I think it's an excellent project. I'm very, very happy with it.

**Chair Banda:** That being that being said, Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard, you can give us a quick summary.

**Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard**

Yeah, so we're looking to wrap the canopies along the corner entries that seemed pretty consistent across the Board, and then paint the dock doors for buildings three through nine. It sounded like one and two were meeting those painted requirements. And then for the retention areas, either provide some seeding, at least remove some shrubs or at least provide some access for that water to actually reach that retention basin general flows. Loosen up the plant palette in the basin.

- 3-k **DRB21-00884 District 6.** Within the 4400 to 4700 blocks of South Power Road (east side) and within the 6800 to 7000 blocks of East Warner Road (south side). Located at the southeast corner of Power Road and Warner Road. (40± acres). Requesting review of a group commercial center. Sean Lake, Pew & Lake, PLC., applicant; Power 40, LLC., owner.

Staff Planner Sean Pesek presented the case

Chair Banda invites the applicant to speak.

**Applicant Vince Di Bella:** Just real quick, we spent a fair amount of design effort articulating the Power Road street elevation, even though the retail entrances are on the interior side. And then also the endcaps and spaces between the buildings, we provided some permanent covered areas for patio space integrated with the building and not just an appendage. I just wanted to bring those two pieces out. Thanks.

**Chair Banda:** Thank you as the Design Review Board, we like to hear that and really appreciate. I will open it up to the board for further discussion.

**Boardmember Thomas:** I like it. I think it looks great. I think that we saw some original renderings when this project was first coming through. I really like it. I will say the monument sign that you show on one of the renderings. I hope that it looks that fun, and you guys can keep it like that, because it really brings the whole Cannon Beach kind of theme together. I like it. Overall. I have no comments on this one.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** I do have a quick question. The sort of Tahitian roof form that's on those two towers, I seem to recall that you had something like that in the larger development. Is that what's going on there?

**Applicant Vince Di Bella:** Yeah, there's some throwback to the kind of the restaurant row piece that you saw several months ago, sort of bringing that feature element to the forefront here.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** Yeah, I would say you don't need it. But if it ties back to the larger development, I can see why it's there. Otherwise, I think you've got a great little project here. It's nice.

**Chair Banda:** Anyone else?

**Boardmember Knudsen:** I just want to say that I appreciate the project. I think it's very nice. And your colors are very nice.

**Boardmember Green:** Thank you. Okay, I got one question on lighting, the rope lighting that's shown here. What's the material for the diffusion?

**Applicant Vince Di Bella:** Specifically, I don't, it's part of the LED.

**Boardmember Green:** Are these the ones that are made to look like the neon placement? Yes. Probably a silicone or more of a solid? Yeah. Correct. I don't have any other comments. Looks great.

**Chair Banda:** Okay, I don't think anyone else has a comment there. But I do. I'd like to add that. I knew this was on the pipeline when I was making a comment about the mix of canopy edge signs and I thought this captured it. I like the use here. I appreciate the emphasis on the Power Road side, even though it's not your main entrance side. It's well done and looking for this coming to the city of Mesa so if Sean could provide a summary for us to be great.

**Staff Planner Sean Pesek:** Thank you, Chair. Sounds like there were no comments from the board.

**Chair Banda:** That is wonderful. Thank you for hanging in there.

**Applicant Tom Snyder:** Thank you. I do have one comment. Tom Snyder with DPS group. I'm the planner, project manager and landscape architect on the project. And just from our design team and the client themselves, thank you to the City of Mesa. Who really has accepted this, the board, City Council, Planning has been really helpful on this project as well and Economic Development. So thank you very much for your support.

- 3-I **DRB21-00887 District 1.** Within the 1400 block of West Bass Pro Drive (north side). Located west of Alma School Road and south of the 202 Red Mountain Freeway. (2.5± acres) Requesting review of a corporate office building. Glenn Hurd, Butler Design Group, applicant. Mesa Hotel LLC, owner.

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard presented the case.

Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak.

**Applicant Glenn Hurd:** This is not a spec office building. It is actually a build per CCS Corporation, their headquarters, their technical integrated AV technology group. They would do something similar to this room and some buildings. And this is their new headquarters. And they're moving from Scottsdale to Mesa

**Chair Banda:** Okay, excellent board. Any comments you'd like to add?

**Boardmember Astle:** I think it's a nice project. I don't have comments.

**Boardmember Knudsen:** I do have to say you incorporated the purple very well. It was intentional.

**Applicant Glenn Hurd:** And that was an owner decision. They wanted to put that in. We had originally shown them an option for that. And then it was taken out and then they came back and they were more concerned about the architecture than costs. And that's where the project is.

**Boardmember Knudsen:** It's very nice. A lot of times people don't realize that they're selecting purple and I can tell this was intentionally done. It's all well done.

**Applicant Glenn Hurd:** It's their corporate color.

**Boardmember Thomas:** I think the architecture looks great. I don't have any comments on the building architecture. There weren't any elevations or anything for the parking shade canopies. And we've typically, in the past said we'd like to see something that somewhat is incorporated to some of the design, so keep that in mind as you're doing some of that for those. I know it's super easy just to do the standard off the shelf ones that lots of people do. But a building like this, I think that hold some value to be able to bring some of that architecture into those parking, shade canopies.

**Applicant:** We're looking at a couple different options and kind of a narrow profile with the recessed frame. So it's more of a cantilevered look to it.



**Boardmember Thomas:** Great, again, something that somewhat incorporates and not your standard off the shelf, afterthought one.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** I think it's really great project. Glenn, thanks. Well, I've got to ask one question. In the rendering if you can toggle to the next rendering, actually, maybe it's previous? Yeah, that one right there. So, when I'm looking at the two forms that sort of punctuate the canopy, my question is, did you do that to respond to our design guidelines? Here's what my eye wants for that canopy. To just go across the whole thing. I think that would be really beautiful.

**Applicant Glenn Hurd:** We actually had it just flushed out with the building. And I pulled it back in to make it more like it was intersecting and driving through the building versus going in front of the building.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** Anyway, something to consider. Yeah, I mean, just from my personal preference, I think it would look really sharp to have that carry along the whole face. And then to keep those forms below it. But, I mean, you've got a beautiful project. So do what you need to do.

**Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard:** Just so I can get some clarity on that. Are you looking for the canopy itself to be extended? Or just a banding of metal?

**Vice Chair Johnson:** Could be a band, just to tie it all.

**Chair Banda:** Yeah, I think it's a beautiful example of an office building. Another great addition adjacent to the hotel. Josh, please summarize.

**Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard:** So, essentially make sure there's design elements incorporated as part of the shade canopies and possibly continue the banding of the canopy throughout the structure just to maintain that plane north south.

**Applicant Glenn Hurd:** Just to close we've been working closely with Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard and Economic Development to keep this project moving forward because it's been very fast track and the City has been great to work with. Excellent.

