

Tuesday, October 11, 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 Paul Johnson
Knudsen
Vice Chair Tanner Green
Boardmember Scott Thomas
Boardmember J. Seth Placko
Boardmember Dane Astle
Boardmember Justin Trexler

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Boardmember Jeanette

STAFF PRESENT:

Evan Balmer
Cassidy Welch
Jennifer Merrill
Josh Grandlienard
Chloe Durfee Daniel
Alexis Jacobs

OTHERS PRESENT:

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

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

- 1 Call meeting to order.**
- 2 Consider the Minutes from the September 13, 2022, Design Review Board Meeting.**

A motion to approve the Minutes from September 13, 2022, Design Review Board Meeting was made by Boardmember Trexler and seconded by Boardmember Thomas.

Vote: 6 – 0

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES - Johnson – Green – Thomas – Placko – Astle – Trexler

NAYS – None

ABSENT– Knudsen

ABSTAINED – None

3 Discuss and take action on the following Design Review Cases:

- 3-a DRB22-00685 District 6.** Within the 10900 to 11000 block of East Elliot Road (north side), and within the 3500 block of South Signal Butte Road (east side). Located north of Elliot Road and east of Signal Butte Rd (84± acres). Design Review for an expansion of a water treatment facility. Cameron Rhodes, Black & Veatch, Applicant, City of Mesa, Owner.

Staff Planner Evan Balmer presented the case.

Chair Johnson invited the applicant to speak.

A motion to approve case DRB22-00685 was made by Boardmember Astle and seconded by Boardmember Trexler.

Vote: 6 - 0

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Johnson - Green - Thomas – Placko – Astle - Trexler

NAYS – None

ABSENT– Knudsen

ABSTAINED – Trexler

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

- 4c DRB22-00825 - District 4.** Within the 300 to 400 block of West Broadway Road (south side), within the 400 block of South Morris (west side), and within the 400 block of South Country Club Drive (east side). Located east of Country Club Drive on the south side of Broadway Road.(±1.3 Acres). Design Review for a self-storage facility. James Hamilton, Applicant; B & T Lucas Family Trust, Owner.

Staff planner Josh Grandlienard presented the case.

Chair Johnson invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant James Hamilton was available to answer questions.

Chair Johnson read online comment card into the record.

John Conover, 410 S Morris – “We live in the home 410 S. Morris, Mesa, AZ, 85210. We object to a huge 3 story commercial building being built on/ next to our property. This is not appropriate for use or design nor encroachment nor easements nor planning nor zoning. Please do not allow them to take away our peace and our home.”

Vice Chair Green: Josh, can you just clarify something about that building that's adjacent to the subject property? Can you just go over that part again of why the building is able to be there?

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard: Yeah, so I'll bring up the aerial just so you can get a context of the site. The existing structure is zoned DB-2. For Downtown Business Two, the main intent is that area south of downtown core along Broadway that is more industrial focused. DB-2 was originally designed to blend from that downtown core into the industrial located further south. As part of that, within the permissible use table for DB-2, self-storage is permitted by right, while single family detached is not allowed. So, since this was obviously developed in the past, I believe it was about 60 years ago or so, at the time, it must have been a legal use. But since that code has changed over time, it is now a legal non-conforming use. So, they're allowed to maintain that use as long as they're in the original capacity. But if they were to expand or make any changes on site, they would have to bring that into conformance where that use itself would not be allowed.

Vice Chair Green: For that specific single-family home.

Chair Johnson: Yep, got it. So that's Mr. Conover's home?

Boardmember Astle: I feel like we all need to remember that it's design review. And ultimately, it's a Planning and Zoning discussion as well as the comment itself, you know?

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard: Yeah. And I've spoken to Mr. Conover. And just I let him know that as well.

Boardmember Astle: So, he's aware and he can participate in that meeting hasn't happened yet.

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard: Right. That is planned for October 26.

Boardmember Astle: So, I'm guessing that conversation will clear it up.

Chair Johnson: Has there been any neighborhood meetings already?

