Design Review Board

mesa·az

Minutes

Tuesday, October 13, 2020
Virtual Platform
57 East 1st Street
4:30 PM

A work session of the Design Review Board was held by Virtual Platform at 4:30 p.m.

Board Members Present:

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

Recused:

Staff Present:

Nana Appiah, PhD., AICP, Planning Director
Lesley Davis, Senior Planner
Tom Ellsworth, Principal Planner

Others Present:

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch
Staff Planner Ryan McCann
Staff Planner Kellie Rorex
Staff Planner Wahid Alam

Chair Randy Carter welcomed everyone to the Work Session at 4:31 p.m.

1 Call to Order

2 Consider the Minutes from the 9/8/2020 meeting

Boardmember Banda motions to approve minutes from September 8, 2020 meeting, Boardmember Thomas seconds the motion.

Vote: 7-0

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Carter–Banda–Thomas–Placko–Knudsen– Green–Johnson
NAYS – None
ABSENT – None

3 Discuss and Provide Direction Regarding Design Review cases:

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

3-a DRB20-00459 District 6. Within the 6400 to 6600 blocks of East Southern Avenue (south side). Located west of Power Road on the south side of Southern Avenue. (1.5 acres). Requesting the review of a retail and medical building. Tamimi Architects, Applicant; Kadeeja LLC, Owner.

Staff Planner, Cassidy Welch, presented the case.
Marwan Tamimi from Tamimi Architects represented the project and commented that the client had wanted a contemporary design for the building.
Boardmember Johnson

- Thinks it is interesting to combine retail and medical uses
- Wants the design to be more cohesive
- Concerned that everything is gray except for two spots of color
- Believes the design would benefit from more simplicity
    - The applicant stated that they had originally started with a more simplistic design, but the client wanted something more unique and really likes the style of Zaha Hadid
    - The purple and yellow are logo colors for the clinic and are meant to provide hope for the patients

Chair Carter reminded the board that they should make sure to base their comments around if the design meets the City of Mesa design guidelines. He also states that this review should not be about their personal preferences and they are not here to redesign it how they like it.
Chair Carter

- Believes the project will be a good addition to the City of Mesa

Boardmember Banda

- Really likes the sign/logo and hopes it is backlit
- Believes that it is a busy building design
- Wants to know the lighting elements that will be present
- Wants lighting integrated into the canopy around the building
- Believes the project is unique and neat, but is a complicated combination of uses
    - Applicant stated they will add lighting to the design and agrees that lighting will make a big difference
    - Proposed a lighting range recommendation

Boardmember Green

- Feels like it was three buildings pushed together
- Wants more cohesiveness in the texturing and shapes
- Wants the colors to be used more or less, but is okay with the bold colors

Boardmember Thomas

- Asks what materials are used on the second-floor south elevation as it will be visible from the parking lot?
  - Applicant states that the material is stucco
- Asks what is the height of the highest point?
  - Applicant states that it is 26 ft
- Is concerned with the south side second floor material.

Boardmember Knudsen

- Likes the large sign
- Doesn't mind the entrance colors and design
- Notes that her eyes have a hard time landing anywhere on this building
- Is concerned about the different hard finishes
- On the north elevation, are those all windows
  - Applicant goes into detail about the different windows
- Wants less lines
  - Applicant will bring this to the client's attention

Boardmember Placko

- No comment on the landscaping
- Asks if there are screen walls?
  - Applicant states that the client wanted screen walls to help with the homeless
  - Mentions the screen walls will also be done in a gray color palette

Chair Carter

- Agrees with Boardmember Johnson that there is a lot of design on the building
- Expresses concern with previous point and recommends simplifying the design and working with the city staff
- Notes that the project is very interesting

Vice Chair Banda

- Asks about the finishing on the parapet
- Talks about the difference between the dated/wrong feel of split facing vs. a more modern look
  - Applicant notes there is not split facing and that it is smooth
- Talks about the split facing on the perimeter wall
  - Applicant says they would be happy to replace it

Staffmember Welch summarized Board's recommendations

- Wants more simplicity and to calm the busyness of the building
- Wants to reduce the planes and materials
- Wants more modern architecture

- Wants lighting integration
- Wants more cohesiveness
- Wants the entryway to be more contemporary

3-b DRB20-00495 District 3. 2311 West Broadway Road. Located west of Dobson Road on the south side of Broadway Road. (1.5± acres). Requesting the review of a medical office building. Phil Fitzgerald, Applicant; MT Bross, LLC, Owner.

