

**Tuesday, May 10, 2022
Virtual Platform
57 East 1st Street
4:30 PM**

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

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

MEMBERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT:

Lesley Davis
Cassidy Welch
Kellie Rorex
Jennifer Merrill
Josh Grandlienard
Robert Mansolillo
Kwasi Abebrese
Alexis Jacobs

OTHERS PRESENT:

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

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

- 1 Call meeting to order.**
- 2 Consider the Minutes from the April 12, 2022, Design Review Board Meeting.**

A motion to approve the Minutes from April 12, 2022, Design Review Board Meeting was made by Boardmember Thomas and seconded by Vice Chair Johnson.

Vote: 7 – 0

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Banda – Johnson – Placko - Thomas – 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.

- 3a DRB21-00910 District 6.** Within the 7700 to 7900 block of East Elliot Road (south side). Located east of Sossaman Road on the south side of Elliot Road. (18.6± acres). Requesting the review of a multiple residence development. Brian Andersen, BMA Architecture, LLC, applicant; ACERO HAWES, LLC, owner.

Staff Planner Sean Pesek presented the case.

Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak.

Boardmember Green: On the plans I saw, the proposed landscape was set back due to application of the fire code. I'm not seeing that here. Is this an application of the fire code or is this Alternative Compliance?

Staff Planner Sean Pesek: I should have clarified; it is due to the application of the fire code in the conflict with the foundation base in the access lane distance.

Boardmember Green: I just wanted to get that clarified. Thanks.

Chair Banda: Okay, any other members of the Board have anything? Even positive comments, make sure we're all on the same page.

Vice Chair Johnson: I think it is great. I support.

Boardmember Thomas: I don't really have any major concerns. I mean, typically, I do have concerns with projects like this because they do seem very flat. But looking at the renderings and everything the patios really do recess and there's good articulation on that side where the patios don't always come out as far as the roofline and some other things. I am in support of this project. I think it'll be good. It'll be interesting to see how it blends with all the rest of the development that's going on in this Hawes Crossing area. I know there's a few other projects that are in the works. I know you guys came in first. I guess we'll look to that standard.

Boardmember Astle: Yeah, keeping it simple. I like the project. I definitely agree that the two-dimensional elevations make it a little hard to see the dimensionality of this one, it looks great in perspective, not a whole lot of concern there. The one potential comment is maybe metal rails and view fencing, you could potentially start to match some of those metals. I see one of them might be a little darker than the other. That could almost look good. It is a similar color, but overall, not no comments. I like it.

Vice Chair Johnson: Since you brought up the rails, I do like how transparent they are, and they keep those thin plates. But obviously when you do that anything that goes out on those balconies is visible. I'm not sure what sort of regulations will be in place through the HOA to regulate that. But I think that that would be a good thing to incorporate.

Chair Banda: We have a very specific design standard that it has to be blocked off. But this provides a little bit more transparency in areas to the overall site. You know, when you see this, the style of apartments, it's a breath of fresh air, the way the building is modulated and articulated like this. Breaking into these, we'll call them tower elements that kind of break it down really nicely, and then kind of brought together with a single plane on top. I do appreciate you providing a carport detail. I'm glad you provided that. I'm presuming that's going to be matching the color scheming through the apartment complex, but it would be nice with more detail on the carport, carport details could be more enhanced for the future. But all in all, I think it's a solid project and design.

Boardmember Green: Chair, I was just going to echo your comments on the carport, you've got just about half of the stalls covered that are proposed. And that's a pretty big number. Making sure that matches and integrates, I think is a great thing to consider.

Boardmember Knudsen: I did have a question about the canopy. So, I'm glad that that was brought up. Overall, I support the project as well. I think the color palette is well done. And I have no other no other comments just well done. Thank you.

Boardmember Placko: I don't really have any comments, they didn't really do a shrub layout so it's really hard for me to tell. So, I'll just kind of give the generic comments that I always give with projects like this, watch sun exposure, that sunny plants be on the sunny side of the building the shady plants on the shady side of the building and to watch any kind of thorny plants along pedestrian paths because you've got these tight pedestrian corridors because there's some pretty nasty plants on this plant legend. Just don't have them up next to the sidewalks in the tight little areas. And I think the tree planting needs to be refined because there's lots of trees on top of storm drain lines, there's lots of trees on top of SRP cabinets on top of light poles, so I just think they need to think a little bit about where they're putting all their trees a little more. Take a closer look at it. But I don't have any other comments on that.

Chair Banda: Okay, and then just to wrap it up before Sean does a summary, I'm going to speak to lighting. I always do. Making sure you pay attention to the lighting quality. 3500 Kelvin or less. And then the other thing is even in concept, you might have a drawing for a sign. But I think there's an opportunity here for a really neat sign. Hopefully, your architect gets involved to some degree to make sure that gets integrated on a nicer monument sign. That's one thing you're actually starting to see Valley wide, is you'll see even old apartments, they'll actually come in and they'll hire a high-end sign designer to kind of carry that detail to the street and it really kind of speaks and draws people in initially.

Staff Planner Sean Pesek: Thanks Chair. So, in summary, we have comments about the carport detail for future projects, just making sure we get a little more detail on that. 3500k or less for lighting. There's opportunity for high quality monument signage. Explore other railings for the balconies, no comment on the color palette, possibly match the metal rails on the balconies with the view fencing along Elliott and then be aware of the plant selection along the south facades because the sun exposure and then check the species along the pedestrian walkways, make sure that they aren't a thorny species.

Boardmember Knudsen: And also, keep in mind the parking canopies.

Vice Chair Johnson: Sean, just to clarify one thing. I don't think any of us requested a different railing at the balconies. We just want to make sure that there's provisions in place to control people storing things out there.

Staff Planner Sean Pesek: Okay.

Applicant Daniel Perez: Yeah, just to clarify in that aspect, since we are owners and we maintain our own properties and manage them, it's kind of battle every day, but we're trying to keep control over those exposures of all that kind of stuff.

- 3b DRB21-01257 District 1.** Within the 2900 to 3100 block of North Oakland (west side), within the 4200 to 4400 block of East Palm Street (south side), and within the 2900 to 3100 block of North Omaha (east side). Located west of Greenfield Road and north of McDowell Road. (3± acres). Requesting the review of an industrial building expansion. Robert Brown, Robert Brown Architects, applicant; KGN, LLC, Owner.

Staff Planner Kellie Rorex presented the case.

Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant Robert Brown: I don't have much to add. The original site plan and building were approved back in the 90s with the intention of a future expansion, which is what we're doing now. So, we're completing what was intended originally. And we believe we've tried to match the existing building as much as possible. And so, we look forward to any comments you might have.

Chair Banda: Wonderful, we appreciate it Robert, and I'll open it up to the Board for additional comments and questions.

Vice Chair Johnson: I think you're doing the right thing as far as matching what's there, it seems appropriate. I guess two concerns I have is that I don't know what the condition of the 1990s original is. It's nice. You said as far as like, does it need to be repainted or whatever when you build a new one? Is there going to be an issue with matching it?

Applicant Robert Brown: We were trying to use the existing colors as much as possible but it will be repainted so it will be consistent throughout.

Vice Chair Johnson: And same question as far as lighting goes, will the existing lighting and the new lighting be consistent, or do you have any thoughts in regard to that?

Applicant Robert Brown: That might be the toughest thing. Matching the lighting because fixtures back then and fixtures now are different, the only light fixtures that are being added are the ones that are going to be on the west side and those are not going to be visible at the same time you're going to be seeing ones on the north and south. So, we have a couple of wall packs on that west side.

Boardmember Thomas: Yeah, so I mean, I think you've done a good job trying to match. I agree that to paint the entire building to match. And I think that you've done a decent job it looks like. I'll let Seth comment more on it but trying to increase the landscaping to meet code. I think it works. I don't really have any major comments about it.

Boardmember Astle: Similar, I just think, considering we're attaching it to an existing building, this is the right move. And I like that we've embellished it a little bit more to give it a slightly more current presence considering what we've got.

Boardmember Green: The only question I have is, so it looks like it's mostly the building getting a little bit of landscaping, and then you're also doing some trash enclosures that are going to get updated too, I'm assuming those are going to match the existing ones on the east side. Is that true?

Applicant Robert Brown: Yeah, we're flipping the western trash enclosure. Currently, you have to go through the back end. So, they don't have to back up now. So yes, we're going to use the same materials, which is the masonry.

Boardmember Green: That's all I was going to say is I think just keeping with the same thing, make it match. I think that looks great.

Boardmember Knudsen: Yes, I think this will blend really well with the existing building. We drove by and looked at it this weekend, and I think you did a good job. And I don't have any issues with your Alternative Compliance.

Boardmember Placko: I don't really have any concerns on the landscape palette, I think you've got a good palette there. I always recommend or caution people against using oak trees in parking lots if the people are parking there all day long. Because the oaks drop a sap that gets on the cars, and then it has to be buffed out. If people are there for half an hour, commercial place that people are just in and out it's not a problem. But if you park under the tree all day long, it becomes quite annoying. My other concern is the condition of the existing irrigation system. I see you're going to be adding a bunch of plant material. Do you know anything about that existing system? I do not. It'd be a challenge; I suspect you're going to be cutting into pipe that's probably 20 years old. Good luck, you may end up having to replace all the pipe. Okay, because you won't get nice clean cuts. The conditions are pretty low after time. So yeah, it gets brittle, and it cracks and then you can't get good seals. So that's all that's my only comment, that's not really a comment, just so, and that thing about the oaks, it's your call, okay.