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard: Yeah. So as part of the initial outreach, there was a hey neighbor letter, just due to the overall interest in this area. To my understanding, he might not be the official property owner of that site. Per the MZO, it's to the property owner that receives the notification, that might be where the disconnect might have been. So, with the most recent letters being

notification for this meeting, he did receive one of those. So that's why he became part of the process at this time.

Vice Chair Green: I think this is actually a really nice-looking building, I think for a storage building, I feel like there's a lot of detail that has gone into it. I did have a question about the fire access. I was curious about the maybe I'll call the detail. I was curious if there needed to be a turnaround there because of the access. And if I'm understanding there's a gate there on that side as well. But I guess maybe my only question is how is that? So, I understand is going to be for fire access. How is the general public going to understand that that's not a spot to pull in and, and use is there like a rolled curve or is it the flat you know, a square curve or what what's happening? I guess they'll treat that.

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard: Yeah, so I believe it is a roll curve out there.

Applicant Carl McCollum: Carl McCollum 1217 Dallas, Texas, Suite 500 representing Five G Collaborative Studios. I appreciate your time and especially working with the staff and working with DXD capital, thank you so much. If for some reason that intersection was blocked, we brought basically a curb has been slightly cut for the fire department to go over and it's kind of like a block and this block is designed for the fire truck and then the optic comm. system opens up the gate and gives the street as secondary access even for our neighbors also in the truck is the fire line is 26 feet wide, it also gives the apparatus to the roof and the roof access. We'd negotiate that with the fire department very diligently.

Vice Chair Green: Great. Thank you. I think that those were the only comments I had. I just wanted to understand that a little bit better.

Boardmember Thomas: I got a question about the effects of stucco. Is there movement in and out in that the renderings look like there? There is some in and out movement.

Boardmember Astle: Is there an EIFS on this?

Applicant Carl McCollum: It's a stone product. We are looking for warranty and for long term durability. We've used this quite a bit and so what we did is we've looked at some of your downtown aspects. And some of the color aspects and this is representing this building in sort is being built like on top of an older looking building. That's the reason we modulated that and had that look. So, the street, the facility next door, it coincides with that design, and we're trying to be harmonious with the neighborhood. And we appreciate the staff guiding us to this end result. We couldn't do it without them.

Boardmember Thomas: So that stucco was premanufactured. But there will be in and out movement between the dark and the light.

Applicant Carl McCollum: No, it's going to be it's going to be in the same plane, sir.

Boardmember Thomas: Because, yeah, that rendering really shows that there is some in and out movement, or at least what I see.

Applicant Carl McCollum: There is articulation there is and he's mentioned in that, I thought she meant by separate panels that it is articulated, the building is articulated quite a bit.

Boardmember Thomas: I'm referring to the specific the darks, and the lights, darks and lights. It, it looks like there's some in and out movement between the dark and the light. And that's what I was looking for. But you're saying that it's a flat plane

Applicant Carl McCollum: It is a flat plane. But we do have the articulations that we've that we've abided to your regulations in your design.

Boardmember Astle: A couple of just quick comments. A few things come to mind, I'm noticing this, I'm going to call it the copper. Or we'll go with rust because it looks like that's on there. So, the rust-colored metal panel, I noticed in a couple places there's a block continues in front of it other places it drops to the ground. I don't know if that's required, but part of me would love to see more of a consistency and how that panel is used. So, when we get to the big front public storage building, we have a lot of that wainscot going around and I feel like that metal panel coming down with look a little nicer in that location,. For reference, I see it coming down in numerous other places, and I think it's real nice. Part of me was kind of thinking there's so much texture on this building already, this split phase could almost be a little smoother, but that's not 100% crucial, but just something to think about as well. The planes I always have a little bit of trouble when a material and another material align on one plane. It looks like often you step it just a little bit and then there's a few moments where it looks like it doesn't step in there literally almost align the stucco and the metal panel. I personally would like to see at least a little step between the difference of materials

Applicant Carl McCollum: We'll take that noted this really the base on the block is supposed to emulate an older building. And we've enclosed some of those windows This is emulates the to the facility there's across the street. So, we we've kind of taken those cues from that and wanted to say that this building

there was an older building and we've attached this and expanded that to other stories on top of this to give it character

Chair Johnson: I'm sorry, there's the material board does not include the EIFS colors.

