

**Tuesday, August 10, 2021  
Virtual Platform  
57 East 1<sup>st</sup> Street  
4:30 PM**

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

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Boardmember Jeanette Knudsen

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Nana Appiah  
Lesley Davis  
Rachel Prelog  
Evan Balmer  
Cassidy Welch  
Kellie Rorex  
Chloe Durfee-Sherman

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

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

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

**1 Call meeting to order.**

**2 Consider the Minutes from the July 13, 2021, Design Review Board Meeting.**

A motion to approve the Minutes from July 13, 2021, Design Review Board Meeting was made by Boardmember Thomas and seconded by Boardmember Green.

**Vote: 6 – 0**

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

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

NAYS – None

ABSENT – Knudsen

ABSTAINED – None

**3 Election of Design Review Board Officers –**

- a. Chair**
- b. Vice Chair**

The Board postponed voting for a new Chair and Vice Chair until Boardmember, Jeanette Knudsen, could be in attendance.

**4 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.

- 4-a DRB20-00801. District 1.** Within the 3300 block of East Thomas Road (north side) and within the 3600 block of North Val Vista Drive (west side). On the northwest corner of Thomas Road and Val Vista Drive (13.1± acres). Requesting the review of an industrial development. Jeff McCall, McCall and Associates Architects, Applicant; Thomas Val Vista, LLC, Owner.

Staff Planner Evan Balmer presented the case with an alternative compliance request for their materials.

Vice Chair Banda invited the citizen who submitted a comment card to speak.

Greg Hitchens introduced himself as a concerned homeowner in the area. He listed his concerns as follows:

- No industrial buildings near the height of this building anywhere nearby
- On average, height is 44 feet
- No buildings in area over 40 feet, why this one
- The height is too tall for this area
- 44 feet is four stories
- Narrative stated it will be a good screen of the freeway, but two-thirds of the height would suffice as well

**Boardmember Johnson**

- What is the allowed height?
- Was any outreach completed?

**Staff Planner Balmer**

- Maximum height is 50 ft and the property is zoned GI
- Yes, neighborhood meeting in December
- 10ish residents with concerns about height
- Lehi developed as residential after the zoning for this property was already GI

Rod Jarvis with Earl and Curly introduced himself as representative for the applicant. He introduced the architect, Jeff McCall and described the project, noting the following:

- Zoning allows for 50 feet in height
- 44 feet needed for square footage
- Zoned for use in 1981
- Explained to residents that rezoning and use were explored and told no by staff
- Mailed notice, held neighborhood meeting, spoke with neighborhood leaders
- All but one was in support
- Height for square footage
- Industry standard is 30 feet
- Requirement for the roof structure and screening of mechanical equipment leaves us at 42 feet
- Guidelines require stepping of the building height which leaves us at 46 feet

**Boardmember Johnson**

- Well designed
- Material colors and choices are appropriate
- Opportunity to incorporate more human scale due to proximity to neighborhood

**Boardmember Thomas**

- Back of building is flat
- Could bump out dock doors or between dock doors for articulation
- What is the elevation of the freeway at that point?
- Is it a standard 8 feet screen wall?

**Jeff McCall**

- Freeway is close to grade, maybe under by 3 to 4 feet, but then descends towards Val Vista
- Continuous wall from neighboring property

**Vice Chair Banda**

- There is more opportunity to make something more friendly to the residential across from it
- Lights are kept pretty light, make sure to provide 3,000 kelvin range for warm color palette

**Boardmember Green**

- What are the minimum setbacks from Thomas Road
- Is there opportunity to push back more to the freeway
- Feel similar to citizen comment
- Only general industrial on this side of the freeway in 2 miles
- Something needs to happen to help blend this more or reduce the massing
- Is the alternative compliance for the south side?
- Material selection and landscaping could help soften

**Staff Planner Balmer**

- There is a 15-foot landscape setback
- The building is 101 feet from Thomas and 137 feet from the west property line
- They did provide common open space
- Open space is made more as an amenity to property and anyone walking by
- They are requesting alternative compliance for all sides and percentages