Chair Banda: Okay, I think we got all the comments from the Board, one of the questions I was going to ask was about lighting too, and I had to double check on it too, because I thought they were replacing all the luminaires all the wall packs on the outside, because that's what it appeared to be, I would actually like it to be consistent, because you will notice there'll be different colors, not just different fixtures, and it will show from the street. If I were to make a condition it would be to make sure that they're

consistent all across that building. But all in all, I want to state that you have good bones initially, it is what helps with a good addition because we've seen other ones where they tried copying the same and it just doesn't work. Complements to the original design and with the new blend, so thank you.

Staff Planner Kellie Rorex: So really, the only comments I have is just making sure everything's consistent and that the lighting is replacing all the lighting with one type of light.

- 3c DRB22-00039 District 6.** Within the 6800 to 7100 blocks of the South Crismon Road alignment (east side) and within the 10000 to 10200 blocks of East Pecos Road (south side). Located south of Pecos Road and east of the Crismon Road alignment. (37.5± acres). Requesting the review of an industrial development. George Pasquel III, Withey Morris PLC, applicant; Cubes at Gateway, LLC, owner

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch presented the case.

Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak

Applicant Adam Baugh: This is the Cubes at Gateway. It's a 260 plus acre site, within this case the 37 acres here. This is the fulfillment of this big case that happened some time ago and we're finally making it happen. You saw the Lowe's one, maybe two months ago. And then later on the agenda, you're going to see another property that's also part of this original case. So now we're bringing in buildings A and B. And Building D will come in soon as well. So, you're starting to see the build out and evolution of this case here. CRG has worked closely with the architecture team to do their signature red color, but to make sure that the street points are articulated, whereas the dock side have less of that visibility, therefore less of the type of attention relative to the street side with this. I think on the phone or Zoom is the architect, Michael and so if there's any particular questions about some of the design, he can also answer some of that as well. Between the three of us we're happy to take any questions you might have.

Chair Banda: Okay, wonderful. I open it up to the Board for discussion.

Boardmember Thomas: I'll jump in really quick. Looks like the only place form liners are being used is a couple of the large narrow ups and downs or like the slivers, is that correct? Correct. I really don't like those same areas where the panel looks like it goes up probably about four feet above, but there's no depth to it. It's just the panel itself that sticks up there. Is that five feet? Yeah. So right there, you can see where that gray panel sticks up. There's really no depth to that to show any kind of structure itself. It's just a panel that shooting up right there. Looks fine, straight on, but you're never going to see it straight on. You can maybe add some wings back, something like that. I mean, we've seen that on other projects, to where it looks like at least has some sort of depth in it. And I'll lean on, Paul and Dane to give a little bit more comment on that. But overall, most of the time, I'm hit and miss on the tilts. But I would like to see a little bit more texture to this a little bit. It looks like the form liners are only being used in a handful of

spots. The shade canopies that are out front could be improved quite a bit looks like. But I'm not a huge fan of their design.

Chair Banda: I think holistically I really liked the strong corner that's got a strong presence to it. And I'm not a fan of the five-foot parapet. We call them battlements. But here, you're not just doing it to do it, there's actually a meaningful design to it. I really appreciate it. But the one thing that stood out to me was those canopies, it was reminiscent of Tomorrowland, I think of like Disneyland of the 1960s. It kind of had its own standout. It felt almost foreign to the overall building. It didn't feel like it was well integrated. And so, I would agree with Boardmember Thomas that I think that there's where some focus and improvement could be is on those entrance, the central entrance area.

Applicant Adam Baugh: So, are you thinking that, besides changing the type, that they be integrated or connected with the building?

Chair Banda: Really depends because right now it's foreign to the design to so it's not even taken on the same vernacular of the overall building. And so, I guess that's my concern.

Applicant Mike Moran: Okay, so the sloped facia of the canopies, really, we're trying to relate to the form of the eyebrow canopy and the cornice at the corners. And so that really is where that geometric came from for the facia. But in this in this particular building the canopy doesn't have the proximity to the corner element that we had on Building C. So possibly we could look at the facia and reimagine that, in the light of, you know, its location next to the center entry, which is much more rectilinear and has a squarer geometric feel. I also would like to just comment that the vertical panels are recessed from the main façade by a foot. So, there is a step back at each of those, there'll be a shadow line, and the corners of the low parapet will stand against those panels. We're trying not to recess them too deeply, because it's a much smaller building than Building C. We don't want to take away too much interior area to make that feature happen. But if the Board feels like it's necessary, we could maybe increase that so there's more volumetric play in the façade.

Chair Banda: Thank you. Boardmember Green?

Boardmember Green: Yeah, Chair. I was just going to say I appreciate the architect's comments on this. That's what my feeling was is that these elements are trying to play into that, like the main entrance, the geometry if you just drew the line across the elevation, it just matches up. But I think it's too disconnected. And that would be my concern. Yeah. So, I understand where it's coming from, but I feel like there needs to be a little bit more connection to the building.

Vice Chair Johnson: I think there's something displeasing about the shape it feels almost like a mushroom topped. Yeah, I think even if you inverted it, I think it would be highly successful.

Boardmember Green: I agree. I think you're drawn to that upward movement if it was inverted. The only other comments I was trying to understand the wall length alternative compliance request. So, 50 feet is the requirement. Where are they at right now?

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch: Chair, Boardmember Green, I don't know the exact dimension.

Boardmember Green: I don't have an issue with it. I feel like it has worked so far. But I do think, you know, when you look at all three of these alternative compliance requests, the wall length, the materials and the 50% of the I, I feel like ins and outs and texturing is kind of the theme that I feel like it needs. I appreciate the form liners and I appreciate the reliefs. I don't have a problem with a parapet with the relief inside of it that though. I think that's actually kind of a good detail. I don't necessarily have a concern unless anybody else does about those conditions. I just I think adding a little bit more texture in somewhere, through one of those articulations or form liner or something might be useful. I think the entrance and the corners look great. I feel like those were nailed really well. And then the only other comment I have is on the SRP transmission lines. I understand they're not there right now. Are these going to be overhead or underground lines?

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch: They will be overhead. KV230.

Boardmember Green: I think the only thing I would comment on is, my pet peeve is the trees underneath. If you've got planting underneath, and you're trying to put trees there, just make sure you've got the clearances you need for future lines. Don't hack the tree off.

Applicant Mark Sonnenberg: We have been in serious coordination with SRP on all that. I mean, we've had really good constant dialogue with them as it relates to those items. So, anything that we've planned, has been items that we've discussed with them.

Applicant Adam Baugh: Boardmember Thomas and Green your comment regarding texture, is it a particular portion of the building that you'd like to see more texture?

Boardmember Green: For me, to be honest, I feel like there's a lot of relief with color. But if it's a long flat plane, the color may not be enough. And so that's where texturing either through form liner or reliefs in the panels can start to play. I'm going to lean on some of the other people in the Board to see if there's any specific comments about that but to me, I want to leave it up to you as much as possible. But there's a reason we have this standard there that we're trying to meet.

Vice Chair Johnson: I just have one comment and it's a preference more than anything, but I think because this is and especially around those entrances is very modern has a very sleek feel to it. I'm questioning the selection of split face block in that area. I mean just my personal preference I think it would look better as a smooth block or ground face block. But I like the way it's a stacked orientation rather than a running block I think that reinforces that kind of modern look. Speaking to the amount of texture

that's along the façade of it you know, given what this is I think we've seen more challenging applications I don't really have an issue with it here.

Chair Banda: Especially with the size. Some of the ones where I've asked for additional texture were 800,000 square feet or a million square feet. For this size and scale, I think it reads well. The only other comment I have is in relation to the center office, it feels incomplete. I think you did a great job kind of creating that, you know, the geometric detail on the bottom parapet but the top feels like it's missing its hat. If you were to carry that you did on the corners, you don't have to wrap it, but I think if you were even to put that detail along the top of it as a parapet detail, I think it would look really sharp. That's just my opinion though.

Vice Chair Johnson: My take on it is either lose the bottom or wrap the whole thing.

Boardmember Astle: My comment was going to be, if we wrapped this central entrance and then addressed the canopies in both locations in a slightly different way, I think the whole thing might tie a little bit more together. But again, there's some subjectivity there. And I know that design has been thought through for each of these elements. But I think for those canopies to work, the whole thing needs to be wrapped. These umbrellas in the front, I know it's just a rendering and that doesn't necessarily mean much, but I'm struggling with them. I think they would need to be selected carefully to be there; it seems like it would want to be more of a fixed element at such an important corner of the project overall. Love the project, I think it's going to do great just need to tie a few of those little loose ends together and it'll be done.