Boardmember Trexler: Question on the EIFS what seems to be represented as reveals there's a pretty dense grid of reveals and then there's an alternate altering color. Is that reveal going to be like aluminum extrusion?

Applicant Carl McCollum: Yeah, that's actually the full panel. That's the panel of the EIFS and it's it is actually the that is the size of the panel. That's where we we're looking for long term performances. And with guarantees from the manufacturer and what the color is there.

Boardmember Trexler: We're getting into the details of it but how is water prevented from getting into the building?

Applicant Carl McCollum: We have all sorts of backers, and we abide by those. And it is it's a detail that we've done with nationally throughout some of the other facilities that we've done like this, and it is it is something that we do definitely watch out for.

Boardmember Trexler: And then last question on EIFS. What is the finish? Since we don't have a sample, sand finish?

Applicant Carl McCollum: It is a textured finish. It's a textured finish like a typical stucco finish. It is texture. I don't like smooth finish, it needs to be textured, So it's a texture type of finish.

Boardmember Trexler: If you could bring that sample up, I would like to absolutely look at it. Thank you.

Chair Johnson: So, I realized we're abiding by the zoning. But there is sort of an odd situation here. And I wonder what we can do to be good neighbors in a situation like this? I sort of tend to think that the answer might be in landscaping. And I see that you've kind of ring to the landscaping around your neighbor's property. So, if you have any ideas on that, or any consideration that you've already taken

Applicant Carl McCollum: Absolutely, Mr. Johnson. Because that's the first thing that I thought of when we were looking at it because, you know, the screening requirements there is there is a screening wall that requires in that

condition. And with those conditions, it's eight feet. Next up to that, because it's actually the screen wall is 10 feet away from their, from their building. And we thought about that, as a matter of fact, we thought about it quite a bit. And with that screening wall does a lot of things. And it gives it more of a scale, if I was going to look out, that's what I would look out into it will be a long term good value for the homeowners. And I was thinking about that too.

Chair Johnson: Yeah, I wonder just even the selection of those particular trees that are most visible from that property, if they can be a little bit larger caliber to begin with, or something like that, just so that there's day one, there's a little bit of maturity to the landscaping

Applicant Carl McCollum: We thought the same thing too, I wanted to give the house before this is over, I want them to something that this is really this would add value to their house, and we're aware of what they have there. But we were hoping that with this wall that we're giving them and as part of the part of the ordinance too and we articulated and added capstone on the top and to you know to give it value and that's what we were looking for. For them that's what I would want if I was living in the house and that's where we position at 5g Studios we thought about that and we thought about that quite a bit and you are right this isn't unusual, but I know that what we've provided is something is good value and staff is and thanks to the staff that they they've worked with this through this process also.

Boardmember Placko: I see largely it's a pretty good in that area between the building the two buildings it's you've got hop bush in there so that's the shrub I would want. You've got Willow Acacia in there which will help mitigate the height of the building tall skinny trees. You have some elm trees in there. And I think that's the one that concerns me. It gets big but you're you only have about 10 feet between your sidewalk and your wall and I think your that tree is going to overhang your neighbor's wall probably a lot. And that might annoy that annoys some people when trees overhanging their wall. So I just would the elm tree might be just not be a good choice for that tight space. The Willow Acacia would be great because they'll get tall and skinny the inner as they do a good job. So, I think then the hop bush I think is a really good choice for that tight space. I have a question. The at the southeast corner, it looks there's a fenced off area. In that retention basin, they have some creosote bush, get the creosote out of the retention basin. It will not handle inundation very well. And the last question I have is there's nothing on here that discusses the articulation of the ground plane surfacing. I think you just need some definition on what your ground plan articulation is

Applicant Carl McCollum: Yeah, so what we did is we did the reverse with it. At the intersection, we did a little retaining wall, as for the outside, and then on the inside, we flipped it. And still having that theme.

Chair Johnson: Obviously, one, one final comment. Do you see in the rendering, at least that there seems to be some site lighting around that outdoor area?

Applicant Carl McCollum: Yes, sir. Absolutely. I've done a bunch of government offices. And I always did in a matter of fact, I've seen a couple of your buildings over here doing the same condition. And I wanted to bring in a scalable light that is dark-sky friendly. And to bring in that conditioning and actually making a nice, pleasant location for that wall if someone's having an early morning bus, or something to sit down on. And that's, that's something that we did think about immediately on that.