**Applicant - Rod Jarvis**

- We are over 250 feet from the neighborhood wall
- The setback was increased to respond to neighborhood request

**Dr. Appiah**

- In addition to working with the developer on setbacks, a future horse trail has been incorporated

**Vice Chair Banda**

- A large yard is helpful, but not a big part of the design
- If we knew the user, we could design it more specifically
- How can we soften building for the adjacent residential
- Landscape could be rendered in or could help soften the site

**Boardmember Placko**

- The two materials were so similar, I couldn't tell what was riprap and what was aggregate
- No real issues with landscape plan

**Boardmember Astle**

- The landscaping band in the front will be a big part of how well the building is buffered from the neighborhood

**Staff Planner Balmer summarized the board comments**

- Soften the building from the adjacent neighborhoods
- Add additional materials
- Articulation of building facing the freeway
- 3000 kelvin lighting
- Enhanced screen walls
- Enhanced landscaping to help further soften the building

- 4-b DRB21-00134 District 3.** Within the 1900 block of West Southern Avenue (north side) and within the 1100 block of South Dobson Road (east side). Located on the northeast corner of Southern Avenue and Dobson Road. (.87± acres). Requesting the review of Don Andrews, Andrews Design Group Inc, Applicant; Phoenix Dobson LLC., Owner.

Staff Planner Kellie Rorex presented the case with an alternative compliance request for their materials.

Vice Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak.

The applicant, Felipe Zubia introduced the case and discussed the Fiesta District guidelines.

**Boardmember Green**

- Confirmed that the alternative compliance is just for materials on one façade

**Boardmember Astle**

- There is a new modern design for some of the fast food in the valley
- I wish there was something that would look more updated and modern
- The rock could be stone
- The red tower could be deeper
- The flashing could be darker
- Could pop out another red element
- Wants an updated piece in the Fiesta District
- Mural may date it more

**Vice Chair Banda**

- Happy with the outdoor seating area
- Could be a better street presence
- Want to capture more modernization
- Mural should not be the only additional material
- The design already has a dated feel
- Could have canopy edge signs or other modern ideas
- Signage needs to push for better design
- Opportunity to have additional materials and make a more modern design
- Opportunity to update near one of busiest colleges in the state
- If there is a plane change, wouldn't that be an opportunity for a material change?
- Is mural okay of alternative compliance?

**Boardmember Thomas**

- For the outdoor seating, what is the design of the shade structure?
- Concerned about what the shade structure top is and how much sun will get in
- South elevation is flat and zero articulation
- Will the major elevation be seen from Southern Avenue?

**Boardmember Johnson**

- Not having the same strong negative reaction as other boardmembers
- It could be more modern
- The trellis, enclosed patio and deep overhang over drive-thru are nice
- The south elevation over the door looks like a fake move, but there should be real movement in the wall
- Nothing fundamentally wrong with it
- Could grab the whole form of gray and drag it over
- Would not propose adding another material to the palette

**Boardmember Placko**

- The use of sissoo tree is a concern

- Sissoos are drawn too small and drawn the same size as the mulgas when really they are twice as large
- Need to loosen up and give them more space
- In the driveway that's going away, what is being put in for the pavers? It needs to match up with what is in the Fiesta District.
- Work with staff to match the Fiesta District paving

**Boardmember Green**

- A mural will not be enough for alternative compliance
- Most visible elevation (south) needs more interest and movement
- Need more control if it is a mural so it can't just be painted over
- The building overall meets guidelines
- Opportunity to enhance and move the Fiesta District forward

**Vice Chair Banda**

- Two board members are okay
- Three want more modern

**Dr. Appiah**

- The board is recommending to take a vote for your recommendation
- There is a need for revitalization in the area
- Council member concerned that whatever goes here will set the tone for the area

**Boardmember Johnson**

- Want to be respectful to the Fiesta District
- If the tone is to be more progressive, then I can work with that, but I don't know

**Vice Chair Banda**

- The goal for West Mesa has been to push for more progressive design

**Applicant Felipe Zubia**

- Modern design is a loose term
- Are we talking about materials?
- The mural was going to be a mixed media and possibly a joint project with the Mesa Center for the Arts
- What guidance do you have for the modern design you are looking for?