Applicant Adam Baugh: Are you referring to kind of that that edge wrapping that goes around the red corner there?

Boardmember Astle: So, the white wrap around the corner entrance, potentially do the same to the center entrance, and then let those canopies and maybe have a canopy down on this end as well, where the people are trying to sit and kind of work that together a little bit.

Vice Chair Johnson: You guys did too good of a job here. You got us all, like passionate about it.

Boardmember Astle: Great project. Thank you.

Boardmember Placko: So, you guys you guys have met with SRP? Yes. Have they looked at this planting plan?

Applicant Hannah Marshall: Everything we design we upload to SRP's portal, and they are in the process of reviewing. They're still in the process of designing where their poles are going. So, we're kind of just working together as we go. We understand that there's some risks here and there. And that's our responsibility. But you know, all of what you see on the plan has been shared with them.

Boardmember Placko: Have they asked you to put their pole set up areas and wire setup areas on there? Are they allowing trees in their wire set up area?

Applicant Hannah Marshall: They actually do allow planting and landscaping in their easement as long as it's 50 feet away from where they plan pole locations.

Boardmember Placko: They allow them in the easements Yes, but they have pole setup areas. And they have wire setup areas. And they do not allow trees in the pole and wire setup areas.

Applicant Hannah Marshall: Are you talking about the setup for when they actually build, it is what you're saying?

Boardmember Placko: No, when they maintain it.

Applicant Hannah Marshall: I see. Well, I mean, we've been working with them. And they've been looking at all of our plans, and our engineers have been going back and forth with them. So, I feel like we have a pretty good idea what they're approving at this point.

Applicant Mike Morhan: SRP has given us some preliminary locations of where their poles are planned. We are aware there is 50-foot radius, no build area, around those station points. And any landscaping that we have on the edge of the easement is off of their tree and shrub list. So, we're working within their published guidelines for what that material can be and what the tree species and in shrub species are allowed to be.

Boardmember Placko: Be careful with SRP, there are several other projects coming through today that are similar like this, and they've all got their pole setup areas and their wire setup areas. I'll move on from that, because if they're going to allow you to start putting trees into their wire setup areas, I want to know that. That's where I'm going with this. There's no information on here about the ground plane surfacing. I'm curious about that. I would follow up on that. I might suggest you do a more rugged ground plane surface along your perimeter and your retention areas and then have something a little more refined up closer to the building. I would also not recommend in your parking lot islands using the Sweet Acacia or the Mexican Red. Sweet Acacia is deadly plant, and you'll skewer people with them. And the Mexican Red just will not handle the reflected heat. They will cook out one summer in the parking lot. So that's all.

Boardmember Knudsen: I had no additional comments. I'm looking forward to the project.

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch: Thank you Chair. So, we'll be looking at the depth of those raised vertical panels and seeing if we can add some wing walls to give the appearance of more depth when you're looking at that building facade from an angle. In addition, adding some additional texture to the elevations, particularly those long planes, so most likely on the west and east sides of the facade. And then looking at the entry

element for the center office. Either capping that fully to match the corner elements or removing it entirely. And then redesigning the canopies to be more consistent and integrate more with the overall building design.

Chair Banda: Then we had a comment about the ground face CMU versus the split face.

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch: Right consider a smooth/ground face CMU versus split face CMU. And then in regard to the landscaping, making sure that that ground surfacing is noted, more rugged on the perimeter and more refined close to the building. And then adjusting the landscaping that's shown within the parking lot.

Boardmember Green: I was just going to say the only other thing I would note is on the texturing as the discussion progressed, I think texturing adding like additional form liner or reliefs like that may not be needed if that center part is treated. And there's maybe an adjustment in those ins and outs, the texturing you wouldn't have to add additional texturing I think that would take care of it would bring it together. So just make note it's not required.

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch: Yeah, I've got the smooth CMU and then to clarify Boardmember Green's comments in regard to the texture could be resolved by addressing some of the other comments that were made.

3d DRB22-00046. District 6. Within the 7700 to 7900 blocks of East Velocity Way (south side) and within the 6300 block of South Downwind (west side). Located east of Sossaman Road and north of Pecos Road (28± acres). Requesting the review of an industrial development. Glenn Klipfel, ADM Group Inc., Applicant; Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority, Owner.

Staff Planner Sean Pesek presented the case.

Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak.

Boardmember Thomas: Can I just clarify that on the elevations, P2, 3 and 4, are those all going to have some sort of form liner to them? I know reading the elevation it doesn't say. That's why I'm asking. But P6 clearly calls out for a board lap. It looks as if there would be a texture to it. It's just there's a lot of form liner.

Applicant Jeff Fleming: Yes, there's form liner on this building. Most of it is where the light blue is, it's very similar to the building we did about a year and a half ago right across the street. So, it's kind of tying in the whole complex with similar materials and colors.

Boardmember Thomas: So, Jeff, just to clarify, the P5 is not the only one that is really receiving the form liner and the other ones are just more for look.

Applicant Jeff Fleming: The light blue color insert is what is the form liner. Everything else is scored.

Boardmember Thomas: Additionally, I like it if this is true, but your storefront where your door entrances are is that full height?

Applicant Jeff Fleming: The storefront doesn't go full height it's the underneath the canopy is storefront and then we also have some storefronts on the corners that are a little bit different as well. Yeah, the single door units which help break up that facade has glass going all the way.

Boardmember Thomas: So, the single door is full height from ground all the way to the 36 feet?

Applicant Jeff Fleming: Yes.

Vice Chair Johnson: Sean, can you go to the rendering of the entrance? So just to clarify, that is the form that's above the blue in the rendering that looks like it's got some kind of texture to it, but it doesn't appear to be noted that way in elevations.

Applicant Jeff Fleming: I believe that is scoring not necessarily a form liner.

Chair Banda: As a clarification the scoring shown on the elevations does not match the scoring shown on this rendering. And so, we were all under the impression like it almost looks like you have a long running pattern there. And then here, it doesn't appear like this long scores. And here, you actually have completely different scoring. So, what I'm seeing in the rendering, I like. What I'm seeing in the elevation is not as amazing.

Boardmember Thomas: There's a lot of textures going on just the elevations. Right? Hard to read.

Vice Chair Johnson: I'll say for my part, I think the design is great. I really liked the movement, there's really good breaking down of the building mass using all of these different joints and textures. The one thing about the rendering, at least on my screen is it looks a little purple on the metal panel. But I've seen it now in person and I do like the color, so I don't have any recommendations. I think this looks good.

Chair Banda: Thank you Vice Chair, any other members of the Board?

Boardmember Astle: No need for additional comment. I think it's a good project and bits and pieces of it I think we could shift or talk about form liner, but I think overall from a subjective standpoint, I think it looks good. I think it's good project and it's working with their brand.

Boardmember Green: Just one question, Sean, can you clarify the fenced in area is only on the dark side? Is that right? Or does it extend over into the parking lots?

Staff Planner Sean Pesek: Correct. Standard parking screening along the side, but the eight-foot walls will be along Downwind Circle. So, the loading dock side.

Boardmember Green: Okay, eight-foot walls and then those walls. I was having a hard time pulling up all the details. I assume they're being painted to match. And are they matching in terms of material as well? Is it smooth? There's a split face.

Staff Planner Sean Pesek: I thought I had the detail shown here. Looks like it's totally made to match.

Boardmember Green: I think the wall detail and the pillars, and everything looks nice. I think just making sure that everything, all the textures work together. Kind of echoing some of the comments, there's a lot of things that it's a little bit hard to get a reading for. What that's going to feel like, but I think as long as the textures play nice, I think it's a good-looking building.

Boardmember Knudsen: I think your color palettes well done. Good job on that. And I don't have any issues with your Alternative Compliances. Looking forward to the building.

Boardmember Placko: Sean, has the City engineering seen this yet?

Staff Planner Sean Pesek: City engineering has reviewed the site plan and documents.

Boardmember Placko: Has Traffic Engineering seen that, because on the northwest corner, they've got a whole bunch of trees in the sight distance line. I don't think that they'll allow that. So that's the first comment that I have. That more engineering. If Sabine and those guys aren't going to take care, don't worry about it. I think my biggest concern with the landscape plan isn't so much the plant palette, the Prosopis species as thornless hybrid that doesn't tell me a whole lot and you're using that particular plant in very tiny little planting diamonds. I think you're taking an awful risk here. One windstorm and you're going to lose all your parking lot trees. Because these trees some of these, depending on which you use, they have a tendency to outgrow their root systems and you're not giving them a good amount of soil to grow in anyway. So, I think you might want to reconsider your parking lot tree.

Chair Banda: I really liked the forms. I really liked the way these buildings modulate and is articulated throughout. The use of the ACM panel is fantastic. I'm a little bummed that it's scored differently though I do like that corner element. I do like it; they had a somewhat horizontal scoring or horizontal element. It's not required, but I think that would give it that little extra edge. It would look fantastic. But wholistically, it's a good design. This also made my wall. Just letting you guys know, I did like it. I printed it out. You know, it's hard to make an industrial building look good.