Staff Planner, Kellie Rorex, presented the case

Phil Fitzgerald represented the project and commented that the client is a collector of antiques and train and railway memorabilia that they want to include them in the project. They also noted that the sliding is a cement siding and that the building is historic in nature and character.

Boardmember Knudsen

- Likes that the colors coordinate
- Is concerned that the colors are too dark, dated, and are more antique
- The property across the street is more modern and contemporary
- The building down the street is also dated
    - The applicant states that the client was going for historic colors and is trying to mimic old train stations

Boardmember Green

- Appreciates the intent to recreate a train depot
- Concerned that it does not fit into the neighborhood
- The applicant could draw from the Phoenix Union Station or the Fullerton, California station as examples to better fit into the area
- Believes the theme does not fit into the neighborhood

Boardmember Placko

- Likes that the applicant is trying to work with the original trees on the site
- Thinks that some of the plants are too large
- Thinks that the plant symbols are too similar
- Thinks that the plants are being placed on top of each other
- Questions if the applicant can use Ficus as they do not think it is on the low water plant list
- Wants a more cohesive and desert-based planting
- Recommends putting all Rio Bravo Sage in the back to screen the building

Boardmember Johnson

- Agrees with some of what Boardmember Knudson was saying about the palette

- Agrees with Boardmember Green's comment that it may be displaced in the community
- Accurately historic
- Great piece of architecture, likes that they are using some of the existing building
- Play with color a bit to make it fit surrounding context better
- Soften architecture to fit a little better in the area
- South elevation – in packet showed very little articulation and it looks like some was added and it could go a little further

Boardmember Thomas

- Believes that shingles do not last in our heat
- Defers to Boardmember Knudson on the colors

Vice Chair Banda

- Well done on an adaptive re-use
- Context of neighborhood- would encourage that they stray away from context of the area, that there is not much there
- They can create something new for the area
- Creating something fun and unique
- Toning colors down is possible, but is ok and reminds him of a train station in San Francisco
- Could use standing seam metal roofing, but thought the roof was tile
- Take a look at the lighting styles
- Could use gooseneck lighting
- Recommends to not go above the lighting range of 3500
- Thinks the design is whimsy and fun
- Supports the different feel

Chair Carter

- Asked if there was another palette that is historic and may be less "Brilliant".
    - Applicant will talk to client about the color and roofing
    - Notes that the client really likes the current color pallet
- Architect explained the unique environment
- Suggested the board agrees that colors could be toned down

Vice Chair Banda

- Likes board and batten

Staff member Rorex summarized the Board's recommendations

- Color palette – consider revising
- Compatibility concerns for area
- There are some plants in SVTs
- Ficus not allowed in right-of-way
- Look at the shingles and long-term durability

3-c DRB20-00511 District 1. Within the 1100 to 1200 blocks of West Bass Pro Drive (south side). Located west of Alma School Road on the south side of Bass Pro Drive. (30± acres). Requesting the review of an office building. Rachel Lopez, Applicant; Salt River Point LL, LLC, Owner.

Staff Planner, Ryan McCann, presented the case

Chair Carter asked for date of the Planning and Zoning Citizen Participation Process Staff member Dr. Appiah clarified that the board can provide comment/feedback and can recommend to see this project again after a neighborhood meeting.

The work session was opened for public comment:

Krisine O'Connor, 1315 W Mountain View, spoke in opposition to the project.

The comment card provided from Ms. O'Connor in opposition stated: This parking structure and additional building will create noise and light pollution at eye level, for the entire adjacent community. In addition, it will block any views to nature, and continue to create a commercial real estate look and feel at eye level to my yard and home. This will reduce my ability to re-sell and have a negative impact on the value of my home.

Ms. O'Connor also stated in the meeting that she reviewed the quality design guidelines and found that the surrounding area is residential and that this project does not fit into the area. She is also worried that the proposed garage will take away the privacy of her yard. She asks for the scale of the garage to be reconsidered and that the back wall have some interesting structure added to help screen the interior of the garage from the homes nearby and vice versa.