**Boardmember Astle**

- More updated color scheme
- If the mural is modern, maybe on a more modern material
- Would prefer a masonry element vs a stone wainscot
- More glass
- More architecture on the street, one of the most important sides

**Vice Chair Banda**

- 6 inch offset on the south facade as Johnson talked about
- Could have different colors or materials
- Could have a stacked bond
- Could do C-channel metal
- The stone and wainscot are 2005 feel
- Looking at other Wendy's online are something to aim more for

- Possibly take elements of those
- Appreciate putting building on corner and having the drive thru on inside
- Canopy could be more incorporated
- 

**Boardmember Green**

- Goal is urbanization from the Fiesta District Design Guidelines and connecting with the urban environment
- South side has pedestrian access
- Create something to draw people in

**Staff Planner Kellie Rorex summarized the board comments**

- Update the color scheme
- Update materials such as the stone to a masonry
- Mural should be on a more modern surface
- Use more glass
- Have a 6-inch offset on the south elevation
- Creating an urban design that draws people in from the street
- Integrated canopy
- Mural area could be maintained and work with the Fiesta District

- 4-c DRB21-00200 District 1.** Within the 1800 block of East McKellips Road (north side). Located west of Gilbert Road on the north side of McKellips Road. (2.2± acres). Requesting the review of a Drive-Thru Coffee Shop and Minor Automobile Repair facility. Jesse Macias, M3 Design, Applicant; Orange Tree Marketplace II, LLC, Owner.

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch presented the case with an alternative compliance request.

Vice Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant Jessie Macias gave an overview of the design of the site

**Boardmember Johnson**

- On the Gunnels building there are opportunities to clean up the design a little
- No specific comments for the Dutch Bros.
- Like the corrugated metal siding
- The industrial material has a hint of modernism
- There should be a more premium material at the entrance
- The entrance wall is articulated with the chamfered cornice detail that takes away from the modern design
- A simpler cornice detail would be preferred
- Wainscot detail is dated
- Stucco also looks dated and could be more updated and modern

**Boardmember Thomas**

- Looks like a very small awning over garage doors,
- Clarified that the awning depth is 36 inches
- Confirmed the awning material is metal and will provide shade
- Make sure you tie that to roof drainage on the side
- The top of the parapet walls could be more squared off
- Front parapet could have more depth
- No comment on Dutch Bros

**Boardmember Astle**

- Cap detail should change to match the metal fascia like the Dutch Bros building
- Front façade could be more asymmetrical
- Could have more depth

**Vice Chair Banda**

- Western façade should have a return on the Gunnels
- Wainscot does not go with running bond and looks dated
- Using the metal for modern edge, but center treatment is more dated
- What is the underside of canopies on the Dutch Bros
- Could have tongue and groove on underside on canopy
- Signage should be halo lit at minimum but do something fun
- Have planning look at signage and not just permitting
- Could do something with outdoor seating and landscaping that makes it neat

**Boardmember Placko**

- Front of the two buildings, there are three planter islands being cut through with sidewalks
- Palo Verdes are jammed in
- Willow acacias might be better
- Too many trees near the trash, take them out
- On north side of Dutch Bros there are too many shrubs
- There could be more outdoor space
- Don't understand what the landscape is trying to accomplish
- If being used for retention, there are too many plants
- Could do more with outdoor seating

**Boardmember Green**

- Love the improvements for adjacent Orange Tree Marketplace, could tie in lighting with it
- No issue with alternative compliance

**Staff Planner Cassidy Welch summarized the boards comments.**

- South elevation for Gunnell's – modernize the front entrance
- Square off chamfered cornice detail



- Deepen the parapet
- Remove stucco wainscot and modernize with metal
- Make sure the underside of awnings of Dutch Bros have the same architectural detailing as the rest of the building
- Tie in lighting with adjacent Orange Tree Marketplace
- Replace palo verde for the willow acacia to create a better pathway
- Provide better organization for landscaping

Applicant Jessie Macias noted that he loves the stack bond idea, will square off corners and work on main entry. He said that the landscape intent was to be lush for the cars, but they will look at that.