**Boardmember Astle:** Considering you're breaking ground soon I would say that the comments on the building are more just thoughts I actually like the breaks and I your project will look great.

3-m **DRB21-00929 District 6.** Within the 4200 to 4400 blocks of South Sossaman Road (west side). Located west of Sossaman Road and north of the Warner Road alignment. (101.2± acres). Requesting Review for an Industrial Development. Sean Lake, Pew & Lake, applicant; The Dale C Morrison Trust, Owner.

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard presented the case.

Chair Banda invites the applicant to speak.

**Applicant Brian Sandstrom:** I'd like to talk through any comments about how it is proposed and then also get some feedback on some tweaks that the owner and the construction team are wanting to investigate.

**Chair Banda:** Okay, well, we appreciate it. So we'll open up the discussion to the board and we'll work through those as we get them or

**Vice Chair Johnson:** No renderings?

**Applicant Brian Sandstrom:** We actually have them. They look good. I don't know what else to say.

**Boardmember Astle:** It is a good-looking building though. The only note I had was perspectives please.

**Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard:** We do have them. I can make sure and can send that out.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** I can tell there's care taken to design but it's just so hard to just to evaluate it without those. But it does look like, I think you had a comment about the exterior scuppers maybe we can look at those. But the movement in the facades looks good. I was actually pretty excited to see what those canopies look like. They look like some kind of like lightweight kind of shade trellis.

**Applicant Brian Sandstrom:** Yeah, they are. So, on the canopies, what we want to do is bring some emphasis to the entryways and bringing the canopies high is one way that we achieve, formalizing the entryways and to make the shading effective, we put the horizontal louvers and you get a little more solar block, as the sun's tracking onto the glass, then it also adds a nice touch and makes the canopy not look so pencil thin up top.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** I actually like the lightness of them. It's a nice kind of articulation of pinstriping on a building that I think plays nicely with that lightness. I would have liked to see renderings; I still would like to see them. But I don't have any comments as far as changes go.

**Chair Banda:** The other members of the board?

**Boardmember Green:** To piggyback off that comment. I think we keep coming back to, on industrial buildings like this is, once again, the ins and outs of the building. I don't have any issues with the alternative compliance as it's shown. But the renderings would definitely, help immensely. On that the note, I would say is some of the returns on the parapets. For example, where you have the movement in the building, having the returns is something we've hit on again and again. So, I think as long as that's there, it's kind of difficult to tell from these. But as long as that's there, that's probably good.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** I'd like to f talk about that, just to add a clarification, because I think that if you do, particularly in a tilt up building, if you do play with the language of planes and offset planes, then I think it's okay to leave the parapet walls without a return. But if you're treating them as if they're a mass, then it's a whole different ballgame. Right?

**Chair Banda:** Well, in the case of the returns of the parapets, those often played on the commercial buildings not in the industrial tilt up scale. So, we have been making that comment over and over again, and Brian, being a former member of the DRB is fully aware and used to make that same comment. I do have a question. Why aren't we internalizing the downspouts and scuppers on all the downspouts on these ones because I think as elegant as this building is, I think it kind of takes away from it a little bit. I think there's an opportunity there, plus I thought it was a requirement. Is that no longer a requirement in Mesa to internalize the down drains?

**Applicant Brian Sandstrom:** Let's go to the rear elevations. If you look at this all, I mean the short answer is, that the suites, they want to take them outside and they're all internal facing as well. So, from a visibility from the roadside perspective and the way that they get suited out, they wanted to leave the walls without having any of the internal downspouts that you would have taken them inside. So, we looked at it, and I mean, all the buildings are internal facing. That was one of the things that we did in our design, was we sloped roofs in one direction, so that you didn't have any downspouts to the exterior.

**Chair Banda:** Yeah, so for example, building 2D and 2C, there's absolutely no visibility on them anyway. Right? Okay, well then, I don't have an issue with it.

**Boardmember Astle:** Fairly simple solution often is to use a rectangular downspout rather than a standard round or square just to give it a little more of a band look.

**Chair Banda:** Yeah. And that could be a good solution as you're driving through the project. And if they're amenable to that, I think it's a great solution. I think it's something we can probably look at in the future, too. But otherwise, I appreciate that answer because I was concerned because it has future Warner and current Sossaman having that visibility on that and making sure we're not ruining those. I think you said it, so That's why I brought it up

**Applicant Brian Sandstrom:** Early on, when we started out we had them internalized and that's also, you can see in those elevations, the verticality reveals and so what we want to do is make them kind of go away. But due to the suites and then also due to the maintenance issue. The ownership team wanted to keep them outside. Okay, so we push everything, so that they're all internal facing.

**Chair Banda:** Okay, well said. Thank you, sir.

**Boardmember Thomas:** I'm going to break my normal comment here. I actually think the white on the doors on this one plays okay, because the way the line breaks at the top of those doors, and I think it plays fine with it. But this is the second, third Ware Malcom project we've seen. The night renderings would have been great. But I've already said at once you guys do great design on these buildings. So, I'm not overly stressed or concerned that this one's not going to look great as well. But yeah, nice work. Thank you

**Boardmember Placko:** Brian is it meant that people are going to be parking here for eight hours a day on these buildings?

**Applicant Brian Sandstrom:** Yes, sir.

**Boardmember Placko:** Because you've got a lot of oak trees in these parking lots, so I just bringing that up. That's up to you guys to decide what you want to do with that. The retention basin on the west side of the project. I think it's planted much more naturalistic than the previous project that was up here. I think my concern with it is the granite color. You're using desert brown, which is a very dominant color. And on the rest of the project, I think it's alright because you're using a very heavy density planting style everywhere. I think it kind of works, but in this area I don't know.

**Applicant Brian Sandstrom:** You're saying in the retention area?

**Boardmember Placko:** The retention area on the west side. Okay, maybe what you need is fewer small shrubs and more bigger trees in that retention area. To not make it look like a moonscape. Remember what the rental car center used to look like at the airport when you drove up and it was just brown everywhere because it roasted the heat gain off of the off of the rock fried all the shrubs? All that was left was a couple of cactus and some trees.

**Applicant Brian Sandstrom:** Okay, so I'll talk to our landscape architect and see where he can get trees in there.

**Boardmember Placko:** Maybe drop the amount of shrubs in the retention area and maybe increase the number of trees in the retention area and I would definitely have them watch what plants they put in the inundated areas especially I would watch the cacti and accents that they're not putting stuff that can't handle being inundated for a while. That's typically trees can handle being inundated more than shrubs can.

**Applicant Brian Sandstrom:** That was going to be my next question, actually. Where the trees root line can be submerged in water. For too long, right? Yeah, the landscape architect will get the right selections.