Chair Johnson: I just think even for security and safety, that's a good idea to make sure you have a minimum level of lighting.

Applicant Carl McCollum: I'm big into the safety and making sure that the lighting level is always at a correct level at all times throughout the building. It is a passion of mine. I've taught self-defense all my life. And it's something that I've always thought that you should have a correct lighting level at around my buildings.

Vice Chair Green: Can I just piggyback off this comment about safety and what and security when I'm looking at this, maybe you can correct me if I misunderstood anything from the building to the to the new screening wall, it's approximately five feet is that? From that screen wall to the property line. 10 feet away. And then that property line, it looks like the buildings on that existing building is almost right up against that property line.

Applicant Carl McCollum: No, not particularly. I mean, they have their own yard., I just walked it pretty heavily. It is not they do have a small site area, they do have a small cyclone fence

Vice Chair Green: Okay, I guess one of my concerns is that five feet spacing between the building and the new screen, we thought about that? I think it is there's a high concentration of homeless in this area, the existing shelters and other aid that's in that vicinity. I live not far from here in downtown Corona in an area where we have a similar situation. For the past four years, I've been dealing with homeless in and out of this particular area next to my property. It's something I continue to work on with neighbors. This area, I think, I think the

chances of you've seen people in there and the security issue is significantly high. My opinion would be it might be better to abandon the idea of having a like a narrow place, and basically incorporate your screen wall into the building. If you're if your intention is to have two screens that kind of come out, I'm going to say towards Morris from the building, I would almost tell you to just get rid of that five-foot separation and build it into the into the building. I have concerns from a safety and a design person I get, you know, having a separate wall would be great. If something ever happens with that addition, that property there. It all changes.

Applicant Carl McCollum: I agree with you on that I understand what you're talking about. But the ordinance is pretty defined on the space. We can adjust that and have an on the ends, we could on one end. We could put a nice wrought iron fence detail very cheaply, very easily. And I thought about that but one step at a time. I'm aware of that condition. I live I work downtown Dallas and I'm completely there's a spot right next to my office where they do hide. And I think about that all the time and we are going to we do have lights in that area. Matter of fact, it's lit, where it does not shine on the neighbor. It's below the 10-foot line. And we're aware of that condition. And we can add very easily a nice decorative wrought iron on that one side. And if it becomes a problem, we can easily there is one access of it, there is a fire access coming out of that we could easily do a panic bar on the outside. And that's something that we would easily address.

Vice Chair Green: I think I wanted to mention it not only for you, but for the neighbor. the code is pretty well defined on that. The code is also pretty well defined now that a building even shouldn't even be in there. So, I think I think there's some places where we, we've got to maybe work with staff and try to figure out if there's a creative solution for some of that.

Chair Green: Alright, any additional comments? I think it's a really great look at building. Thank you for your presentation. Josh, would you mind giving us a summary?

Staff planner Josh Grandlienard summarized comments:

- Swap elms for Willow Acacias
- Define groundcover
- Add wrought iron as a part of the screen wall
- Work with staff on screen wall

- 4a DRB21-00998 - District 6.** Within the 6400 block of South Mountain Road (east side). Located south of the 24 Gateway Freeway on the east side of Mountain Road. (5± acres). Design Review for an industrial development. Tim Rasnake, Archichon Architecture & Interiors, L. C., Applicant; TWC Properties, LLC, Owner.

Staff planner Jennifer Merrill presented the case.

Chair Johnson invited the applicant to speak.

Vice Chair Green: Jennifer, no applicant is here. Is that correct? Okay. So, I'm trying to address the concerns of alternative compliance. And a question I had to clarify. To me, these canopy forms feel more like roof structures. And I wanted to understand when we talk about the modulation, I think I've always interpreted that as more wall modulation, not necessarily like a roof. Like, for example, if I have a 12-12 pitch roof, is that going to count towards the 1/3 of the building height? Or is this something that's separate? I guess I'm just trying to have a little bit of clarification around that.