**4-d DRB21-00454. District 5.** Within the 4500 block of East Ivy Street and within the 1700 block of North Parkcrest. Located south of McKellips Road and East of Greenfield Road. (2.3± acres). Requesting the review of a multi-tenant office and warehouse building. Eric Leibsohn, Applicant; OPUS BUSINESS PLAZA LLC, Owner.

Staff Planner Chloe Durfee-Sherman presented the case.

Vice Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak

Applicant Eric Liebson introduced his project

Vice Chair Banda thanked him for designing a building that fit the shape of the property.

**Boardmember Thomas**

- Like the building
- Clarified the depth of the overhang
- Provide more landscaping on back side of the building
- Appreciates masonry and something other than tilt for industrial

**Boardmember Astle**

- Likes project
- Pop-outs could be more prominent
- Consider taking the striping off and make a different tone
- Bring brow down to top of glass and cantilever without arms and thicken
- Don't be afraid to stop striping on inset portions

**Boardmember Johnson**

- Exciting to see the use of materials
- Appreciate articulation of the plan for the site as it adds a dynamic quality
- Struggling with geometry of entrances and a little with the color
- Geometry feels a bit static, perhaps because the canopy doesn't project much

- Could it slip under the form back to the glass?
- Metal eyebrow on corner could be deeper
- Look for ways to add a little more dynamic quality to eyebrow to compliment unique building form
- Clarified the colors.
- Felt they were a bit cartoonish
- Refined masonry palette doesn't think colors tie in well to rest of the palette
- Suggests reducing to one or two colors
- Open to a justification for it
- South elevation should move in and out rather than up and down even if only 8-inches

**Boardmember Placko**

- Reconsider the use of grass. There is too much of it
- Don't have grass up against the building

**Boardmember Green**

- Noted that the grass fits with the industrial park. Others in the area have grass but be cognizant of actual use and maintenance

**Vice Chair Banda**

- The building form is great
- Entrances are a little detached and foreign to building
- Canopy feels a bit foreign and doesn't quite feel attached
- Integrate a little more with depth and integrated lighting
- not a fan of four different colors
- Noted that color is subjective
- Not opposed to alternating colors
- Accentuate eyebrow corners to be more pronounced

**Boardmember Thomas**

- From a business aspect, the four colors differentiate different owners
- Clarified that there is not a sheen on metal
- On the color board it looks like a matte color

**Boardmember Green**

- Clarified warm or cool colors

**Staff Planner Chloe Durfee-Sherman summarized the board comments.**

- Reconsider the grass and remove adjacent to building
- Canopy eyebrow to be thicker
- Provide additional landscaping at rear side of building– where possible

- 4-e DRB21-00503 District 6.** Within the 9200 block of East Ray Road (south side). Located east of Ellsworth Road on the south side of Ray Road. (0.87± acre). Requesting the review of a fast-food restaurant with a drive thru. Dorothy

Shupe, Sketch Architecture Company, Applicant; PPGN-Ellsworth LLLP, Owner.

Principle Planner Rachel Prelog presented for Jennifer Gniffke's case.

Applicant Rob Burgheimer introduced the project and clarified that there are four materials on the building, not three.

**Boardmember Green**

- Asked how bright the LED panel is

**Boardmember Johnson**

- Noted the colors don't match the color material board.
- The color and materials are creamy on the elevations while cool on the palette
- Confirmed that the colors match approved colors for Cadence development.
- The images on the material palette feel nice but the elevations feel too tan

**Boardmember Astle**

- The color samples do look better than rendering
- The rendering has a yellow tone while the materials have more of a gray tone Confirmed materials and brick vs Nichiha (fiber wood panels) Confirmed panels are 6-inches

**Boardmember Johnson**

- Like the horizontal reveals in the EIFS
- Canopy over the drive thru window could use more integration
- The left to right relationship of the form is more the issue, being more centered or coordinated