Staff Planner Sean Pesek: Thanks, Chair. So, I'll work with the applicant to match the elevations with the proposed rendering with regard to the scoring above the corner

entries, and then look to replace the thornless mesquite with a different species in the diamond islands.

- 3e DRB22-00100 District 6.** Within the 7800 to 8000 blocks of East Warner Road (south side). Located east of Sossaman Road on the south side of Warner Road and west of Hawes Road (50± acres). Requesting the review of an industrial development. John Heiney, Komunale Properties, Applicant; GATEWAY/202/WARNER DEVELOPMENT, LLC., Owner.

Staff Planner Sean Pesek presented the case.

Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant Josh Heiney: Chair and Boardmembers, thank you so much for your time tonight. It's our first project in Mesa and look forward to it. We're based out of Denver, and I have quite a few projects there and on the East Coast, and one here in Chandler actually, that was tilted a couple weeks ago. So, making our presence here in Arizona, and hopefully we'll be around to see your faces, numerous times in the future. But this is an exciting project of ours, we really feel like we're presenting a really contemporary color palette. That factors in various form liners articulation and varying parapet height, while maintaining a really modern kind of perspective on an industrial box, which, as one of you mentioned earlier, it's very hard to design these. So, we appreciate your feedback here, but we were working to integrate various materials like rusted steel, and then, on a couple of the buildings in power blue accent color, just to contrast the various buildings in the park. It's a larger project. But we also wanted to provide varying building sizes, from 40,000 feet up to 160,000-foot building, just to cater to a broader portion of the market. And really, it'll provide, I think, a lot of nice architectural depth to the site as you drive by it on Warner or the 202. So, look forward to your comments. Thank you.

Chair Banda: Thank you. Open up to the Board for discussion.

Boardmember Green: Chair, I'll jump in first. I've gotta say, I am really digging this project. I really liked it. There's one thing that caught my eye, which was the material. The concrete or the rusted metal, that's a huge difference. I would love to see the rust of metal, I feel like that if you go to concrete, and you just stay at the copper color, I feel like that's it's just not going to be the same. So, I would say on that, that particular building, the rust of metal is like it's got to stay. And if it does, you know, the two things I would note on that is, if you don't seal it, be conscious of where weeping happens, right. But I would just say just try to see if you can. The other comment with that is, it looks like that color carries throughout the buildings, those reliefs, those highlights that are down the side. I would love to see those tie in, you know, once again, same material, I understand there might be some cost engineering that goes on there, at that point really looking to match color would be ideal. But if you can keep the materials the same, I think that, you know, that would just really, really do it. I think it's a great use of the form liner and the reliefs, especially at those entrances, I really like it.

Applicant Jeff Fleming: Boardmember Green, I would just say is we 100% agree with you, I think originally our architect rendered it with that kind of rust color from our

guidance, because we really want it to blend in with the natural environment around here in the desert. And so originally it was rendered with just like basically like a rust orange color. And I said, well, we need some variance in color. I don't want it just to be like one solid color. So then, we started talking with our general contractor. How can we accomplish this? We're still working on achieving the final plan. You know, we were long term holders, we're not merchant builders. A family-owned project. So, we want it to be right. We want it to really convey an awesome perspective, especially as you go down the 202 or down Warner especially when Hawes Crossings is done and there's a lot more activity in that area. We want it to stand out in a positive way. And I think it can be accomplished potentially with a very high-end concrete staining application because we're going down that path and I could send you some examples of some things we've been exploring, but I think we can accomplish the same look potentially with a high end, you know, concrete application, while also saving some cost. But ultimately, we agree we want the product to end up as a class A industrial project that looks very nice and is lasting. So, if that means going to the rusted steel, then that's what we're going to do.

Boardmember Green: And the only comment I would have to that is the texturing of those materials, the sheen off that is, it's just, it's different. Even if you have a high end stain the sheen that you see off the how the light plays with it, it's just going to feel different. The metal is going to have very different feeling obviously, I think you're clear on that. The metal is definitely going to have a little bit more, I would call it the higher end feel.

Vice Chair Johnson: Just to echo that. I mean, that's the one thing that caught my eye too. I thought everything else looks fantastic. The concern I'd have too with it going to concrete is that particular shape that you have with the eyebrow and the thickened wall. You can do that out of concrete, I'm sure you guys have discussed it. But that's not an easy shape to do, especially with the eyebrow projecting out and the thickness that you have shown there. So, I would be concerned if it did go to concrete that would change the actual proportions of the thing, which I think is what's making it super successful right now.

Applicant Jeff Fleming: Yeah, our architect Gray Wolf Architecture, they're based out of Denver, and they have some sample projects in Colorado where they have similar entries. And just to be clear, regardless of whether we do steel or not, is the base structure of that corner of the building will be concrete. But it would just be a fascia on the front of it, that would be steel. And there is a structural way to build that they've done it before. It's a clever design that our structural engineer came up with, but it works. I had the same comment when I first saw that design.

Boardmember Thomas: I like it. I'm going to agree with a Boardmember Green. Keeping the metal on there and carrying it through is a huge, kind of just carry on. And I think that the metal on this one and flopping back to something on the blue works really well in the complex, I do like it. I'm going to give my standard comment, which is your dock door should be painted to match whatever color the wall is beside it. I actually just drove past a project this weekend that I made the comment on probably a year ago, and they painted them to match, and it makes a huge difference the way that it looks. So, if

your dock doors can match the color that whatever side of the building is beside it, it will make a big difference. Not a fan of seeing those white roll up doors. So outside of that I liked the project. I think it looks great.

Applicant Jeff Fleming: And Scott, we did add that. It was addressed in a comment that we had received; I think in the fourth-round review where they were originally white. And we did select a more natural color. It's not matching exactly the adjacent color of the building, mainly because there's various colors that transfer across horizontally. So, we picked a color that we thought kind of corresponded with overall color palette, the best we could, but we'd be happy to kind of look at some other renderings of slightly different colors to make that that blend work.

Boardmember Thomas: Yeah, I think that being that you've got a couple of different colors back there, you might just be easier just to work with your contractor just to spray those when they spray everything else. I mean, I am a GC, so I understand that. Yeah, it's a cost to it. But the appearance from a resident, it blends a lot better than those standard doors that are just going to pop.

Applicant Jeff Fleming: My only comment there Scott is you know, if you're a contractor, we really liked prefinished doors because they just last longer. I'd prefer not to paint infield doors. But maybe we could pick some adjacent colors with prefinished colors that match closely just maybe it's two or three different colors along the back but they're all prefinished so that we don't have maintenance issues down the road because I'd rather not have kind of ugly peeling paint doors in five years especially in Arizona climate.

Boardmember Thomas: I agree. I think that there's some options to play with.

Chair Banda: New to Arizona but he gets it already.

Applicant Jeff Fleming: I'm a quick study

Boardmember Knudsen: I think it's a very handsome building. I thought it was very interesting and intriguing when I first saw this. Your color palette is good, I think you did a very good job with that. I would recommend just to bring a little bit of that orange color, wouldn't have to be a lot, but little pops of the orange in building three, four, and five, so that it relates to the other two buildings. And again, it doesn't have to be a lot, just something. Otherwise, you see the orange on the outside of the buildings, but then when you look inside, it's just not relating. So, I think just even if it's just, you know, a few sparse orange stripes in there, would really kind of tie the whole thing in.

Boardmember Placko: I really like the way this project is not afraid to mitigate the mass of the buildings with trees up against the buildings. So often we see these 40-foot buildings and they put a 10-foot shrub or tree right next to it and think that's somehow going to mitigate the mass of the building. So, I really like that. You guys all know here on the board, the reputation sissoo have here in Mesa, and you've got 180 of them. So, you're brave. The one thing I would caution you on is in a couple of the parking lot

islands you're coming in with what looks like a blue grama. And you've got like 50 of them in one little parking lot island with a sissoo tree. And I just don't know how you're going to irrigate that without flooding out the parking lot island and surface watering the sissoo tree, which is exactly what we don't want to do to a sissoo tree we want to deep water those things. We want to push the water down your irrigation, you may even want to get your irrigation designer to deep water, the sissoo and the cottonwoods. And so that's my last comment is on the cottonwood tree, there are four on the project. Three of them are in the retention basin, which is where they need to be. I would either get rid of the fourth one or move it into the retention basin.

Chair Banda: So, Seth, just as a clarification. Sissoo are kind of invasive and kind of destructive?

Boardmember Placko: If you don't irrigate them properly That's the whole point if you surface water them, then they will come to the surface, which is one thing.

Chari Banda: The other thing too is that I've seen it where an entire section of sissoo get wiped out by single small disease. So just a caution, that mix variety may be helpful. So, you can use sissoo, just use it more sparingly.

Boardmember Placko: I actually like sissos in parking lot islands. They're fast growers. They're tough. You know. And so often we put trees in parking lot island and then wonder why they don't do they don't give us any shade.

Applicant Jeff Fleming: We'll cover the stuff with our landscape architect and make sure we take care of it.