Shawna Boyle, 1328 W Mountain View, spoke in opposition to the project.

The comment card provided from Ms. Boyle in opposition stated: Please require that the developers compromise with us. The parking garage should be placed underground or should be behind other buildings and not obstruct our view. The residents of this neighborhood are paying a high price to build, live in, and maintain large custom homes in West Mesa – West Mesa needs thriving, well-off neighborhoods just as much, if not more, than commercial development. You have the chance to allow both to happen. Reward our neighborhood for being concerned citizens and we will want to continue to contribute to the betterment of this city.

Ms. Boyle also stated in the meeting that she is worried about the light and noise pollution that will come from the proposed garage and the south facing panels that will shine into homes. She points out that the renderings and the plans differ which makes it hard for the neighbors to understand. She would like to have a discussion about having coverings on the third and fourth floors to block seeing into yards and

homes.

Joshua Boyle, 1328 W Mountain View, spoke in opposition to the project.

The comment card provided from Mr. Boyle in opposition stated: I believe that you should require the developers to be good neighbors to us, the home and property owners on Mountain View who will be effected by this new construction. The best option would be for an underground parking garage for the new building. The next best option would be to switch the placement of the parking garage and the placement of the new building. This will make the parking garage clearly visible from Alma School. If you do not want this parking garage visible from Alma School then why should we have it in our line of sight? Underground parking is the solution. Please require the developers to be good neighbors to us. Underground parking is the solution to this issue. Would the city like the parking garage and new building swapped? I imagine they would oppose it because the garage would be more visible from Alma School Rd. Why should the neighbors be forced to have the parking garage visible to us? The developers should have reached out earlier and prior to getting this far into the project. Underground parking is the solution.

Mr. Boyle also stated in the meeting that he would rather there be a train depot than a parking garage and that there were too many parking spaces planned and that they should be reduced.

Janice Jaicks, 1318 W Mountain View, spoke in opposition to the project.

The comment card provided from Ms. Jaicks in opposition stated: The proposed parking garage is way too close (and an inappropriate height) to our homes. Also, it will be lit up at all night, headlights in our bedroom. Suggest putting parking garage underground. Quality of life will be compromised. This is a historical neighborhood with custom homes. Not enough notice or appropriate documents were sent about this project.

Ms. Jaicks also stated in the meeting that there is no citizen participation plan and that the developers have not worked with the neighborhood to solve their concerns. She also notes that the notice to the neighborhood was incomplete and misleading.

Perry Jaicks, 1318 W Mountain View, spoke in opposition to the project.

Mr. Jaicks stated in the meeting that there has been no citizen participation and how happy he is to be able to speak in the meeting about the project. He is concerned about the light pollution and asks if the proposed garage could be put underground or have a buffering of trees or even be moved to a different location.

Michelle Kuhn, 1222 W Mountain View, spoke in opposition to the project.

The comment card provided from Ms. Kuhn in opposition stated: I am deeply concerned about this construction project and how it will impact the neighborhood.

This project is of no value to our community.

Ms. Kuhn also stated in the meeting that the letter to the community was misleading and that there has been no communication from the developer. She also notes that people in the proposed garage will be able to see into their homes and bring noise and traffic while blocking their mountain views. She is also worried about the project allowing homeless people to climb into her yard.

Laurie Kagiyama, 1252 W Mountain View, spoke in opposition to the project.

Ms. Kagiyama stated in the meeting that she wants the parking garage to have a maximum of two stories above ground with the rest being underground. She also identified that the south side of the garage would be looking over the canal path and recommended that the two stories above ground be an aesthetic feature for the public who use that path.

Phil Branson, 1242 W Mountain View, spoke in opposition to the project.

Mr. Branson stated in the meeting that he was speaking on behalf of his mother who is a resident. He stated that the provided site plan does not fully provide the details about the project and that because there is only 300 ft between the garage and the homes, there will be an intrusion of privacy and noise. Mr. Branson does not want a parking structure that is above ground and wants the City of Mesa to revisit their parking requirements as there are way too many spots provided.

Diane Yazzi, 1263 W Mountain View, spoke in opposition to the project.