**Boardmember Placko:** The larger the shrub, the longer it can be submerged, you'd get the accents that want dry roots, they're not going to like it. Smaller shrubs like lantana does, they're not going to want to be underwater. You can fill those things up pretty easily with two or three feet of water on a big storm event. So, I would, just in these large

industrial retention areas, or seed it like ADOT does. I don't know if that that fits your aesthetic. But yeah, I'm afraid if you put in the brown granite, and a bunch of little shrubs, you're going to see the granite and you won't see the plant material.

**Applicant Brian Sandstrom:** Gotcha. Okay.

**Boardmember Placko:** I think that's all I had.

**Chair Banda:** Okay, any other members of the board? Okay, excellent. There was one other thing I wanted to mention real quickly. A certain architect here told me that I would enjoy the design of this building. And now that we're actually seeing the rendering, it will get shared for everybody is well designed. And you're right I am impressed.

**Applicant Brian Sandstrom:** Thank you. Thank you.

**Chair Banda:** It looks fantastic. It is a beautiful rendering. We all agree. The other comment I had, and I forgot to mention earlier is as we get through these areas of heavy traffic, there's one thing I note to the planners that are here today. As we're doing the crosswalks, I think more than a painted crosswalk would be essential, but of some sort of color integrated change, whether it be stamped asphalt or stamped concrete. Yeah, and I just couldn't tell from this rendering here. But I just want to make sure that that is kind of a standard comment making sure that it gets addressed. So, stating that, oh, you have one more thing?

**Boardmember Placko:** One more question Brian. It on the planting plan. It looks like there's a dashed line that runs down the sidewalk and then there's no landscape between the sidewalk and the buildings. I don't know if that's by design. Yeah, I'm looking at what building one A and if you can zoom in close enough on that drawing.

**Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard:** This is about as far as I'm able to zoom on this one.

**Boardmember Placko:** I know it looks like there's space for landscape and it looks like they just didn't put anything in there. It's right up against the building. So, it looks like a little sliver on this this scale of drawing.

**Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard:** Is that the section between the screen wall and the parking?

**Boardmember Placko:** No, I'm between the parking lot and the building.

**Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard:** Essentially along the foundation base?

**Boardmember Placko:** Yeah, so along the foundation base.

**Applicant Brian Sandstrom:** The short answer is that it's all paved there. There's a pedestrian plaza area that were accentuating within there. There's another rendering

that we provided that showed the pedestrian areas, so that the goal is to make those more focal points, and make them more usable to, sprinkle little bits throughout the whole facade

**Boardmember Placko:** Because it looks like it's at least 10 or 12 feet wide. Are you paving all that?

**Applicant Brian Sandstrom:** It's 12 feet. Reason being the City of Mesa's fire pushes us to a 12-foot foundation base so that we don't exceed 30 feet from the building.

**Chair Banda:** So anything else? All right. Hearing that Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard can you provide us the summary of the comments.

**Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard:** Yeah. And Michelle's passing along the rendering of the plazas just for the members of the board can see as well. So essentially, just reiterate that the rendering would have assisted as part of the presentation, as well as just confirm that the parapet returns are consistent with the style of architecture.

**Boardmember Green:** So just maybe a clarification, I think, to Boardmember Johnson's comment, it's about massing. If it's significantly offset, and it's treated like a mass, there should be some return but if it's not, if it's just minor details, that's less important.

**Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard:** Okay. So, it's just on the depth of that articulation essentially. Okay.

**Applicant Brian Sandstrom:** So, if we could just touch base on that quick. So, those elevations, you'll see where there's the vertical masonry piers that go all the way up, we have actually pulled those out proud of the rest of the façade. They come off, a full course of masonry, so that you do get that undulation. And then at the front sides, the walls also return behind, they received the plane about 12 inches as well.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** You did it the right way.

**Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard:** And the additional comments, just concerned about the brown granite color along the basin along the canal and reduce the amount of shrubs and possibly add more trees in order to retain more of that water and become more consistent not to create that browning effect.

**Chair Banda:** Okay, were all comments captured? Excellent. I appreciate it. Brian, yes, sir.

**Applicant Brian Sandstrom:** If you don't mind, I would like to broach one topic. So I appreciate your time to review this. And these comments are great, especially with the landscape, I always enjoy your comments. Even serving with you, Seth, I learned quite a bit sitting with you. So that was a that was time well spent on the board enjoyed it. But we are going to be resubmitting a minor site plan amendment. There's some square footage with the building, I've already broached the topic with staff. And then there are

some tenant things, so they've brought on their leasing team already. And they've got their ideal mix in place. I will say some of the tenant types are looking for, lease rates at a certain dollar value, I'm not sure what it is. But basically, what it's going to come down to is the buildings that are further back that do not have any view from the from the major roadways, from Sossaman and Warner, or from the from the main drive. They're going to be doing some proposed substitutions with the masonry and with some of the front facing glass, and that's something that I wanted to get your thoughts and comments on. I don't know if this is the right time to do that.

**Chair Banda:** I think this is this is exactly the right time because it'll come back here from a design perspective anyway. So, you're correct and mentioned that so you're proposing less glass and what else?

**Applicant Brian Sandstrom:** So if you want to pull up, let's go to 3, for example.

**Boardmember Green:** Chair if I can ask, is this, what you're talking about? Is this going to be part of the phase one that we're viewing right now? Or is this part of a phase two?

**Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard:** It's all single phase.

**Applicant Brian Sandstrom:** That's the other thing. The markets is that procuring building materials, is they'd rather do it all in one shot. So, if you take a look at building 3C you can see this will say the intermediate portion of the building. There has the storefront there, the short piece to the left. One thing that's going to be just one tenant. That's going to have entryways at the book ended sides, so they don't see any need to, put the glass there when it's just going to be, for one tenant. What we're going to propose is just carrying that tilt panel all the way down to the ground, so that you still carry the language of the architecture throughout the site. And then we're going to do some knockout panels in in those places. So that, 15 years from now, it gets broken up into multi-tenant types, they can still put in the glass there. So that's one. If you take a look at the masonry piers.

**Boardmember Thomas:** Brian for that particular area, are you going to carry a color that would simulate, like a glazing color?

**Applicant Brian Sandstrom:** No, so the panel that's up top, we would just carry that panel all the way down. And then you'll see where we have the masonry over on the right-hand side. What we would do is we would keep the color of the masonry, but that's just going to go to concrete, it's just going to be a tilt concrete.

**Boardmember Thomas:** So, would you use a form liner?

**Applicant Brian Sandstrom:** Yeah, we do actually have reveals. So, we're dressing up the concrete with more reveal patterns, so that it still has some visual interest to it.

**Chair Banda:** We're kind of stating here, we're stating that we're going to have the same design color language here just played down for something you can't see. I think it's kind

of the key point of this whole discussion is like, it really is out of sight of the rest. There's no visibility on it at all. But we're still keeping the same language?