Staff Planner Jennifer Merrill: Chair, Board Member Green, the way that I've always looked at it is the overall height of the building. But I don't know if Evan or Cassidy have any additions to make to that. But I've always looked at it as the overall height of the building.

Vice Chair Green: Okay. Yeah, I guess that's part of why I was thinking about to me these remind me of an airplane hangar. That's kind of what it feels like, it's intentional, it's an arch. And to me, it feels like it's more of a roof., I'm not as worried about modulation. I think in that sense, that's my opinion, those screening that's placed on top of the shipping containers honestly feels really scabbed on, I don't feel like it fits. So, I would be more in favor of if the intent of that was just simply to try to reduce the height difference. So, we were meaning closer to 1/3? I would say I'd be more okay with getting rid of those and allowing a larger modulation. That's my opinion. The other stuff? You know, there's questions I would love to ask to the applicant about some of it. But honestly, I think I don't have many concerns on the other things that PVC, I have a similar concern to us that my impression is that this is probably going to be somewhat of a translucent PVC, meant to just allow some filtered light through during the day. And if that's the case, I'd love to see is can this be lit at night? How is this plane into the overall structure? So same with airflow. If this is a shop area, are they putting, you know, big fans here, swamp coolers? Like is there going to be noise and other stuff coming out through the perforated metal? It's in the front? Those kinds of things. I'm not really concerned about noise from the surrounding area. It's more, how does that play into the overall design? Maybe that doesn't answer all your questions. But in terms of the alternative compliance, I don't really have a

ton of concerns with them. It's a different kind of a building. And I'll leave it to others to have maybe some particular comments about that.

Boardmember Trexler: Overall, I really like it, it's a little quirky and different, which I appreciate. I agree that the screen walls, on top of the shipping containers seemed a little bit of an afterthought. Perhaps there's mechanical equipment up there, they may be screening? I'm not sure if so. So that was my first two comments. On the west elevation, it looks like there's not a whole lot of rhyme or reason, to the window and door alignments that windows are one height, the door another height. The screen walls are another height, and then there's little punched openings that are another height. I think it looks a lot nicer if there's some sort of alignment or a rational arrangement of the openings on the west elevation.

Chair Johnson: Any comments?

Boardmember Astle: I agree, almost all regards everyone's hitting the mark, I kind of agreed that it's an interesting concept as an architect, we've probably YouTubed a few more times than some others seeing these shipping container roof to roof structures, and it's interesting to see it built out into an actual concept here and it will be unique, I think there's a few things that feel out of place to me. The stone choice is like an industrial, really huge shipping containers involved, you get all this excitement, then you see this really traditional almost residential stone applied. And I feel like it's the wrong material. I'd lean on like a block or something, probably even a smooth face block with some nice-looking joints in the place of any of the stone on this whole project. The screen walls maybe if they sit back a little further and they morph into the slanted walls, that wouldn't look as painful. You know, just give it a little dimension back and let the edges kind of fall into the roof angle, the angle of the roof kind of let it dovetail into the space, maybe that'll help. I mean, they're never going to be perfect. But I do understand. Having a little something there can be nice. That's probably more than I needed to say. But that's my thoughts.

Boardmember Thomas: So, I have a couple of thoughts. So, we do this all the time in construction on temporary sites. And that material will last about 10 years. And that's about it. So, though it'll be a maintenance issue for them. When I first saw this, I thought there was a building down here on center that they did masonry up and then they put like a Quonset hut building on top of it, if you want to say there it is. And that's initially what I thought that this was that they had that type of metal structure over top of this, which would last durably much longer with no issues. I don't like the screen that they've stuck on top of the storage containers. I may like it better if there's depth to it, but in the renderings that they have. There's no depth to that. And you can tell it's just scabbed on it's an

afterthought. I agree with the stone, I may go a little different direction and say with some of the other colors that they have almost maybe a river rock might work in a stack. Again, I'm not an architect. So don't take what I'm saying. I think I think you could do something with Gabe in wall type for your screen wall type of stuff to bring good work. Yeah. Yeah, bring some of that rustic feel to this, even if it's just like a market wide Yeah, just something Gambian to do that screen wall. I think that with the storage containers, you're trying to go with that rustic look that gave you and could work with that. But those are my thoughts.