Chair Banda: I'd like to add a couple things. First of all, I think these are handsome buildings. I like these. I like the variety of sizes to makes it a lot easier to dress it up but well designed. The one thing is you have this very modern clean design. But your perimeter walls don't complement your architecture. So, you have split face and heavy caps, but face cap lock on it. I think there's potential that maybe modernize that a little bit more. You can use a honed CMU, maybe a little bit different detail on there. It just doesn't blend well. And the other thing too, with these warmer colors that you're using these desert colors, you are using a 4000 Kelvin light. And that's going to be a white at night versus at 3500, which is that balance of white in that traditional light that you would see back in the day. I think that probably speak better to the architecture you're providing. All in all, I like this. I think it's well done. So, thank you. And Sean, if you can give us a summary.

Staff Planner Sean Pesek: Thanks, Chair. Could I just ask Boardmember Placko for clarification? So, is your recommendation to reduce the number of shrubs within the landscape islands that have the sissoo?

Boardmember Placko: I think in these elements where you've got a ton of these blue grama. And there's a few of them. They're kind of corner elements. Probably yeah, I mean, or maybe get rid of the sissoo. I wouldn't do both when we put it to you that way.

Staff Planner Sean Pesek: I'll work with the applicant's architect to have the perimeter walls; the parking screened walls complement the building architecture. There's a comment to incorporate the rust color on the other buildings that don't have that those vertical for minors. Reduce the number of shrubs within the islands with the sissoo or figure out a way to maybe replace some use with a different species. And then the dock door comment, if they are going to be prefab just work on a better color that matches the color of the primary building. That's all I have.

Boardmember Green: Can I just add to that? The screen walls in the rendering package that I was seeing on one of the renderings where it's more the aerial view, you can see the screen wall between the two. I guess that's the north side. But, between those two buildings, you can see there's a lot of detailing. If you look at some of the other renderings, it doesn't necessarily show them on the screen wall, something like that. I think that right there, ties in really well. And if elements like that were brought around, I think that would be really good.

Applicant Jeff Fleming: So that wall was incorporated, mainly because we were wanting to put back a house kind of storage and parking between those buildings, just for fleet vehicles and things like that. And so, we, through the process incorporated a well-designed wall there that incorporates form liner or reveals things like that. It's a pretty elaborate wall. And I think the key there is that it's along a major frontage of Warner. And that's why we really focused on kind of making that connection.

Boardmember Green: Yeah, that makes sense. And I get there's always costs involved, right? And there's others, I think tying it in, I was just going to ask with that comment, tie it in the other areas, wherever you can, understanding there's the implications you've got to balance out.

Applicant Jeff Fleming: And just one thing, Jeanette, you'd mentioned kind of integrating some orange into the, what I call the blue buildings, we contemplated that. I'm from Denver, it becomes a Broncos building, which I don't want. That's a bit of a joke. But it's also, we wanted to kind of isolate the frontage buildings as the orange and then the center buildings as the blue and make them very, bifurcated, mainly because it's, in Mesa, it's a small project still. But for us, it's a big project with six buildings. And we really felt like the connection from the future connector road right into those blue buildings, creates a nice avenue to the frontage of those corners. And then really, when you're on the 202, and Warner is just having that more rusted color and just really create that bifurcation, keep them very unique. We're open to looking at it, but our architect did look at it a little bit. And I actually made that comment, originally to her and she played around with some stuff. And I think we have some renderings I could send you, but it didn't really meld the way that we thought it would type thing.

Boardmember Knudsen: I understand where you're coming from. And that's what I said just a few, you wouldn't need a lot, maybe three or four on the building. Because right now, it feels disconnected from what I'm seeing in the rendering. And that's just my designer eye there's a tendency to make sure that there's a little bit of something from

each building that keeps the continuous flow. So yeah, I was looking at this and I'm, you know, I'm thinking it wouldn't have to be a lot just like maybe up on the top, there's some real thin lines. And I'm just thinking just a few, to just to kind of bring it, just to keep that continuous flow. Otherwise, it looks like you've got orange on the outside and then the middle and they relate. But it's not, you know, it's not a requirement. It's not something that I think you have to do. I just think it helps tie the buildings together. I don't think it needs to be a lot, but I'll leave it up to you and your team.

- 3f DRB22-00148 District 6.** Within the 7300 to 7600 blocks of the South Crismon Road alignment (east side) and within the 10000 to 10400 blocks of East Germann Road (north side). Located north of Germann Road and east of the Crismon Road alignment. (64± acres). Requesting the review of an industrial development. Adam Baugh, Withey Morris PLC, Applicant; Yoshiyuki Nohmi, Owner.

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch presented the case.

Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant Adam Baugh: Two things where it's worth pointing out. You guys see a lot of these types of buildings in the last two years. I think there's a feeling that these are going to be these big distributors. It is so cool to see a high-tech manufacturer come into this area, which is, I think, what the city's long envisioned. The other cool thing about this is we don't have any sissoo trees anywhere on this site plan. So, I think I think you're really going to like that. The one thing I'll just kind of mention on design is that this looks a little bit different than a lot of your other larger industrial buildings in that area. And it's because of the nature of the type of use and knowing that it's for specific user. This is part of The Cubes at Gateway project, but it shows how that zoning can allow these types of things so you can get a high-tech user like this. So, when they designed this building, they include different types of materials, functions and forms, because they're designed for a specific user in mind and less of a generic distribution facility. We can take any comments you might have.

Chair Banda: All right, open up to the Board for discussion.

Vice Chair Johnson: I'll say something. You know, this breaks probably all of our design guidelines, but it's really, really good design. I mean, it's just flat-out great design, I could tell you've taken a lot of care in the composition. And I love it. I hope we get more of this in Mesa. Maybe we need to rethink how we word things in our code to encourage this.

Chair Banda: You know, thank you, Vice Chair, I appreciate that. And, you know we've been exploring, I guess for everybody's education is that every single case, we see there's an exception on alternative compliance. And that's because it was never geared for as much industrial buildings we're seeing, but actually having a specific end user as opposed to a spec. user can change that application here and I think this is a very elegant design and I'm going to hand it over to my colleagues to continue on with this.

Boardmember Astle: Not a whole lot of comment here. Ultimately, I usually give very little as almost a compliment for the most part because no real need to elaborate, but I feel like I just want to talk about it. I'm just kidding. No good project. I love seeing a different material selection to what we normally see in industrial buildings. So, it's fun to see a variety and an interesting one at that good, good project. I think it'll be a lot of fun. I'm very comfortable with the alternative compliance hopefully we modify things to get design like this in our in our city for projects of this scale. So, appreciate it.

Boardmember Green: Chair I was just going to add I agree. I think this works. I love how you've stepped it down towards the pedestrian, it's lower and it's welcoming and then it's built up when you got the manufacturing space you need. The one question or comment I had was the translucent panels that are in that corner, what is that material?

Applicant Peter Sanchez: It is a translucent material I think it's sort of almost like a plastic type. And the idea was to diffuse the light and we want to make sort of a difference where on the ground level you have the traditional storefront glazing but up there was sort of a clerestory because of the use and the function. The translucent to diffuse light works best in this application for their function.

Boardmember Astle: It's like a polycarbonate skylight.

Boardmember Green: That's what it looked like.

Applicant Peter Sanchez: Yes, that's a better description.

Boardmember Green: So, the only comment was I love it. I love the idea of using it. I think bringing it in, you'll add some difference and it'll play differently on the inside too. The one thing is with all plastics, the sun is terrible on that stuff. So that was the only thing I was going to comment. Make sure it's designed for it.

Chair Banda: Would any other members of the board like to add anything?

Boardmember Knudsen: I was just trying to figure out where some of these different products are going. Most of them play pretty nicely together. But Number 9 & 10 are like white and everything else is more of an earthy tone. I was trying to figure out where they went. It's just that you've got cool colors and clear colors and muted colors. I just wanted to make sure that they're not going to be fighting each other. So, okay, I'm good.

Boardmember Placko: So, this project takes a completely different approach to that SRP corridor than the last one. This project and this landscape really deviate, what I was talking about with the pole setup areas, and the wire setup areas. They had trees all along it, whereas this one doesn't, you can bring trees in between the pole setup areas if they're on SRP's list. And I think it would be a good idea to break up this very, very linear approach where you can walk out there and see where the easement is. And I'd like to see if we can't kind of hide that a little bit with bringing a few trees in to the gaps between your setup areas within the easement but outside of the setup areas, you should be able to do that if it's on their list. So, you may have to add a few plants. I think

the aneura is on their list, I'm pretty sure is on their list. I just like to see you bring a few trees and just kind of loosen those two easement corridors up. I think the only other kind of design question that I have is you have the granite you have half inch screened along the frontage, and you have three-inch minus in the back, and I'm wondering if it should be flipped, you should have the heavier, more rugged granite along the frontage. And the more refined granite in the back of house area. And I'm asking that question more than anything. And then there's a temporary retention basin on the north side of the site. What's your plan to treat that area? Is that future development or it'd be like, either protect it or seed it or not disturb it or put down some kind of dust control palliative I guess, be the intent?

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch: Chair, Board Member Placko, I don't know the specifics, but north of that is anticipated for future development and a future expansion.

Boardmember Placko: Okay. There's a lot of future development that could occur on this thing.