**Applicant Brian Sandstrom:** Yes, 100%.

**Boardmember Thomas:** Yeah. I don't have a concern, I would say that as you look at those reveals, or you're going to take the masonry away, talk to your contractor, because putting that much reveal in there, that's extremely time consuming, they should be able to get some kind of form liner to be able to do something there.

**Applicant Brian Sandstrom:** Well, to be clear, we're not going to do eight-inch reveal patterns, there is still going to be a different pattern, but we're not just going to do a blank wall of concrete and then paint it.

**Chair Banda:** Okay. Board any concerns with what he's talking about. Alright, so just for clarification, for everybody here, we're talking about buildings, 2D and 3D. Are there any other buildings that have been impacted by this minor modification?

**Applicant Brian Sandstrom:** There's other buildings but, those are those are the main points.

**Chair Banda:** Okay. Well, if those were the two mains, I would leave it at the discretion of staff at that point in time. I get 3C, 2D, but it will start impacting other areas. I leave it at the discretion of staff to look at it, because like, for example, 2C you probably will be able to see, but 2C on the south side. You would.

**Applicant Brian Sandstrom:** Yeah. So, Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard, if you don't mind going back to the site plan? Yes. You're hitting exactly on some of the discussions that I had with the client. All along that front drive there, the buildings that are fronting right onto the roadway there will still maintain the masonry, but then, if you look at, the glass at building 2B and 2C, for example, those are so far away, so far removed from any public view that those two would get the alternate design elements to it.

**Chair Banda:** Right, but you're talking basically in this case 2B would be the west side, and then 2C would be both east and west side. But the south side of that would still have some visibility on it. So, you'd maintain it. So yeah, I think I think it's important to highlight where these changes are. And I think staff can, Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard can take a look at it specifically to where the request has been placed. And if the board's comfortable with it I think it's something we can move. I'm okay with moving forward with that request.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** Yes, I think work it out with staff, it seems acceptable.

**Senior Planner Lesley Davis:** Chair, I think the one consideration we'll have is whether there's additional alternative compliance necessary for these changes. But we'll certainly need some time to take a look it and see.



**Chair Banda:** I think, in theory, it works out. But yes, if you do need to bring it back, if it does hit that threshold, just forewarn your client that we're going to have to bring it back.

**Applicant Brian Sandstrom:** Yeah. And on that point, Keeping the color, the massing and the color tones. That is something that we're cognizant of, so that we don't go over the alternative compliance.

**Chair Banda:** So yeah, I think ultimately, your articulation is not going to change. We're just talking about a couple elements removed. Okay. I appreciate it. I don't think we need additional summary on that one. Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard. I think this summary is fine. I think this is what we're moving forward with on this. We're looking forward to this coming and going vertical, really liking those canopies. So, thank you, Brian. Appreciate your time

- 3-n **DRB21-00942 District 2.** Within the 3100 block of East Southern Avenue (south side) and within the 1200 block of South 32nd Street (west side). Located east of Lindsay Road on the south side of Southern Avenue. (2.2± acres). Requesting review of a multiple residence development. Tim Boyle, Tim Boyle Design, applicant; Norelhoua, LLC, owner.

**Continued to January 11, 2022**

- 3-o **DRB21-00977 - District 1.** Within the 500 block of West Brown Road (north side). Located west of Country Club Drive on the north side of Brown Road. (4.8± acres). Requesting review of a multiple residential development. Moazam Khan, MoD a+p, applicant; FIFO LLC, owner.

Staff Planner Jennifer Gniffke presented the case.

Chair Banda invites applicant to speak.

**Chair Banda:** Well, thank you, you know, due to the fact that this is an adaptive reuse, there's no more intricacies to I'd like to start off with our vice chair, on comments on this one, thank you.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** These are old friends, but I think he has hit a home run, it's I have no issues with any of the alternative compliance I'm excited to be driving by this on my trips back and forth from Home Depot, and to see this instead of the building that's behind it. But yeah, I love what you've done here, no issues at all.

**Chair Banda:** Okay, open up the rest of the board.

**Boardmember Thomas:** I'm going to agree with vice chair. Johnson, I think this is a great reuse of this building. The only one comment that I have is more toward the site plan, you have quite a bit of, quote unquote, bicycle parking in there. Being an avid bicyclist myself, I'm not going to park my bike out there in the middle. So I'm just going to say that I would recommend looking at something a little bit more secure for your residents for their bike parking. I know what happens to bicycles when you leave them out in those areas. So I think that you have quite a bit of space for that, that you could

use for other landscaping and other things like that. So definitely look at some option there. But this is a great reuse. I think it'll be a great improvement to that neighborhood.

**Boardmember Green:** I just want to compliment I think it looks great. It looks fantastic. I don't have any issues with alternate compliance. I think it fits really well.

**Boardmember Knudsen:** I like how you're repurposing the building. That is wonderful. Please explain to me, I'm kind of having you're mixing black with the brown. And I'm especially looking at the black metal, the siding. Where is that? Exactly? Is that just going to be a small amount?

**Applicant Moazam Khan:** The dark bronze, or are you talking about?

**Boardmember Knudsen:** Well, this says the doors and windows will be the dark bronze. But then you have the black?

**Applicant Moazam Khan:** Yeah, so the dark bronze. It's almost black. When you look at it. It is it's very similar. And then the black just becomes the painted metal details.

**Boardmember Knudsen:** Oh, where's this one going? This one right here. This one is the black siding and facia black. So that oh, how much of that?

**Applicant Moazam Khan:** That's what you see on that elevation? Yeah, on the corners.

**Boardmember Thomas:** That's on the new building on the new building.

**Boardmember Knudsen:** Because the black bean is it's a combination of black and, and the brown. This, I mean, this goes really nice, but this is really really stark. Okay. So I'm thinking either, because these are the windows and the doors, these either go black, or you do this in the bronze. I'm just having a hard time with those playing together. When you have a large facade of this. It's going to really show as black so then you might want to think about doing I would just take a look at that. Because right now to me, they're fighting. And I think it would if you stay consistent, it's going to have a much nicer, elegant flow to if that makes sense.

**Chair Banda:** Okay, other members of the board.

**Boardmember Placko:** I like the planting palette I just would be cautious with the Texas Ebony and the Agave Americana, as they're very spiky plants just, I haven't been able to find them necessarily every everywhere on the plan. But just make sure that are clear of pedestrian routes and where people are getting out of their cars. I would also I don't see a lot of plants on here, they're going to do really well in dense shade other than maybe the Mexican Petunia. So you might just need to be careful that you're not putting plants on north side of those tall buildings that are going to get completely shaded out. The third, the third comment I guess I have is The Canary Island palm. Is that something? A 10 foot Canary Island palm? Sounds like that takes a long time. So I don't know if you guys are going to buy that. If it's going to be a massive thing. If you're if you're

really wanting to date palms. I'm not sure the available I guess I'm saying I'm not sure the availability of a 10 foot clear cut Canary Island palm?