Chair Johnson: I for one, I'm a fan of it. I really think it's cool. I like almost all of it. I'm on board with the additional screen walls, I think that those don't fit, I would just let those barrel vaults land on the containers. And I think you have a lot of baked in nice proportions that are happening just with the combination of those very basic elements. The stone choice, I think it adds some warmth to the project, the only comment I would say is that the stone itself and the materials in the renderings, everything feels like it's more taupe and tan in the renderings. And then in the Material Palette, everything's got this kind of red undertone, and I'm not a fan of the red. So, I like the materials that are shown in the rendering. I liked the design, as shown in the rendering. The only thing that I would really change is the screen walls. So, we've heard some opinions from across the board, do we want to kind of come to a consensus of what we want to do? I guess I'll make one more comment. I don't fully understand the PVC material. To me, that could be a lot of different things. If it's the PVC canvas, it's stretched across the frame,

Boardmember Thomas: exactly what it is. Okay, it's what we,

Chair Johnson: but look at where that's used. I mean, it's used on Denver airport, it's used at our Skysong project in Phoenix, I don't see any discoloration or, degradation on those projects,

Boardmember Thomas: you won't see any discoloring of it. It'll just wear, and it'll be something that over the next 10 years, though, with some tears or something like that, and you'll have to replace the entire thing.

Chair Johnson: Okay. I really don't think that a 10-year warranty is actually that bad. I mean, in products that we come across often that's I mean, you'll get roofs

Vice Chair Green: I think if we just focus on the alternative compliance, that's the thing. I mean, if we talk about modulation, everything I've heard is those screen walls should go away.

Boardmember Astle: Yeah, I could agree that if we're not going to do anything different with them, then they may as well go.

Vice Chair Green: Right. And then I think a lot of it comes down to detailing on the screen wall and parapets and in the material?

Boardmember Astle: If there's a mechanical purpose to have them, though, I would suggest they do something like

Chair Johnson: it sounds like there's no mechanical purpose to have them. Right.

Boardmember Astle: Correct. None of those rooms.

Chair Johnson: Regarding the alternative compliance, do we have any issue with those? I don't, doesn't seem like the board does. What about the stone versus block comment?

Boardmember Astle: It's a subjective comment. So ultimately, it's yeah, it's an opinion. So, I don't need to change.

Vice Chair Green: Like there needs to be something to break up the steel? So, it definitely needs to be something besides steel. I agree with that.

Boardmember Astle: Whether it's stone or brick, I guess I just feel like there's again, a lot of textures going on I was looking to smooth that out a little bit. It's not required it's it is subjective comments. Again.

Chair Johnson: Yeah. So, Jennifer, what I'm hearing is we do not like the screens. The you have a number of different options to or suggestions to give the applicant regarding the stone. And there's no issue with the additional alternative compliance requests.

Staff planner Jennifer Merrill: Could I ask a question? Is there concern with the screen used elsewhere for the trellises or for the areas over the screen walls under the canopies because the perforated metal material was used in those locations as well.

Chair Johnson: I don't think that there was an issue. From my perspective. No, anyone?

Vice Chair Green: To me, it's more about it wasn't so much about the metal, perforated metal. It's more about the form. So, I agree with the periphery metal in the archways, for example. I know those canopies. That's just fine.,

Chair Johnson: Thank you. We kind of give you your summary.

Boardmember Placko: More of a clarification in the back. They're on the landscape plan. Is there? Are they going to use that? I know they're doing some retention on the southern half of the back portion. But they're doing an awful lot of landscape back there. And I would love to know why they're doing so much landscape back there. Is it a requirement that they do that much back there?

Staff planner Jennifer Merrill: Chair, Boardmember Plato, it's not a requirement, it would be a requirement that it's screened. Or that there's landscaping around the perimeter. And then there's also a requirement that any landscape planters have to have vegetative material for at least 50% of it. Staff did question whether or not the decomposed granite areas would be used for storing vehicles? And so, they vegetated their area too.