Chair Banda: Last comment. I really think that the play of the sign here, if it's internally lit, would actually take away from the overall architecture. I really hope that it actually does have some sort of, you know, Halo illumination, to kind of provide that elegance that you're maintaining. Is that the plan?

Applicant Peter Sanchez: Yes, it's going to be backlit just to have sort of a halo effect. It's not going something fully eliminated. It's going to be accented with lighting to integrate with the facade.

Chair Banda: Wonderful. So yeah, that's fantastic. So that's what I wanted to know.

Boardmember Placko: You might think about loosening up the planting within the SRP easement. Even though you've given them a trail for them to drive on. They will drive wherever they want. And as soon as they drive over it, it kills the plant and snaps the irrigation. I like this approach better than the last approach where they don't do anything, but you might loosen it up a little bit, give them some wider corridors.

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch: I don't have a lot of comments. Really just focusing on making sure that the translucent material is going to stand up to the heat and the sun. And then looking at the landscaping, making sure that the landscaping along the SRP easement is a little looser. So, it's not a clear definitive line where the easement starts and ends. And then look at breaking up some of that ground cover and shrubbery within the easement to ensure that those vehicles don't drive over and destroy all of that nice landscaping. And we're looking at considering switching the granite in the front and the rear, and potentially flipping those.

3g DRB22-00159 District 3. Within the 800 block of North Country Club Drive (west side), within the 400 block of West Rio Salado Parkway (north side) and within the 400 block of

West 9th Street (south side). Located south of Brown Road on the west side of Country Club Drive. (2.3± acres). Requesting the review of the new Child Crisis Arizona headquarters. Chris Woosley, Architectural Resource Team, Applicant; SAFE KIDS STRONG FAMILIES LLC, Owner.

Staff Planner Jennifer Merrill presented the case.

Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak.

Doug McCord provided a presentation.

Vice Chair Johnson: I mean, what a cool thing to be doing for our city. It's fantastic. And it's actually not far from where I live. So, it's, exciting to see it come in speaking strictly about design. My comment would be, I feel like there might be a few too many moves just architecturally speaking. And I'll just give you one specific comment to that when I look at the south elevation, and maybe you can bring that up from your presentation or from our packet that we have. The part that I'm sort of having a hard time with is that transition on the west end. And I don't know if this is maybe just a matter of preference. But I feel like more can be done with that art wall.

Applicant Doug McCord: That volume on the end on the west end, comes forward and allows that art wall to end. And then picks up there's a break room on the top there and a couple more offices.

Vice Chair Johnson: Yeah, I get it. I just think formally something's not feeling right there. There's like almost the energy is ending in a weird way. I don't know I would ask you to look at that again and see if there might be another way. But I just feel like there are a lot of moves here. And so, if there's some way to reduce the number of them, and I'm speaking mostly to the street facing side, I think you can be as playful and have fun. I love that concept that you have on the interior courtyard. I think all of those things are really fun experience. But when you talk about what you're projecting out to the public face. I feel like there's probably some reduction that should occur. If you want me to talk more specifically I can but let's maybe hear from the other board members and see if they agree. But that's my take on it.

Chair Banda: Thank you, Vice Chair, other members of the Board.

Boardmember Thomas: I'm going to probably disagree with everything that Paul said. But I like the building, I think it's great. I lived in this neighborhood area for probably 10 years. So, I'm very familiar with this area. I think this is a great addition to the neighborhood, to the Westwood High School kind of area over here. I like this building, my only real comments going to be is there's a lot of movement. And there's a lot of features in here. And I just hope that it doesn't get value engineered out, because that's what happens on a lot of these. When you get to this point. And with budgets with certain organizations and things like that, things get cut. And there's a lot of cool stuff going on with this. And I can just hope that the funding is there, and it doesn't get cut, because you've done a great job in my mind. Paul thinks differently.

Vice Chair Johnson: Don't misunderstand my comments, I think they've done a great job. But there's some things that can be tweaked,

Boardmember Thomas: I really do like this, I think that down to even the pick of the finish of the stucco, I mean you've got fine sand finish, that's going to be an upgrade when it comes to doing your stucco on your cost there. So, try to get your contractor on board and try to work through that because it will really eat your budget up on some of the stuff, so I like it though personally.

Applicant Doug McCord: I appreciate your comments, Scott. And that's why most of the building is stucco too are trying to especially keep that art wall as the main feature for it and that the other things kind of recede the shadow boxes, we've had discussions with a number of contractors how to do those the most cost effectively, and we're bringing on a GC, the RFPs out right now probably by the end of the month and going to work through construction documents and make it constructible and affordable. It does keep me up a little at night. But Child Crisis are amazing fundraisers.

Boardmember Green: Chair and to the applicant, I think this this design this building this project, it tickled both sides of my brain, and I loved it. I'm the engineer in the group. I'm the one that's always analytical, most of the stuff we review is more on the art and creativity side which I love too. But this just did it for me. I mean, I could geek out all day about the building science and the angles, the sun, the installation, all the different stuff that you've played in here for shading, for structuring, for the reliefs. I love the pulling of the organic structuring with even down to the shade structures of the laser cut leaf patterns and the support pillars with almost like a tree branch like feel. I don't have any issues with it. I think it's great. And I would just I really like what was said I would love to keep as much playfulness in this as you can I think it's great.

Boardmember Knudsen: I think it's a fun building. And I like the colors in it. It's happy and cheery. I appreciate it very much.

Boardmember Placko: Jennifer, can you bring up the landscape legend? I got that question. I guess I'm a little bit confused by the tree legend because there's four symbols and five trees so I'm not exactly sure what goes with what. the net leaf hackberry that's an interesting choice. I've not seen it in the valley very much. And he's only using it in the courtyard.

Applicant Doug McCord: I think and to be frank, the courtyard is not designed yet. And that's going to have a lot of hardscapes and paths through it. You know, a lot of features and things for people to enjoy while they're working or taking a break. So that's not finished at all.

Boardmember Placko: I have no concerns about the lack of parking lot trees if you're shading all the parking lot islands so I would watch the shade exposures on some of the plants around specifically in the north of the building there's a center island that has a

bunch of jojoba in it if that doesn't get enough sun it tends to start getting rangy and looking for sun that might be one. Along the west property line there's a heavy reliance on Mexican fire it's just not a plant I have that much experience with so I'm not sure I'd rely on. I guess if he's comfortable with it it's not going to burn out the first summer, I think my other comment here that the front that the frontage along Country Club and Rio Salado the tree species go 123 There there's no rhythm to the planting design along the frontage. It's all 123 They're all individual species, I realize he's mixing it up not trying to do big rows, and I'm fine with that. But it seems like a little more rhythm could come in there. Because I couldn't pick up on anything. And he's kind of mixing his deserts with his green palettes with the palo verde is in the Iron Woods versus the Oaks in the ash. So, I'm trying to understand what he's doing, and I wasn't having great success with it. So, I think the comment here is just kind of revisit that tree frontage planting, even get a little more rhythm coming out of it or a little more structure to it or something and then watch the ironwood trees along the sidewalks, because they'll reach out and bite you.

Boardmember Astle: A few comments ultimately try and keep them brief. There's a lot of great things going on, there's a lot of things that that are a bit hard to understand how they'll age with the building and there is a ton going on, I do agree with that. But I also understand where everybody's coming from related to why they're trying to activate it so much kind of maybe naturally, like a kid would want to experience something very unique. But the uniqueness that I'm seeing is mostly on that exterior perimeter, you know, it's part of me thinks the excitement should be more where maybe they're going to spend more time I don't know, just something to think about. But I guess from a keeping the comments fairly simple, I'm probably more worried about just how it's going to end up you know, when you really get into the construction documents of a project like this and very specifically the east side where we have shadow boxes, I think is what you named those. My concern is that it says fairly flat face and we have all these integral colors on there. And I just expect as I've seen in almost every interval color, they'll fade a bit and then mismatch over a pretty short period of time and maybe there's a material out there that I haven't found yet. But that concerns me a little in all the different transitions and can it be done hopefully the right contractor does it for you. Overall is exciting I could see it activating the brain for sure I liked the technology aspect of it I liked the net zero I love the design thought and the subjectivity of some of the design choices. It's again subjective. So, I think my comments are I could leave it to what we've heard so far and I think it's a nice project. I think it's an exciting one to see come into the city. I'm excited to see a lot of the aspects of design here come to life and see how they really are brought into the final.

Chair Banda: Okay, I appreciate it. The one thing I didn't see, and I think it's going to be a major part of this is that so we're getting rid of the landscaping in the internal side. We're doing the solar. I have seen solar that overwhelms the site. A lot of different schools. And I've seen other solar that really takes on some detail. They actually integrate some metal work details on the ends, the whole the solar, that'll speak to this design, I think that would really kind of help. So, I didn't see anything on here. I think that can really be integrated into the design. And it's only adding cost at this point in time. But it is a major part of it when you're doing big solar canopies, the angles over the size of them, and really kind of the end details of the metalwork they use. The last thing is, it's

going to be really important on the street frontage side, I actually do know what Vice Chair Johnson is talking about. It's like that it was the interplay on that facade right there, it was the only facade that didn't have as much excitement and movement on it, versus all the other ones. And so, I think as a whole it is a beautiful building and a big win for district three. But I understand what he's talking about is the interplay between that west part of that southern facade versus the other part. But all in all, I think this is a fun design, and a lot of thought and consideration has been put on this. And so once again, the will could be devastating this project, some small details that could cut out will change it drastically.