**Applicant Moazam Khan:** Yeah, well, we're looking into that.

**Boardmember Placko:** Okay. Because yeah, we know, because those things are really nasty. So you don't want to you don't want to play with those at all. So yeah, that's the only design and offering that more of that advice and a comment or anything like that. So that's all I have. Okay.

**Chair Banda:** Okay, I'd like to offer a little bit of comments on this one, too. First of all, adaptive reuse is very tricky. So I really appreciate the level of detail here and really appreciate the rendering, it kind of really spells the language of how it lays out and how it's going to actually live and breathe versus the renderings versus the elevations. I hope you're integral into the design of the sign for this apartment complex. You know, I know oftentimes they go to sign companies. But one thing is that was such a unique design and fun design, I really hope that those elements get carried across the sign not just oh, this is the same colors, and really actually have a fun and unique sign really good opportunity there. I have no issues with the alternative compliance because of the adaptive reuse on this because it's an existing form. And all this is kind of limiting on what you can do on the single plane roofline as well as the unscreened mechanical equipment to some degree. So, I appreciate it. I have nothing else to add and make sure the board has nothing else and like to get a summary Jennifer.

**Staff Planner Jennifer Gniffke:** All right. In summary, the board is in support of the of the design. More secure bikes parking areas are recommended. There's a concern that the metal fascia black may conflict with the dark bronze doors and windows. The Texas Ebony and the Agave Americana might be problematic because of their spikiness, plants on the north side of the building should be shade tolerant. The Canary Island palm indicating that it's difficult to find and then finally, this sign is should be integral to the architecture

3-p **DRB21-00978 - District 3.** Within the 1200 block of South Alma School Road (west side). Located south of Southern Avenue on the west side of Alma School Road. (1.1± acres). Requesting review of a drive-thru restaurant. John Hughes, PM Design Group, LLC., applicant; Stephen Herman, Capital Asset Management, owner.

Staff Planner Sean Pesek presented the case.

Chair Banda invites applicant to speak.

**Chair Banda:** Okay, I appreciate your presentation, Sean. Is the applicant here this evening would like to add anything else, John Hughes? Okay, hearing no other additional comment, I'd like to open up to the board. But I did have a question before I open up completely the board. So I take that back. Let me let me ask you a question. So the Fiesta District is another one in the Fiesta District. And this is one that, you know,

kind of hung up Tanner and a few of us the other day. As far as standards, is there like an opportunity or a requirement to have like walkability or presence back to the street or sidewalk on these? I just want to make sure because as we're starting to see, you know, honestly, when I think I Mimi's cafe that was there, it's kind of an icon that sat in that corner for years. To see it go, it's fine. I think if we have the right architecture on there, and I saw something presented on a Raising Canes, where they had a great street presence to it, it was actually I want to say it was on McClintock and Southern on the southeast corner. It actually has Raising Canes that was placed out of an old gas station was there and they put it right there. And it has walkability to it. And it had a very defined feel to it. I think there's an opportunity here too. But all in all, I think I leave it up to the board for comments, but didn't know if there was a requirement in the district specific to walkability or street presence or anything like that.

**Staff Planner Sean Pesek:** Yeah, I can certainly take a look at the Fiesta guidelines. Michelle, do you happen to know?

**Boardmember Green:** Page three, there's three different parts to talks about pushing closer to the street, or if it's setback, the median distance. Yeah,

**Staff Planner Sean Pesek:** I know, we worked with the applicant. This is the fifth iteration. There are obviously some size limitations. And this is I think the site plan that you see is where we're at and I'll let John maybe answer any questions about.

**Chair Band:** No, it's okay. I appreciate it. I know I feel bad because I said the same thing last time. So Tanner knows what I'm talking about. He was there the conversation so open up the Board for discussion. I was just throwing that idea out there if there was a standard or requirements.

**Boardmember Astle:** I guess if nobody's saying anything, I can probably more open the discussion and give exact comments. I have been struggling with this building a little bit. I think that might be the texture There's just so many, almost so many materials, it's hard for me to make sense out of the form, there are some few modern touches going on that I like, as everyone knows, here, I'm a fan of a modern design, but then all of these materials start to pull away from it. So I'm struggling a little bit, maybe the applique items on the building everywhere also are hard for me because I feel like the architecture here, I feel like wants to, to make the statement more than anything that's pasted on the building. So rather than give every comment, I mean, there's other things I can think of, but more just start the conversation. Is anyone else having trouble with the materiality of it, or the color scheme of these materials? Or maybe the quantity of texturized materials that we have here? I don't know, just some thoughts to open up discussion.

**Boardmember Thomas:** But I would say that I made my comment after looking at the color board. And I believe we had these comments with some of the nichia stuff that came up recently on Circle K. And the glossiness of these. I'm not a fan of at all, I will agree with you that there's a lot of different materials going on on this building. One of my first comments when I looked at this was it reminds me of a Wendy's. And I don't think of Canes that way. So that was so my first initial comments.

**Chair Banda:** Yeah, so Dane, I appreciate your comments as well as Scott's. So the reason why I asked the whole question about the walkability component of is you're taking something that had defined street presence, it was the Mimi's cafe. And then you have in and out that it did a very unique in and out on this particular area, which still addressed that walkability of the street had a drive thru had the larger canopies that reached over to the sidewalk side. And it was it was very different. It was it was something that we that we saw it was like I can't remember if the drive thru side of the street side on it had canopies on it. But you're now taking something that has a street presence on it. Now you're giving it very much a dominant drive thru entrance and knowing Raising Canes, they have queues out the door. So it's a great thing for Mesa, I know that Raising Canes is. But there I think there's an opportunity there that not just materiality, but the other shyness, that material was concerned that we had. And I just think there's an opportunity here to really kind of draw away the drive thru side of it and actually bring more of this presence back to the street and make it kind of de-emphasize the drive thru is not trying to say for the street.

**Boardmember Green:** Chair I'll add some comments. I understand what's being said about the materials, there is a lot of different textures. I don't I don't have a concern about it necessarily, though. I think it's possible. I mean, I think you I think you could simplify some of this. For example, The Texas limestone I think could go away and you could just keep brick. Get rid of the wainscoting and keep that. But honestly, my honest opinion is I really don't have any concerns with this building. I think there is a lot of detail. But I think that's kind of what shows is they've put a lot of effort into the design here. So that's, I think that's my comments.