Boardmember Placko: So, they're not storing vehicles back there? Okay. I'm not going to say anything then. On the plant legend, and this is more just a correction issue or a confusion issue for them. I think they have the same they have desert museum listed twice. One means 24-inch box and one means 36 inch box. And then I started seeing that the 24-inch box symbol had a bunch of 36 inch box tags on there. So, are they saying that? Are they saying that the one symbol is both 24- and 36-inch box and so is the second desert museum symbol supposed to be a different tree? I would just clarify that.

Staff planner Jennifer Merrill: Okay. clarification. Thank you.

Boardmember Placko: It looks like they have three trees. And then two of them are the same species actually get into just a little quality control.

Chair Johnson: Alright, Jennifer, would you like to give a summary?

Staff planner Jennifer Merrill summarized comments:

- The perforated corrugated metal panels atop the shipping containers appear to be an afterthought, and can be removed
- If they're screening rooftop equipment, then they should stay, and designed to have more depth/integration with the building.
- Align the window and door heights on the west elevation
- The stone veneer could be replaced with block, or with gabion walls

- The renderings appear to be tanner, but the physical material samples appear reddish. The DR Board's preference is for tan.
- Clarify the 36-inch box desert museum symbols on the landscape plan. How many are proposed?
- Do the PVC canopies let light through? Will they be illuminated at night?

4b DRB22-00730 - District 1. Within the 4300 Block of East McDowell Road (south side) and within the 2500 to 2800 blocks of North Greenfield Road (west side). Located south of McDowell Road and west of Greenfield Road. (17.7± acres). Design Review for an industrial development. Tim Thielke, DLR Group, Applicant; AZ Greenfield Industrial LP, Owner.

Staff planner Chloe Durfee Daniel presented the case.

Chair Johnson invited the applicant to speak.

Boardmember Thomas: The only real comment is I have is that it's taken over an orchard. I think the building for an industrial use looks great. This is probably one of the better ones that I think that we've seen in the last six months or so. I do like the ins and outs, I don't mind any of it overall and I think it's got good articulation for the most part.

Chair Johnson: I will say I'm most surprised to see industrial here. Is it by the airport?

Staff planner Chloe Durfee Daniel: The site was rezoned to Light Industrial quite some time ago. At the time, there was some concern being rezoned to industrial but there were conditions of approval to help with that and it was passed for industrial quite a while ago.

Chair Johnson: Is there a way a way we can see what the neighbors are for?

Staff planner Chloe Durfee Daniel: You can see on the map to the side there are smaller scale industrial. I have received one comment so far, that doesn't necessarily have to do with the overall design and will be brought up when they go to the Planning and Zoning board. The concern was for the size difference between the different industrial sites and trucks from this site going through the smaller scale industrial, but again, they have no concerns with overall design, it's more of the site plan itself.

Vice Chair Green: I think I'll just have my comments here. That was part of what I was noticing. These are significantly larger buildings than any of the industrial that's nearby, as far as I could tell and I think the only comment was kind of what

Scott said about the citrus, I'm sad to lose them. But with that, what I was going to say is I appreciated the attempt to bring some citrus species into the landscape plan. There's a lot of heritage for citrus in this area and this would be a really subjective opinion, but I would love to see if there was a way to maintain some of the feel of the citrus orchards on the outside landscaping, I would love to see that. It looks like you're bringing in here and there. If there's a way to get even more great, but I'll leave that to Seth who probably has more comments on that. Other than that, I don't have any other concerns with how the building looks other than the size and scale compared to the relative surroundings.

Applicant Jon Schewe: This particular orchard has been falling into a bit of disrepair and not really keeping it up. We looked a little bit into maybe trying to keep some of the existing trees, but they really wouldn't survive the regrading effort. We just put three small groups of new citrus trees, kind of along the longer side of the site to bring a little bit of that up from the two orchards that are directly south of the site are in much better condition to trail that up Greenfield a bit.

Staff planner Chloe Durfee Daniel: To provide more information, the original rezoning approval did have a stipulation involving two rows of orange trees being maintained on the western side of the site to provide screening for the site to the west. This is something that we are looking for approval from City Council to remove as a stipulation.

Vice Chair Green: I would almost say move that to the Greenfield side but that's just me. And I acknowledged what you said about the orchards. It is hard to maintain those if they're not being well kept every year.