**Vice Chair Banda**

- What if we raise the height of the glazing

**Boardmember Green**

- Confirmed that Cadence has their own design review and has it already reviewed this building
- The polycarbonate lens on the light panel will yellow so be careful

**Boardmember Placko**

- Texas ebony is thorny so reconsider for your parking lot

**Vice Chair Banda**

- Concerned that drive thru is prominent feature with the trash facing Ray Road
- Maybe include a pony wall of some sort to screen the site/headlights
- No opportunity for outdoor dining
- Good job with the ins and outs on building

**Principle Planner Rachel Prelog summarized the boards comments.**

- Better horizontal integration for the canopy over the drive thru
- Raise the height of the glazing

- Polycarbonate lens on durability
- Consider the Texas ebony for the landscaping
- Look into using a pony wall to mitigate the drive thru

**4-f DRB21-00565 District 6.** Within the 9200 block of East Cadence Parkway (north and south side). Located south of Ray Road and east of Ellsworth Road. (1.6± acres). Requesting the review of two multi-tenant shops buildings. Susan Demmitt, Gammage & Burnham PLC, Applicant; PPGN-Ellsworth LLLP, Owner.

Principal Planner Rachel Prelog presented for Jennifer Gniffke's case.

Vice Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak

Applicant Susan Demmitt introduced the project, and the architect Cane Garcia reviewed the details for the site.

**Boardmember Green**

- Like building
- No comments

**Boardmember Astle**

- Like building
- No comments

**Boardmember Thomas**

- Like building
- Look at the southwest corner of shops A.
- There could be more articulation
- Incorporate some sort of shade structure

**Boardmember Placko**

- No comments

**Boardmember Johnson**

- Confirmed there is there a canopy on both buildings on the entrances
- Confirmed that on the edge detail on the metal forms, the different color on the border of that form was intentional
- Not a fan of a lighter metal and then a darker metal outlining the field, but not opposed

**Vice Chair Banda**

- Cadence has an overall sign plan, if they can make the signs as edgy as possible, and push the envelope while complying with the sign plan, it would be preferred

**Principal Planner Rachel Prelog summarized the board comments.**

- On shops A on the south side corner, provide more enhancement or articulation, preferably a canopy or structure

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

**6 Planning Director Update: None**

**7 Board Discussion Item:**

Planning Director Dr Nana Appiah addressed the Board.

If you recollect, last month, I started this conversation with the Board about ways to streamline the meetings because some of the feedback we get from the Development Community and staff and also Council is, the length of the meetings is becoming a little bit unsustainable. Because the City continues to grow, we continue to have a lot of projects on the agenda and we want to be respectful of the Board's time and also the people especially as the building now is open to the public, having to have five hour meetings, the Design Review Board so far, we've set a record since I've been here. You are the only Board that goes to three or four hour meetings, and I think, it also even becoming challenging to recruit people to serve on the Board because you guys are passionate. But that's not the main issue. Their concern here is, as you recollect about two years ago, the City Council, as one of their main goals was to make sure that you recommended based on the approved design guidelines, because all the issues and concerns from the Development Community and residents had been the subjectivity of the reviews, because you have seven board members. If you give a space and the opportunity, they will have their own personal preference. But it was made clear that we needed to establish specific design guidelines. The board can absolutely add certain things, but steer our way from personnel preference, and also create a predictable environment. It seems like that has never really materialized because we are spending a lot of time on these reviews. Tonight was a prime example where we had one project where you had three board members having different preferences than other three. My question and why I wanted to open this conversation, you guys sit on the Board, you guys know what is creating these issues. How can we all work together to really streamline the process and also to improve the structure of the meeting? Projects that come before you go through several reviews before being placed on the agenda. We just don't put it on the agenda because they've submitted. We go through the design review guidelines, the code and all that. So when it is put on the agenda it is really close to meeting the standard most of the time, but it seems like that has not really achieved the intent. I just want to open it up and get your feedback and we may continue the conversation. I see you guys and see you guys sitting here for five hours. I know you guys are passionate but we want to work with you guys to not keep you guys here so long.