**Chair Banda:** Thank you Boardmember Green. Other members of the Board.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** Yeah, I'm not struggling with it at the same levels as some of the other board members. I have a few little things that I would nitpick. There's some articulation of the parapet wall where I'd like to see some thickness added just so it doesn't look like it's got the skinny wall sticking up. That's a comment that we make quite often. I do like your comment about making sure that we're connecting to any kind of established walkability pathways and yeah, maybe you could reduce the materiality but I kind of like the eclectic mix that they have. I wouldn't take away too much from that. So you know, all things said, I don't have a lot of issue with this building. I wouldn't change a whole lot in my opinion.

**Boardmember Placko:** Okay, I think the landscape needs to breathe a little bit on this one. I think my biggest comment is the yellow bells and the leucophyllum they're just packing stuff onto this site that is going to force the maintenance guys to go out there and turn all these shrubs and the little melon balls the yellow bells should be six to eight feet they want to six to eight feet wide six to eight feet tall and they're using to your point about walkability from the street they're using them to wall this the site off from the street from the entry from the property the south and then from Alma School. And they're jamming them in everywhere they can't I think they need to draw the plant material to the proper size. And don't be in it's like the designers out of California and he's afraid to look

at decomposed granite. And, you know, we have pretty rock here, we don't mind looking at it a little bit. So I think they need to loosen the shrubs up, there's 91 leucophyllum on this little postage stamp of a project. And there's 150 Red Yuccas, I just feel like you know, leave some plants for the next guy. So I think they need to loosen up the plant material, I think it would help if they would draw them to the proper size. And again, I'm the problem with packing them in that size there, you're going to overwater them just by watering one plant and the water will seep and you'll have a soggy mess. So I think that's my concern with this site is just too much landscape here. I think if they were to draw it to the proper size, it would fit the site a lot better.

**Chair Banda:** To Sean's comment though, I know that he did work hard with Raising Canes, only because I'm seeing something that's different from Raising Canes and I normally see from their standard package, he hit it on the head with the whimsies that number one, that canopy edge sign, which is not normal for Raising Canes either. So there are some really nice points here I don't ever want to see go away. I think they're very well done. I once again, I hope the signage for the site isn't just a standard, you know, box line with a monument on it, but actually has some fun elements like the building. There's a real opportunity there. I'm just asking and making sure that we don't just pull this away from the street, but actually integrate it back in there somehow, or some sort of design element, some sort of canopy something to create something tie into the street. So that's my comment. And besides I think this is a well-designed Raising Cane building. Okay, other comments from the from the board. So we do have one kind of comment.

**Staff Planner Sean Pesek:** So there's a consensus about the materials being too shiny, so maybe work to remove, like for example, the Texas limestone. For landscaping, use the proper size for the vegetation along Alma School, and that could be done by maybe loosening up some of the crown cover the shrubs and adding thickness to the parapet wall.

3-q **DRB21-00981 - District 3.** Within the 1200 block of West Baseline Road (south side) and within the 2000 block of South Alma School Road. (west side). (0.75± acres). Requesting review for a remodel of an existing Convenience Market. Esencia LLC, applicant; Bro Brothers LLC, owner.

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard presented the case.

Chair Banda invites the applicant to speak.

**Applicant Jade Mendoza:** I will just like to say that we're planning to change, not replace that concrete material that has been proposed at the bottom part of the facade. Instead, we're planning to use masonry, it will have the same natural tone is just more for trying to use some more durable material on that area.

**Chair Banda:** And when you say masonry, are you talking like a homed material? What kind because I've seen it where it's just a plain CMU?

**Applicant Jade Mendoza:** Yes, just a plain CMU with a natural tone on it.

**Chair Banda:** Thank you. Okay, board, open it up for discussion.

**Boardmember Thomas:** Is the canopy being redone at all to match the building the fuel canopy?

**Applicant Jade Mendoza:** No that's just staying existing, the changes are only for the convenience store.

**Boardmember Thomas:** It'd be nice to see some of that incorporated in.

**Applicant Jade Mendoza:** That existing fuel canopy has the same blue tone that we're using for the awning on the convenience store. So that's our way of matching those two elements.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** The existing gable roof that's on there, or the hip roof is getting removed.

**Applicant Jade Mendoza:** No. So if you see on the facade, you can still see on the backside of it, I believe, right now has some sort of material that is being removed for we're going to cover with that metal that is in front. That you see on the façade.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** I'm having a hard time understanding it. Because in your East elevation I can see the line indicates where that roof form is. But then when I see the side elevations, I don't see that roof form indicated. Is that roof still going to be there when you're done?

**Applicant Jade Mendoza:** Okay, no I apologize that'll be removed.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** Yeah, I just wanted to clarify that.

**Boardmember Thomas:** My understanding from looking at your demo plan, the only thing that's really staying is that west wall, for the most part.

**Applicant Jade Mendoza:** So basically, we're expanding the building on both sides. But the store that is existing right now, those exterior walls will remain and we'll expand over the sides, and then we'll pretty much redo the whole facade of the building.

**Boardmember Green:** Question on that I guess the west side of the building 2 questions, the landscaping that's existing there. There's, at least according to Google Maps, I haven't driven by this site in a while, but there's trees there. Are those trees staying? Okay, so nothing's changed on that part. And then I guess the only other question I had there's a ladder currently for roof access is that staying? I don't see it depicted anywhere.

**Applicant Jade Mendoza:** I believe, and I will have to double check, but I believe we're going to have an internal access.

**Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard:** Yeah. And it's required to be internal.

**Boardmember Green:** Yeah. Okay. That's what I was wondering. Okay. That's all I have for now.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** I just have one more clarifying question. So if I look at the North and the South elevations. You see how your front tower hits the canopy and then just stops. Is that a rendering mistake or is that actually what's happening?

**Applicant Jade Mendoza:** You're talking about that awning.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** So see how the tower element hits the canopy. It's above the canopy, and then it hits the canopy and then below it, I just see trees.

**Boardmember Astle:** I think it's a rendering error.

**Applicant Jade Mendoza:** Yes, correct it is a rendering error.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** Okay? I'd say the only little detail it's a little odd about this is the way that you support the canopy changes, like you have kind of these cables that are holding it up on the sides, and then in the middle, it's supported by buttresses. That's a little bit of an odd switch. You may not even need them.

**Boardmember Astle:** Eliminate those buttresses.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** Yeah, that's what I'm thinking is maybe those are just kind of unneeded articulation. Otherwise, I think you're have a very clean, kind of repurposed here, and I don't have any issues with it.

**Boardmember Knudsen:** I like to say that I appreciate your color palette, it's well done.

**Boardmember Placko:** Just a quick question for you to clarify with the architect. In the northeast corner of the site, right there in the intersection, there are four symbols look like little...they're not in the legend. So again, clarification as to what those are. Yeah.