Boardmember Green: Chair to the point you made about the solar panels, and maybe a question to the applicant? Are these intended to be integrated solar parking structures? Where it's, I guess what I'm getting at is, is the solar panel built into the parking structure? Or is it just stacked on top of an existing parking or a new build parking structure?

Applicant Doug McCord: I'll answer two questions about the solar. So the intent is this solar panels are the shade, so we're not doubling down right price really, we're going to try to figure out how to harvest rainwater off of those panels, that system somehow too, because they're all capped as far as the edge banding, Jody at Child Crisis has already been talking to me about how we're able to brand the PV's because gonna have I believe Thunderbirds are going to be big donors for the PV system, possibly as well as SRP. So having signage or something that goes around that edge and acknowledges those donors for the PV panel will give us some detail on that on the edges.

Boardmember Green: I appreciate that clarification. I was going to say even at some of your main parts, like your transformers or the other places, those are also really good places for signage as well, if that's out and available in the open.

Staff Planner Jennifer Merrill: Okay. I don't have a whole lot of comments, but overall, on the south elevation, at the west end of the building, it could be reworked or modified where the mural terminates into the building. So that that building mass that's west of the mural, if I'm understanding correctly.

Vice Chair Johnson: That particular is a part that I'm having a hard time with, but I'll leave it open to how it's addressed.

Staff Planner Jennifer Merrill: Okay. Overall, there's an appreciation for the high-quality design with the playful elements. There's some concern about the materials and how they'll age over time, whether there's fading and to choose a contractor wisely, who can get this constructed without a lot of value engineering. Regarding the landscaping, the job may need more light than it will get under the canopies. And then, regarding the frontages along Rio Salado and Country Club, the trees should have more rhythm to the design. And the ironwood trees may not be the best species near the pedestrian walkways. And then there were comments about the solar panels being integrated into the design of the canopies, but it sounds like that's been answered.

- 3h DRB22-00261 District 6.** Within the 9100 block of East University Drive (south side). Located west of Ellsworth Road on the south side of University Drive. (2+ acres). Requesting the review of a restaurant with drive thru. Withey Morris PLC, Applicant; Valencia Heights, Owner

Staff Planner Robert Mansolillo presented the case.

Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak.

Boardmember Green: I just was trying to find where the fireplace is because it looked like a chimney on that one part. That's the only comment. Take it for what it is. That just feels a little out of place, but maybe that's just me.

Boardmember Astle: I think generally we've had other Wendy's come through. Situations where we've been more nervous than I am for this one. That said, I do think the tower the red one specifically, and probably the brown, I feel like they they're just a little excessive for the building from a height standpoint. Overall, I don't have a lot of comments as it relates to the components of this design, but I think that it is slightly mis-proportioned on the towers.

Boardmember Thomas: What is the overall height of that red tower? When you look at the elevation, I mean. I agree that it stands out quite a bit higher than the normal.

Applicant Adam Baugh: It's not as tall as the KV towers that are just right next to us. Great. It's actually small in proportion to those. Now, I mean, I think it's just intended to give an element but yeah, we can reduce it.

Applicant Justin Gregonis: One thing that might help is to actually raise the adjacent parapet so it's not so low, I think that would help offset the tower heights. I think that's probably the biggest thing is that that difference between the towers and the lower parapet line.

Boardmember Astle: It may even be the general parapet height because it is pretty low on that body of the building. Maybe that could potentially go up a little in that other one come down and you blend it pretty quickly.

Applicant Justin Gregonis: Right, yeah. And you know, the mechanical equipment is actually behind the higher parapet line. So that wasn't necessarily needed for screening, but it can easily be brought up some to help with that. You know, variation in the height.

Vice Chair Johnson: Yeah, I think that's a good comment. Only other thing I noticed was the placement of the trash enclosure on the site is pretty front and center. As far as how you experience the site for all those people going through the drive thru, I didn't look at the details on that.

Applicant Adam Baugh: The challenge was the WAPA line. We even had to roll our curbs under the WAPA just so we could make this thing work. So, there wasn't a lot of

options. The site is pretty squeezed and narrow. And then we add in that big easement there. There's just not a lot of room.

Vice Chair Johnson: Just be thoughtful on the materials for that thing. And especially, especially the gates.

Applicant Justin Gregonis: Yeah, this site has been challenging. It's been looked at a number of times over the years. And it's a difficult site, because basically, we can't build anything within that 105 easement or one half of the site.

Applicant Adam Baugh: Basically, it was there or at the drive thru exit. Not kidding. There are really only two places that it can go, and we had to find a spot.

Boardmember Thomas: Just from past experience, with WAPA, all of your site lights over there are going to have to be like 10 foot tall.

Applicant Adam Baugh: We actually have this into WAPA right now. They've given us some preliminary comments. So, this actually is a little farther down the road with the utility company with regard to landscape and retention.

Boardmember Placko: So, they're actually giving you that 20-foot landscape setback on the south property line, because you have a 125-foot electrical transmission easement. And it seems like your wire setup, your pole, and wire setup areas aren't going within the 20-foot landscape setback.

Applicant Adam Baugh: Their preliminary feedback has not reflected that comment yet. We've made a secondary submittal. So, we'll see if they pick it up there.

Boardmember Placko: It also just seems to me like maybe you're missing some wire setup areas. But no. Okay.

Applicant Justin Gregonis: There's only one pole in that stretch.

Boardmember Placko: I like the way you got the areas between the set-up areas,

Chair Banda: Anybody else on the Board like that? I do want to add something too, and I would just be cautious on this too. I've dealt with a building similar to this and it was a great idea and concept when they do the tall towers. You can see it from the freeway, and it looks strange when you go with these taller elements, but I'd also be cautious of raising the whole thing because it just doesn't feel proportioned correctly. And it was a Carl's Jr. and I'm going to pass this to the board. But the one thing I would like to see on this, and this is just me, is that red tower element, if it were a different material than stucco, I think that would look really sharp. It's a very stucco building. The only other materials besides stucco you have is going to be on that that shade screen and the veneer at the base. But I think that would be really neat to see something different and that's just me. I think there's a lot of these fast-food restaurant chains are going towards

those kinds of unique materials on some of their tower elements. And that's something to explore, not required.

Applicant Justin Gregonis: The one other material that just to point out is the kind of the canopy it's more than the canopy but the element that kind of wraps around the whole building that is metal panel. So, there's a number of materials used here. But we could take a look at that. I unfortunately I don't know if the heights on those towers, but I think that lower parapet line is really pretty low. Tell you the truth. I think that's only like maybe 16 feet. So, raising that up more into that 21-foot height 22 feet, I think will actually help make the towers not seem so substantial.

Chair Banda: So besides that, I have no other additional comments I think we're set I think this is going to be a nice addition on it's something that's undeveloped able to see something come out there. So, one we're going to some sort of soccer match out this way we have somewhere to eat. Thank you.

Staff Planner Robert Mansolillo: Yeah, thank you Chair, members of the Board. I think the biggest comment here is the tower, perhaps raising the parapet to match the height of the tower perhaps looking at a different material for that tower. And then make sure the gates for the trash enclosures are of quality. I believe that's all I really have.

Boardmember Green: I was just going to say proportion. I think technicality it does not match but proportional.

- 3i DRB22-00336 District 6.** Within the 9400 to 9600 blocks of east Pecos Road (north side). Located east of Ellsworth Road on the north side of Pecos Road. (±49 acres) Requesting the review of an industrial development. Gammage and Burnham, PLC, Applicant; Pacific Proving LLC, Owner

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard presented the case.

Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant Dennis Newcombe: Nice to be here this evening. With me this evening is our architect from Butler Design Group. They are the ones that designed this project. We are very pleased to see it. Also, with me this evening is Merit Partners who is in a joint partnership with the property owner of this Pacific Proving Grounds for this joint venture project. We're pleased to be in a posture here today of this project. We have another project to the east. This is a long time coming to see this property develop. I had a lot more hair and a lot darker hair many years ago when this project started. I saw this project, not this specific project but the Pacific Proving Grounds. We're pleased to be seeing the Legacy Sports, Bell Bank Park develop. We believe we've addressed design considerations with regards to the drainage channel along Pecos Road, which was a challenge, and we work diligently with the staff to come up with an alternative design there. I can go on, unfortunately, I'm long winded sometimes. So, I'll keep it short. I know the Sun's game is starting soon, so we can answer any questions you may have. We're again, thankful for your time this evening.

Chair Banda: Okay, I open it up to the Board for discussion.

Boardmember Thomas: Simple and sweet. The roof drains look like you got to expose, we would like to see those interiors along that back dock area. I think he can still make that work. And then those dock doors. They don't bother me nearly as much because how far it sits off of Ellsworth. And there is probably going to be another project, that's going to sit closer, that will block a little bit more of that. They don't bother me nearly as much. But outside of that, I don't have any problems with the articulation, the different materials. Butler, you guys usually do a pretty good job at most of the buildings we see. So, I think this one I'm okay. Thank you.