Ms. Yazzi stated in the meeting that she wants the developer to engage with the neighborhood and is concerned with the lighting and noise pollution the proposed garage will bring as well as the traffic

Staff member Lesley Davis read from the comment cards staff received:

Richard Gurtler, 1262 W Mountain View, is opposed to the project. The proposed parking structure is placed only approximately 240 ft from residential property lines (a sand wedge distance) and at 45' in height is invasive on the privacy of residents. The proposed additional building and parking structure represent a much higher density of floors and offices compared to any properties in Riverview. Multiple presentations over the years have failed to alert residents of the full scope of the project, each time coming back and altering the number of buildings, building heights and density of the project. The increased density will increase traffic.

Ruth Ann Showalter, 1262 W Mountain View, is opposed to the project. Speaking as a nearby residential property owner in a neighborhood that will be dramatically (negatively) impacted by the siting of this proposed project (Waypoint 5 -- 3-story office building and 3-story parking garage).

Erin La Grassa, 940 N Vale, is opposed to the project. A 3-story garage is unacceptable. Lights on a parking structure will be disturbing at night. We were told in 2007/2008 that there would never be structures over 2 stories high. We received nothing about this 3-story structure. Daily, there is never a full parking lot. Not even 50% occupied. It is unnecessary. If you must build it, perhaps you can build it underground. Suggest a complete change in location of trash collection; noise of trash collection and dumpster use would not be pleasant. Trash enclosures are not included on the building rendering. Continue south landscape/buffer from building 3 (as shown on the site plan) west to building Consider larger trees that could create a buffer from landscape to building. Mechanical enclosure is large and obnoxious and would likely present a consistent noise that would be noticeable form the neighbors to the south. Landscape or vegetation to break up large black façade, to mitigate pancake effect and light bleed from middle and top levels of parking garage. Also, consider a relocate of mechanical equipment to mitigate noise to neighbors to the south. South facing solar panels on top of garage will cause a reflection to neighbors to south. FYI, building rendering does not show solar panels or parking structure lights or landscape lights. Neither does it show the houses on the hill behind the site. They are rendered incorrectly as flat unoccupied desert. South elevation of Garage landscape should not be considered an afterthought as related to landscape. Vine trellis to shield industrial.

Sara Stapley, 505 N. Date, is opposed to the project. I oppose the parking garage design, because the neighborhood should be given higher priority in a softer, more compatible residential design to a single-family use. I recommend the parking garage be redesigned so it is softer, nicer (if not reduced to be lower than the office) so it is not so commanding, imposing, & industrial. I by free speech can request it be lower scale as that is an architectural quality of balance, context, cohesiveness next to residential. That is a lower density, historically nice neighborhood that makes this area of Town attractive to neighbors and employees.

Boardmember Thomas

- Garage looks like the one for “The Union”
- Plain pre-cast structure
- Would like it to be more architectural
- Look at waterfront project
- Look at the Grand project in Tempe by exit to the airport
- Do something other than plain pre-cast structure
- Underground may not be possible due to the river bottom, but by Cubs stadium at the Union, they went one story underground, which could help residents
- Building looks great and likes the glass

Boardmember Green

- Appreciates the comments from the citizens

- Noted the plans are contradictory and identify a 3-story building for parking garage, but the elevations show four story
- Contradiction need to be clarified
- Massing and scale in design guidelines encourage a transition to residential. That should be considered.
- Concerned with light pollution
- Screen the commercial area to the residential
- Building 5 is beautiful and the amount of glass is appropriate
- Height at 55 is appropriate
- Materials to south elevation of the garage to block light and sound would be valuable to consider to help the adjacent neighborhood

Boardmember Johnson

- Sympathetic to neighborhood concerns
- There are issues that are difficult to address but applicant needs to complete neighborhood process
- Agrees with 60% glass as appropriate
- It is a well-designed building
- Consider inverting the relationship of the interior space to create more distance to residential properties
- Suggested use of imagery of screening applications in packet for material palette in landscape section
- Create a barrier for light is something to consider

Boardmember Knudsen

- Appreciates comments from the neighbors
- The building itself is handsome and well designed
- Agrees with other comments from Boardmembers to adjust parking structure design

Boardmember Placko

- Reduce parking – projects are too overparked in Mesa
- Landscaping is well done except along south
- Add landscape buffer with Eucalyptus and Willow Acacia
- There are 8 trash enclosures along the south side – suggests moving them away from residents
- Likes canyon area between buildings, but may need artificial turf since the grass may not survive
- Trellis on garage should be repeated on south side of the garage