**Chair Banda:** I guess the, is it still going to be the four brothers ownership? Or? It is okay, so it's not changing signage, or anything are we? Yeah, no. Okay. I don't really have any other comments, I think it was kind of hit on the head by both of our architects here. But I would really hope in the future, we get to see some sort of improvement to the canopy, because I canopy is a very much a generic Chevron canopy. That's, that's my comment, not about the building, but about the overall site. And so that's I'm just going to leave it at that.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** I'll throw one other just idea at you. You know, the integral color CMU block to me is just, like cheap. If you just want to sandblast that or expose some of



the texture? I think that would actually, since it is, you know, your front elevation next to your entrance, I think that that would be a good thing to consider.

**Chair Banda:** Yeah, I actually, that was the reason why I asked to begin with Thank you, Paul. Vice Chair, I really appreciate that. The other thing is too, as we're doing this, the site is very, I drive by it all the time is very sterile with the colors with other uses very, very, very, very bright white. And I'm hoping that we end up kind of toning this down, because this is a very cold palette, not having that same 4,000 or 5,000 Kelvin that we're seeing there. Be a little bit more neighborhood friendly to Dobson Ranch, to tone it down to the 4000 or less. I think that'd be a good statement on there. Besides that I agree with Vice Chair about home CMU or sandblast and CMU to create something a little bit more finished and refined. I have no other comments. Did you have any other comments board? And then we can get a summary from Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard. All right. Thank you.

**Boardmember Green:** Sorry, Chair, I just want to ask one clarifying question. So looking at the once again, I'm just using a Google Maps view, but the events for the tanks look like they're located to the north of the building. I don't know this is just a question. If you're going north on the expansion, is there any way to hide those vents into the build or to cover those up? So they're not just two poles sticking out of the ground? Maybe? No,

**Boardmember Thomas:** Not now. It's existing. You can't do anything with it now.

**Boardmember Green:** That's what I wondered. Alright, nevermind.

**Boardmember Thomas**

I mean, if they were going to redo the canopy columns, like I'd like to see on a normal one, you can easily vent it straight up through the canopy, the columns but you can't now.

**Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard:** Alright, so in summary, you know in the future incorporate the design of the field canopy as part of redevelopment. Eliminate the buttresses on the canopy for the storefront itself in order to create an order the wires to make sense in terms of architectural sense. And to clarify the symbol at the northwest corner of the landscape plan to determine exactly what that plant is.

3-r **DRB21-01057 - District 6.** Within the 4500 block of the South Hawes Road alignment (west side). Located south of Warner Road on the west side of Hawes Road and north side of the Loop 202 freeway. (50± acres). Requesting review of an industrial development. Jason Sanks, Iplan Consulting, LLC., applicant; Billy Maynard, owner.

Staff Planner Sean Pesek presented the case.

Chair Banda invites applicant to speak.

**Applicant Jason Sanks:** Chair and Boardmembers. No, I believe that covers everything. Just wanted to state if you need more details on the pedestrian amenities, both the ones that are hugging the buildings or the amenity nodes I'd be happy to share those but I think you should be able to read the details pretty well in the in the exhibits.

**Chair Banda:** Okay, fantastic. I opened up to the board for this further discussion.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** I want to compliment you on that detailing around the entrances. I think that's very nice the way that wing wall comes out. Like to see that so I don't have any issues with the architecture.

**Boardmember Thomas:** I'm not going to say too much on the dock doors, I think from the renderings. Looks like most of that's going to be, you're not going to be very visible for your dock doors. So just so you know, though, that is a stickler for me. I think overall, though, Butler, you guys do a great job on your design. The other one, you guys just did it earlier at Elliot and the 202 looked great. So I don't have a lot of concerns with this project.

**Boardmember Knudsen:** Thank you. I just wanted to say that I think you did well on the color palette is very nice. And I think it's a nice looking building.

**Chair Banda:** All right, I know Boardmember Placko has a couple comments he would like to share.

**Boardmember Placko:** Alright, I see you're using oak trees in the parking lot. And if you've been here tonight, you know, Mike, your opinion, it's yours up to you. If you do it, I'm just giving you a heads up. I like the way in the retention basin, I like the way that this site is laid out. Whereas not all the stormwater is deposited in one location, it's kind of broken up throughout the site so you don't have this giant moonscape that I was referring to on the other side. And I also like the way that the landscape architect has extended the drainage riprap off into the site to break up the ground plane. However, I still think there's still way too many shrubs in these retention basins. One of the critiques I'd have of the plant legend is appears that there's two plants that have hollow circles as their symbols so I can't tell there's in these retention basins if you were to bring up the landscape plan are just littered with hollow circles and I can't tell because the legend which one it is. But so I can't tell if it's a plant that can handle wet feet or not. So I think you're going to have to watch that could be a leucophyllum could be a nolina I'm not sure.

**Applicant Jason Sanks:** Chair, Boardmember Placko we will address that through a revised landscape plan.

**Boardmember Placko:** I guess my suggestion would be you know, more trees, fewer shrubs in the basins they'll suck up the water and be able to handle being inundated better. And I like I said both within the bottom of the bassin and other areas of the site, the multiple changes in ground plane colors, sizes and textures. Like that's something I'd like to see. That's all I have.

**Chair Banda:** Along the same lines of that landscaping, I'd like to bring up the wall. I'm not a fan of painted split face, I know why they do it but you want to paint face I like I prefer color integrated. So the eight foot masonry wall is all painted. When it comes to split face just not too keen on if you get what you guys think of it. But besides that, I really like the elevations that are provided. I think they're well articulated. I did like the lighting details that were on there as well. By the way, I think they're a lot more fun than your typical standard lighting. And I do appreciate the amenities package. I wish we would see that more often on these industrial sites. So board any other comments or questions?

**Vice Chair Johnson:** Is the split face painted?

**Applicant Jason Sanks:** William with Butler Design is with me today. I believe it is painted. But I can refer back to the architect. If it's the preference of the board to do natural finish on the split face. I'll review that with them and get back to our planner.

**Chair Banda:** It's my preference. I don't know what the rest of the board thinks.

**Boardmember Thomas:** From a long term maintenance perspective, you're going to be better off with interval color and knowing how long it takes to get joist these days, you got plenty of time to order.

**Chair Banda:** So I think the consensus is we prefer to see color integrated specifically on the split face. So and all the all that wall. There's painted at this point in time. So all right, hearing other comments from the board. I say we go ahead and move on in summary, so thank you. Looking forward to this Sean.

**Staff Planner Sean Pesek:** So two points, just the oak trees within landscape islands consider replacing with a different species and then maybe loosen up the landscaping within a retention basin, there's a lot of shrubs, and then fine tune the landscape plan. If there are shrubs shown on the on the legend, and they aren't shown on the landscape plan remove them, and then using color integration on the split face greening.

3-s **DRB21-01068 - District 6.** Within the 6200 block of South Ellsworth Road (west side). Located north of Pecos Road on the west side of Ellsworth Road. (19± acres). Requesting review of a Maintenance, Repair, and Operations Hangar located at Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport. Andrew Whisler, Kimley-Horn, applicant; Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority, Owner.