Vice Chair Johnson: I don't have any issues with this, or any of the Alternative Compliance requests.

Boardmember Green: I think the only comment I'll add is that I think I like it. The only part I'm having a hard time with is the shade structure over the corner elements. Right here on the rendering, for example, it feels a little bit broken up to me, I don't know that that's critical. I think it works everywhere else where you've got those shade structures coming out from the building, you've got an entrance, this particular place, you've got three shade structures, but only one entrance. That's where it feels disjointed to me. But that's not a hard and fast, it just felt a little bit off to me. So maybe others have an opinion on that.

Applicant Corey Wilkes: When it comes to shade structures on this side, on this north building, in particular, we plan that the building will be mezzanine capable, if not mezzanine ready. With it overlooking the fields to the north, it gives us an opportunity to market to a user that might actually put in a second-floor mezzanine level that they would utilize. And we're designing the canopy such that they could actually be turned into balconies. And so that could actually contribute to that further design, depending on the user that comes in gives them a great opportunity to take advantage of the views that they would have over the sports center and to the north.

Boardmember Green: Yeah, I appreciate that clarification. I think that those being balconies versus shade structures, it definitely changes the feel of it. So no, I appreciate that. Once again, just to comment, it feels a little disjointed because of that, because it feels like you're drawing to three different entrances at the same time, but I'll leave that up to you.

Boardmember Knudsen: Thank you. I don't have any issues with your Alternative Compliance, and I think your color palette works very well.

Boardmember Astle: Yeah, I don't have concerns. I think there's a lot of activity going on here. And it was well choreographed and put together and I think there's not much I would say that it's necessary in this project. Thanks.

Chair Banda: Okay, well, wonderful. I have no additional comments other than what Scott already added about in the internalizing the downspouts. I would like to see that more often. Especially with a building like this.

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard: Internalize downspouts and consider coloring the truck doors. It just feels like the shade structures are a little disjointed. So, we want to make a prominence to that door.

Applicant Korey Wilkes: Can I clarify on the truck doors because you didn't say that you necessarily wanted them colored in this screen very well. We actually prefer, just so you know, contrasting color is more of a functional thing than it is anything because the truckers can't see the doors if they're blended in with the building. And we go back to our projects that are 10 years old.

Boardmember Thomas: I don't know. Again, this project sets off the way its positioned. I don't think that you're going to end up seeing those from Ellsworth. So, I do not think we need the door colors changed.

- 3j DRB22-00337 District 6.** Within the 10200 to 10400 Blocks of east Pecos Road (north side). Located east of Ellsworth Road on the north side of Pecos Road. (±38 acres) Requesting the review of an industrial development. Gammage and Burnham, PLC, Applicant; Pacific Proving LLC, Owner

Staff Planner Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard presented the case.

Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant Dennis Newcombe: And again, we're pleased to be in the posture here today of this project and having it in this good position with Josh and everyone in staff with regards to all of the elements that were discussed here. Certainly, this is the first piece of the drainage channel. So, they have a little bit more of a task to function to transition that from Project Cork to this project to the next project down the lane. We're certainly pleased to be able to be able to accommodate if you will, the drainage channel and we think the project looks really sharp, this will actually be a sold piece. So, the property owner will be selling this to Caprock. And again, their architect is here and Caprock is here as well. We're again, very excited to get this project moving along. One would think this would be very easy to have these two projects, but and challenge they are in their own way. We've gotten past all those items with staffs help and diligence on this. So, I will we'll open it to any questions you all have with regards to this project.

Chair Banda: I appreciate it any comments questions on this project here?

Boardmember Thomas: So, I just got one question. We saw this a couple of months ago on our project, and I really like it and I know there's a cost that goes along with it, but it looks like on the that elevation right there. The red panel, is that an added panel on top of the other one, or is that how's that work in there?

Applicant Cal Coastsworth: The red panel is part of the base panel. The technical way it's done is we cast the panel red face down on the slab with a formwork. Above, which, when it's tilted sets the parapet back panel thickness or thereabouts.

Boardmember Thomas: No, and I think that'll read the same way that I'm talking about it. But I think your returns look great on your higher panels. So, I don't have any issues with this project.

Vice Chair Johnson: I'll make one minor comment that that corner element, the darker tower. It is meant to the way that it's articulated right now it feels like a tower element right like that, that that cube kind of projects up. If I look at that, the aerial rendering I think there's kind of a giveaway once you get to any other prospective view of that tower you see that it's not really a tower it's just it's just a panel so to me that that's a little bit of an issue I'm not getting too hung up on it but I would consider maybe lowering that or I know returns are difficult with tilt panels but that's something that I think you should look at just the form doesn't match the language or the construction technique

Boardmember Astle: I wonder if it had like a little roof a little slender roof structure or something over the top to give it something.

Vice Chair Johnson: I wondered if it even needs to come up if it stayed down and then just returned into those other walls right there then maybe match the height of the JC cream or white colored wall, I still think you get the accented corner without sort of the gymnastics that are required to make that look

Applicant Cal Coastsworth: I might like to bring it down a little and then put some wings on it that'd be easier to do if it was lower and then part of it intended to screen any mechanical equipment over the office.

Boardmember Astle: Yeah, I'd say work on that I am similar comment and I think there's a couple of moments where a little canopy coming out in entrance areas on this project could be beneficial it's lacking maybe an accessory, I feel like I don't know if you agree but just over the entry areas. It feels good to add that extra piece of material as well. I think it makes the design a little nicer.

Boardmember Green: Well, I was just going to add my comments. I don't have any issues with the alternative compliance. I don't have any comments to your guys' points. Nothing to add there. I appreciate the landscaping I'm sure we're going to hear about that a sec, but I think having the landscaping or those trees up close to the building if that if that really happens, I think that's a good thing. The only other comment I was going to make this might be more to staff I feel like in the last you know six months to a year we've started to see these types of buildings a lot more but we've also started to see I feel like similar requests for Alternative Compliance but the level of quality coming in his definitely elevated and improved and I'm seeing that trend in the right direction so appreciate your bringing this kind of quality and thanks

Boardmember Knudsen: I don't have any issues with Alternative Compliance.

Boardmember Placko: I don't really have any comments on the plant legend other than the sweet acacia is very thorny so keep it away from any pedestrian routes I have a hard time with this landscape plan telling what plant is going where and they don't give me any kind of shrub layout so I can't really comment on any of that so again you have an acacia you in there and there's a couple other very spiny plants so again generic comment keep the keep the daggers away from the pedestrian routes and the parking the parking lot islands.

Chair Banda: I think there's there needs a little bit more pop, and I think part of that pop to first of all, I appreciate the lighting plan as always, you guys always provide but I think some accent lighting some up lighting defining some moments to finding some of these details. Especially when you do that additional pop would actually go a long way in some of these, a building like this. But you know, for what it is, you know these buildings are come a long way. This is probably my favorite agenda as far as the number of good quality buildings on one agenda.

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard: I'll do a quick summary. So overall, at some accent lighting to help bring out the corner. Overall, the corners kind of the main concern, either lowering or adjusting the height to bring some returns, as well as add some awnings over the entry doors, and overall keep the spiny plants away from the walkways.

4 Discuss and take action on the following Design Review cases:

4-a DRB22-00299 District 5. Within the 4400 to 5200 blocks of east McKellips Road (north side); within the 2000 to 2800 blocks of north Greenfield Road (east side); within the 4400 to 5200 blocks of East McDowell Road (south side); and within the 2000 to 2800 blocks of north Higley Road (west side). Located east of Greenfield Road and north of McKellips Road. (±575.5 acres). Falcon Field Design Guidelines Update. This request will modify the existing Design Guidelines to guide future development at Falcon Field Airport. City of Mesa, Applicant/Owner.

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard presented the case.

Chair Banda: Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard. I guess I have an open up questions here too. I had a question about my kind of the entrance that we were talking about before and how did that go over with everybody?

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard: Yeah, so as part of the ability and our previous zoning case, we do have the ability to basically go back within the PAD and change the photos whenever we want. So, we're going to proceed forward and make sure that those kinds of elements aren't as they're not as tailored to say you have to look like this. We want to have a little more flexibility. So, I worked with the airport staff, and we're looking to add some either like a glossary or something along those as possible ideas for those entry areas of the document.

Chair Banda: Because one of the things that was talked about was kind of the simplifying of the lighting entryways. I think this is a very, very important documents with

you guys. I hope you did poke through I know Tanner read it from cover to cover. I want to get any last-minute input before we go off to approve this or not approve it or condition it.

Boardmember Green: I was just going to say appreciate the some of the updates, I think from what we talked about last time. It seems like they've been incorporated, and it looks really good to me.

Chair Banda: Yeah, I think my concerns and comments were addressed as well. So, I opened it up at this point in time for a motion.

Boardmember Green: Motioned for approval

Boardmember Astle: Seconded

Vote (7:0)

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 7:16 PM.