Vice Chair Banda

- Reminded of the garage length and width of The Union and AT Still campus
- Garage is primary concern
- Substantial mass at garage

- Likes building
- Agreed with Boardmember Johnson's comment about using the imagery from the packet that EPS provided in the landscape package for some details to provide screening
- Perforated metal could help make it look cool and screen
- Length of structure at 500-feet long is a concern – a better way to break it up to provide more movement in the garage
- Diffuse light on the south side– usually done more in urban settings, but this is an opportunity to break up structure and help reduce the amount of light for the adjacent neighborhood

Chair Carter

- Agrees with comments on office building
- Parking garage needs additional design
- Site is way overparked
- Suggested taking out some of the parking
- 500 feet of garage needs to be broken up much more
- Lighting need more details and what view is from residents
- Vary the garage in and out
- Recommends seeing it again after Citizen Participation has been completed.
- Felt the board is commenting prematurely

Planning Director, Dr. Appiah accepts the recommendation for the Board to see it again after the Citizen Participation process and Planning and Zoning Board Hearing are complete. He noted that he heard that parking along the rear should be removed and that landscaping can soften the project. Also possibly move garage to interior. These are things that need to be considered through CPP process.

Staff Planner, Ryan McCann summarizes

- Parking structure could possibly move to the interior and design needs to be enhanced
- Provide massing and variation along south side of the garage
- Additional landscape
- Provide usable open space
- Add landscape buffer with Eucalyptus and Willow Acacia utilize screening for exposed lighting

Applicant Michael Monroe with Lincoln Properties spoke

- Parking garage is one floor on grade and three levels above grade
- Setbacks and height are allowed by city code

3-d DRB20-00592 District 6. Within the 1100 block of South Signal Butte Road (east side). Located north of Southern Avenue on the east side of Signal Butte Road. (1± acres). Requesting the review of a restaurant with a drive-thru. Greg Hitchens, Applicant; Signal Butte & Southern, LLC, Owner.
Staff Planner, Wahid Alam, presented the case
Mr. Greg Hitchens presented the case and noted a plain box would not be enough and described his building

Boardmember Knudson

- Thinks colors are very nice. She does not have any issues with them at all.
- Appealing building

Vice Chair Banda

- Appreciates that the building is different
- Too much of a good thing – some smooth face CMU would play well
- Confirmed that on the west elevation they are using hardy panel coverings
- Reduce the amount of HardiePlank

Boardmember Thomas

- Suggested Cor-ten that will look great and can rust and then sealed when it is rusted enough
- If Vice Chair Banda's comment is about the color it could be painted to match HardiePlank
- Likes what they are doing
- Not a fan of the artwork
    - The applicant, Greg Hitchens, explained that they are always looking for ways to improve.

Boardmember Placko

- Appreciates the salvage of existing shrubs on north curb
- East side is plain, and they could add another tree between drive thru and building
- Autumn sage only on north side
- Watch the size of Green Cloud Sage

Boardmember Green

- Agrees with comments on canopies
- Using other materials is a good idea to limit HardiePlank
- Suggested landscape instead of artwork, but just a preference

Staff Planner Alam clarified that the artwork is not signage as it does not relate to the business.

Boardmember Johnson

- They have done a good job

- Likes where it is headed
- Proportions are nice
- Disagrees with comment to add another material
- Likes simplicity of 3 to 4 materials
- Agrees that boxing in corners should match color of HardiePlank
- HardiePlank doesn't seem right where it comes down and becomes a column
- Change proportion of column to a wing wall
- West elevation – seems imbalanced with door and storefront and sliver of HardiePlank - shift a foot or two to the right and loose sidelight to get more meat from that material

Chair Carter

- Fun building
- Departure for Taco Bell

Vice Chair Banda

- Appreciates Johnsons comments which would help his comments on his HardiePlank

Staff Planner, Wahid Alam

- Explore use of HardiePlank siding
- East side looks like it needs more landscape
- Consider the design at the columns for outdoor dining and pickup window to see if wing wall should be added

Staff Member Dr. Appiah asked for some more clear direction from the board

Vice Chair Banda

- Clarified that if they use a wing wall – then no need for additional material
- Agrees they all like the overall look and feel of this Taco Bell

Boardmember Green

- materials don't need to change,
- Agrees with Boardmember Johnson, Vice Chair Banda and Boardmember Thomas

3-e DRB20-00606 District 6. Within the 2700 block of South Signal Butte Road (east side). Located north of Guadalupe Road on the east side of Signal Butte Road. (1± acres). Requesting the review of a coffee shop with a drive-thru. Brian Maxwell, Applicant; Aldi Arizona, LLC, Owner.