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard presented the case.

Chair Banda invites the applicant to speak.

**Chair Banda:** Okay, appreciate it. Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard, for the quick presentation. I'm going to have the time over to Andrew for any additional things you'd like to add if you need to.

**Applicant Sterling Margetts:** Yeah, I'm actually Sterling Margetts with Kimley Horn. We've been working with Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard. And it's been a great experience working with staff. I'm here to answer any questions that we might have. And then also our architect Ken Lauer with BRPH is present. So we're excited about this project and to have this come forth in the city of Mesa.

**Chair Banda**

Okay, really appreciate your patience open up to the board for further discussion.

**Boardmember Green:** Maybe I'll start chair, you know, the one thought I appreciate the effort going into their roof articulation. This is one place where I'd almost say get rid of it. To be honest, I mean, that's, that's my opinion. This is it's, it's a hanger. And not to downplay that. But I think the effort on the design should be focused on the main entrances and kind of guest lobby areas. The only thing that came to mind in terms of if we were trying to meet or do that, I mean, one of the things that came to mind was the San Jose jet center. I mean, there's a lot of long low buildings, but there's some slants there's different, there's different refer articulations there, but I think what I'm seeing is the what do we call this the battlements, the battlements. And I think it almost detracts in that sense, I think you're almost better with you know, something that's, that's either flat, or, or if you're going to really articulate it, like make it more decorative, you know, not just the battlements. So that's one place where I'd say, in this case, the alternate complaints may be better to just get rid of the battlements. So my thoughts?

**Vice Chair Johnson:** Yeah, I couldn't agree more. I think that's a great idea. One, one thing I think that you have done is building as well as you get these external scuppers. Which I think if you did a little bit of a detail, edit to them, actually, they could be a really great accent on the on the front of the building, I see. You know, they start to create the a breakup in that elevation, which is nice, I would prefer, I think we made this comment on an earlier project. Rather than see that kind of tapered shape at the top, if it was just a clean, straight line all the way down, that's just a detailing thing that you can take care of. And then I think that if you're going to do it there, maybe you do it around the rest of the building. In that case, it's just, you know, slip in a white panel of metal. The other thing I would encourage you to take a look at is maybe a little bit more play with your form liner on the one story portion of the building. I think it's you've got some really long lines of sort of unarticulated surface in the same comment would go for the external scuppers on that portion of the building.

**Boardmember Thomas:** I'm going to agree with the board members what comments they've already said, I would say that your entry though, you could bring some sort of canopy out on and I'm going to refer to a project Signature Flight in San Jose. There's a huge front awning that comes out in front of that building, and really draws to that entrance location. If you can look at something like that and kind of bring it in.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** I think there is a canopy?

**Applicant Sterling Margetts** over the entry area, there is a canopy that does extend.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** Is that glass or metal?

**Boardmember Thomas:** Yeah. So here, this is what I mean just something that kind of draws that aerospace kind of like drawn into it. And again, you can look that project up but it really draws to that front entry kind of thing. Outside of that I think it's an exciting project for the city to be bringing in

**Boardmember Astle:** Yeah, simple for me. I don't need to add much I ultimately am excited about the project. I think the simplification of it and making a little bit more of a prominent statement in a place or two is enough to let the size and scale of the building speak for itself without any unnecessary embellishments. I like what you're doing thanks

**Boardmember Placko:** I know we're not supposed to speak on site plan, but I kind of like the staggering of the parking islands in the parking lot. So

**Chair Banda:** That's a design comment.

**Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard:** I'll consider that landscape design.

**Boardmember Placko:** I actually think you know, not in this project, but when we have big 40 foot warehouses and a narrow landscape strip in a parking lot that doing this, instead of just doing some islands would be a thing that we should to get better separation from the buildings and the street, but that's here nor there. The only comment I have, and I know you guys have heard this before, just watch the make sure you're, you're aware of oak trees and parking lot islands. So that's the only comment I have. Thank you.

**Chair Banda:** Okay, so I do agree with both Boardmember Green and Vice Chair Johnson about the battlements. I think meaningful articulation is great. But the one thing I don't agree on is that the downward downspouts and scuppers on the actual office building side of it, I think those need to be internalized, I get it on the hanger side, where you have a little bit more of the nuances of metal building. And but here, I think that it takes away from the office, I think there's it, there's simple ways to handle that. I think it should be internalized, that is a standard that we have. And it's kind of standard practice here in Mesa, and pretty much throughout the Valleys to internalized them on office buildings. And the other thing is to I do agree with the creating a little more whimsies to the site, I think, you know, when you think of gulfstream, you think a little bit of aerospace, you think of that high end, it has great presence from the hangar from the runway side, but it doesn't have that same great presence on the actual parking lot side, which is inside most of us without airplanes, see. So that'd be me. So that's all I had for comments. I appreciate it. Looking forward to this. I'm presuming there's an NDA. We will get a summary from Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard.

**Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard:** Overall concerns about the battlements, either remove them completely or provide more decorative kind of to embellish and create that whimsy to either clean the scuppers on the hanger portion, and remove them completely from the office portion, and then create some more form liners along the base office

portions to create that articulation that essentially the scuppers are creating right now. And to increase the awning of the office entry to kind of draw the eyes to that entry rather than to the hangar where they currently

**Chair Banda:** Just for clarification, it wasn't just increasing the awning it was actually creating a little bit more visual aerodynamic interest to the awning.

**Applicant Sterling Margetts** Can I just ask a point in clarification. Yes, we talked about the downspouts especially on the visual we're looking at right now that's the that's the north side of the building. This is the side of the building that we have all the downspouts that are currently being shown the office tower, which is on the west side, those are actually internal. They got the curtain wall, the three story curtain wall on the right, those are actually internal, because there's potential, you know, maybe things down the road might expand. But on everything on the downspout side, so when you when you talk about on the office tower, you're talking about that North lean two, which is kind of like our back of house kind of maintenance shop area, the main office area is going to be over where the curtain wall system is.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** Question is, since this is not functional office space are we required to internalize the downspouts?

**Applicant Sterling Margetts:** That is correct because we were using that as additional features like we were doing with the hangar there as well.

**Vice Chair Johnson:** I think the right thing would be to internalize them. I personally would be open to the architectural detail that makes it integral but talking about it I just wanted to make sure we clarified for them.

**Staff Planner Joshua Grandlienard:** And just the standard oak tree comment as well was the last one.

**4 Discuss and take action on the following Design Review cases:** None

**5 Planning Director Update:** None

**6 Adjournment**

Boardmember Green moved to adjourn the meeting and was seconded by Boardmember Astle. Without objection, the meeting was adjourned at 7:20 PM.