Vice Chair Banda stated that one of the challenges is, I think today we streamlined it as best as we could, and it helps that I can visually cue a lot of people here. Instead of making everybody speak to it. I think if you have a comment, I try not to repeat as much but I try to clarify the statement. I guess one of the challenges is that we are not going to leave here without having a solution and that makes it a little bit more difficult. So sometimes if it's not a good design, we have to come up with something to give a clear

direction. And I think by doing that, it takes us time to kind of derive these comments that can actually be taken by staff as guidance. That makes it a little bit tricky, you know, because sometimes I want to go, hey, this is off the mark, let's move on, here's what you need to be looking at. That would move it along. But not having that as an option, and having to really kind of emphasize each façade, each detail. Me personally, I do have a passion for it. But it's really difficult to give good comment right now. It's like, man, that is not meeting what I was hoping would be the intent. I think an example that we could talk about here today is the one that we didn't agree on right away. It was the Wendy's. Because there was an opportunity there saying, hey, this is in a not an opportunity zone. But it is in a district that we didn't think was hitting the mark, some of us and I think that had to be conveyed. So that one probably took the longest out of all the items here this evening. It was probably the second smallest building we had. So, I don't know what input you guys would have.

Boardmember Green commented. I think I'm the only engineer on the Board. But I mean, so I'm not looking at this initially from the eye that you guys have, but a couple thoughts. Mr. Appiah, as I think, related to things we continue to see, we continue to see things about facades and alternative compliance. I mean, I think, I'm not sure we've had a Board meeting in the last six to eight months or since the guidelines, perhaps that have not had one case that has at least proposed alternative plans for the facades. So that's something I think that you know, looking for ways to address that, I think is a good thing. Another thing is, in terms of the guidelines, I know, I'm still trying to become familiar with them. I mean, I pull them up every time and try to look to them. But I think to the comments to have a good design and good design is subjective right now. How do you quantify that, and I think one of the things, I'm going to use the Wendy's example that we reviewed today. I think in that particular case, the District, as was mentioned is in a transition period. And when I look at the guidelines, one of the things actually in the Zoning in 11-7-3B, it talks about a theme. And that Fiesta District is still kind of developing its theme. There's not really a strong defined theme in it. And I guess my opinion on this is if we want to get closer or expedite this or get this to a point where we're moving through this, those themes, I think need to be pretty well understood. Whether it's the Fiesta District, or its Cadence or its Falcon, doesn't matter, but just understanding what is the intent that we're trying to capture at a more localized level, because, you know, talking to the guidelines, yeah, there's an intent there. But it's for the entire City, when you get into these different locales, the intent may be slightly different or interpreted at that point, if we have to make that. And when I say this, when we get into a situation, I think this is what happens, we have a lot of subjectivity on what that intent is within a certain locale. And that's what a lot of the discussion revolves around. But by taking some action to define those perhaps a little bit more clearly, in conjunction with the guidelines would help. That's my thought, perhaps that can help expedite for staff so that as we come to something like that, I mean, once again, using the Fiesta District as an example, if we're looking for a more edgy, modern, tech kind of a feel. If that's defined, some more staff can easily go back to the applicant and say, well, this this isn't the style. So that's just my opinion.

Vice Chair Banda stated to that point, there are certain districts sometimes with a Master Plan, that theming is easy to define. That Cadence is a perfect example, that theming is clearly defined, is clearly spelled out, there were no comments on lighting, there were no comments on things because it's falling in line with that overall adopted vision. But this will always be if it was a slam dunk, I don't think we would be here. Because we're talking about recommending high quality design. You heard past members say, you start seeing things more than three times we should be looking at something different. We know the things that are brought to us meet the checkboxes, the size, the alternative compliance part. They're meeting the checkboxes for the for the most part, but part of meeting the checkboxes is taking a look at it from a larger point of view. So we're not taking just a single isolated view at this. We're taking a look at this from a perspective of how does it fit in context. That came up today with that industrial building and that was a lot of discussion. Contextually, if we looked at it as an isolated industrial building, check done, we're good and met the requirements. But contextually it didn't fit in a neighborhood. And that really kind of guided a longer discussion. And staff is correctly saying, hey, this meets the checkboxes. There's only so much they can push. I think that push is going to come from us and I don't know how to really expedite that any more. I think today we did a pretty good job. I think I've kind of summarize a little better.