Boardmember Trexler: I think the aesthetic of the buildings is nice for this building type, no objections to the materials. Overall, a nice project. Thank you.

Chair Johnson: The one thing that's a challenge is the building mass next to McDowell Road. I wonder if the whole of buildings one and two couldn't be moved south one or two drive aisles and put more landscape and parking up against McDowell Road, sort of soften that. Do you know if that would be a possibility, or if there's a functional issue with that.

Applicant Jon Schewe: The reason we actually put a lot of the parking between buildings two and three, was that there's a part of the General Plan that says, you shouldn't look like a large parking lot, you should try to kind of hide that. We actually tried to push the buildings as close as we could but leave one row of parking up to the street to not make it look like a large shopping center parking corner. It would be difficult to fit two-fold double rows of parking up there and still maintain a comfortable space between buildings two and three.

Chair Johnson: Well, I guess what I was envisioning is that the parking that's between buildings two and three would get moved to the space in front of building one. I'd pick up a drive and move it over there because of the mass of the building the length of the building. I know that you're in compliance as far as the zoning, but I would rather see more depth in the parking and landscaping rather than then the existing parking in front. What did you call it? That there was a zoning ordinance or something in place? Sorry, the general plan.

Boardmember Astle: Typically, the city likes to bring those buildings closer.

Chair Johnson: I would typically agree with that, but I think in this case, I want to see more breathing room.

Staff planner Chloe Durfee Daniel: To give more context for the site, directly across Greenfield Road is the Airport.

Applicant Jon Schewe: So just as a reminder, another piece of the parking puzzle is building one is actually the smallest of the three buildings. And to serve both buildings two and three, you really need more than just one row of parking back there, because we actually lost quite a bit of space when we put in a turnaround back in the corner for fire access and the connection to the other road that runs through the other industrial park. This site is actually just evenly parked for the size of the buildings, so we tried to distribute two thirds of it for two and three and 1/3 for building one.

Chair Johnson: I know you need room to navigate between buildings one and two but if there's additional space there that can be stolen and put into the landscape buffer in front as well. Maybe somebody might have any feeling on this or additional comments.

Boardmember Astle: As it relates to the design, I'm comfortable with no extra comment needed from me

Vice Chair Green: To what you were saying, I would just avoid the canyon effect of moving two and three because they are so large. Currently you have decent, almost the same space in between the buildings. If you push two and three closer together, you're going to create pretty close canyon. So that would be my only other thought to that.

Boardmember Astle: I do think the potential of scrapping just a few feet out of what you have and sticking it up in the landscape could be a good solution of what you're saying. If there is any, it does look a little tight.

Chair Johnson: Yeah, I mean even just enough to get instead of just one row of trees, a double row of trees. I think it would be something really worth considering.

Boardmember Astle: Another quick comment, why didn't they let you just use the mechanical gates in the back for the fire apparatus. Is it a through street rather than the turnaround? Separate question, if you were to Knox box those gates, it seems like fire apparatus could access that way.

Applicant Jon Schewe: It was more about the adjacent development connection.

Staff planner Chloe Durfee Daniel: As far as I'm aware, and I came into this case part way through I believe there were conflicting conditions of approval from this site and the site directly to the west. Norcroft Road was built out and there was a condition of approval for that site of it being continued through to this subject site. That was a part of that requirement, but it conflicts with the conditions of approval on this site requiring no access onto the site except for Greenfield Road. This is why we are requesting a change to the prior conditions of approval. So that's where that history on the site is coming from.

Boardmember Astle: seems a little strange. There's all kinds of access here for apparatus.

Applicant Jon Schewe: So rather, the turnaround is for the site to the west. Basically, if they had no reason to access our truck yard, they could come this way, turn around and then get out if the other site was on fire.

Chair Johnson: Okay, can we get a summary of comments?

Staff planner Chloe Durfee Daniel provided the following summary of comments:

- Support for the project
- Support for the Alternative Compliance request
- Consider a larger landscape area off McDowell Road
- Add more citrus trees on both McDowell Road and Greenfield Road

5 Planning Director Update: None

6 Adjournment: Vice Chair Green moved to adjourn the meeting and was seconded by Boardmember Placko. Without objection, the meeting was adjourned at 8:34 PM.