Staff Planner, Kellie Rorex, presented the case and noted the applicant is looking for alternative compliance based on the small building size.

Kimberly Raden represented the case and said they appreciate them hearing the case

Boardmember Placko

- No comments
- Likes use of Regal Mist

Boardmember Green

- Well designed
- Good job
- No concerns with alternative compliance

Boardmember Johnson

- Well-designed building
- Would like to see a little more landscape adjacent to the building
- Soften the hardscape at the building
- Material transition at the plaster blue (south elevation) where it transitions to HardiePlank there is no plane change – minimal shift of the forms would be helpful

Boardmember Knudson

- Appreciates the building
- No concerns with the materials

Vice Chair Banda

- This is put together very well
- 2 different canopies for Dutch Bros. – likes integrated lighting option, which this does not seem to have
- Preference – stray away from shoebox lights with use of LED's shoebox lights (parking)can go away. Opportunity to go with a lighter design. It can be smaller and not detract from architecture and disappear in the landscape
- Rendering does not match elevations – need plane change in wall for material change

Boardmember Thomas

- Plane change for materials
- Agrees with Vice Chair Banda and Boardmember Johnson
- Not a huge fan of the stone
- Is it a pure stacked stone or grouted stone
    - The applicant clarified no grout
- Work with contractor to make sure it gets installed correctly
- Likes the site plan and drive thru accommodation for stacking

Chair Carter

- Saw version of this store in Maricopa today and likes building

3-f DRB20-00607 District 6. Within the 4400 to 4500 blocks of South Power Road (east side) and within the 6800 to 7000 blocks of East Warner Road (south side). Located at the southeast corner of Power Road and Warner Road. (30± acres). Requesting the review of a commercial development. Sean Lake, Applicant; Power 40 LLC, Owner.

Staff Planner, Cassidy Welch, presented the case
Vince DiBella represented the case for Adaptive Architects and stated that Tom Snyder from EPS will be presenting as well. They have a short presentation and wants them to experience the project.

Vice Chair Banda

- Lighting makes or breaks the project
- Lighting is very elegant
- Likes the approved guidelines dictating the signage so that it works with the design
- Creates more elegance
- Enjoys overall design
- It comes together well and reads well

Boardmember Thomas

- Loves the concept
- Not really any comments
- Likes architecture
- Lighting does make a difference and appreciates the night renderings

Boardmember Placko

- Such a large project to digest
- Wanting to understand the boardwalk promenade and the materials
- Applicant said it is paving and pavers mixed to create decorative surface
- Likes screen wall in the parking
- Intrigued by pool fence – wondered if County will buy off on it
    - Applicant said he has looked at that with bars on back side so not a climbing surface, but wanted to keep views into that area

Boardmember Knudson

- Appreciates the color boards and finishes
- Did a great job putting together products and colors
- Likes the project a lot

Boardmember Green

- Agrees with the board
- Beautiful project – well done
- Loves the theming
- One question – asked about phasing and what happens with other areas until built
    - Applicant clarified that the owner is adamant that the frontage on Power and Warner is landscaped and pads will have dust control – between office and hotel

Boardmember Johnson

- Super cool project
- Excited to see it come to our town

- Kudos to the team for developing a great combination of forms
- A lot of movement and variety in towers and active terraces

Chair Carter

- Great project

4 Planning Director's Update:

4-a Update on scheduling of the Design Review Board meeting in December.

Planning Director Dr. Appiah stated moving the meeting to December 15th. He noted that there will be an update training/info session for the Design Review Board on duties of the Board. He discussed the need for a streamlined and predicable environment for the development community.

5 Adjournment.

Boardmember Banda motioned to adjourn the meeting
Boardmember Thomas seconded the motion
The motion passed unanimously

Design Review Board work session ended at 7:42 PM