Boardmember Green said he generally has two questions. The first is if we have things in place to be more in line with the guidelines, and the themes, then I don't think we always need to make a comment on certain designs, to be completely honest. Right? I think there's quite a few of these that come through with discussion and it's there's no need to, right? But on those are we do. My opinion, is we should be referencing if there's an issue or something that we're talking about subjectively saying, I have a concern with this, it should tie back to the guidelines where we have the concern, I have a concern that it's not meeting this part, because this is how I interpret this part of the guideline. I'm not seeing that. But I think if we were to start doing that, perhaps we would have a little bit of resolution, at least understanding what part of the guidelines are falling short.

Boardmember Johnson asked is it our job to determine whether a project is in conformance to the guidelines. I didn't believe it was and Shawn, you read a statement at the beginning of each meeting. It's just a couple sentences. Can you read that?

Vice Chair Banda read, the purpose of the monthly Design Review Work Session meeting is to allow the board to provide beneficial recommendations on Design Review cases, regarding landscape and architectural design. So staff make sure it complies. They shouldn't bring stuff that doesn't comply with the with the codes and guides saying, hey, 100% of metal doesn't meet the code? What do you think? Well, you're not meeting the code. I don't think it's a matter of meeting the code. I think it's that design, and architectural and landscape intent.

Boardmember Green added that 11-71-6 where it's spelled out for the Design Review Board.

Boarmember Johnson asked for it to be summarized.

Boardmember Green summarized as an example it talks about the Planning Director and Design Review Board should be guided by whether a project satisfies following criteria and spells out about 12 different items. Some of those have sub bullets, but that's generally what it is. I mean, the link is here, we can find that. It's chapter 11-71-6, but it's things like the overall design meets scale, massing, things like that. But let me be specific on my opinion, when I read this, this is aligned to the guidelines. So, when we talk about scale, massing somebody standing next to the building, seeing it, you know, things like that. So once again, my opinion, but that's where it's spelled out for me.

Vice Chair Banda stated that I think that was addressed well on our industrial one, we talked about scale to neighborhood. And that's a context thing and that is an architectural interpretation. That is subjective. And design is always subjective. That's what kind of makes it unique and personally, I'm not trying to platform here, but I think the reason why we're here is to encourage that high-level, high-quality design, utilizing the charter saying, hey, here's the themes. We're trying to encourage it from an urban design perspective, staffs limited on what they can do and sometimes they say, yes, it meets the checkboxes. But let's take a look at this. I think staff is really pointing out what the concerns are. I clue into some of those.

Boardmember Astle stated that this is my first day with you guys, so I can't speak to the long meetings. You know, this is a fairly long meeting even today, but I do want to get directly back to the initial request by the Planning Director and that is the structure of the meeting. Again, I've been here for five minutes, so everyone seems to be doing what I understand to be our role, right? That said, structuring it in such a way that we maintain a meeting length, and still provide good commentary, I think should be the case, I think putting a time limit, even on each case, could be potentially helpful to us, as a guidance to us. I mean, if we each had a minute to talk about a case, and we went through all of them today, we would have been gone in a little over an hour. Not to say all of the comments weren't great, but I think it would help us get specific quickly. Just get right to the point. Not to say I don't enjoy the banter, because I do. But that said, I think there's a way that we could set this board up to still provide the same data at a much more concise level with probable timeframes. We did that on the Planning and Zoning Board where we did our best to limit not only those speaking, presenting all of that. It didn't get out of hand, you know, sometimes it can, and what might be a good thing for us to do is actually apply a time limit.

Boardmember Green stated that he agrees 100%. Dane noted, I think if we added a timeline to each case, that's definitely a way to expedite comments, I think if we want to get immediately down to a reasonable time. We might miss comments that we feel strongly about. And that's where I think some of these other things we've talked about prior to this start to play in. If you have a comment, reference something relative to the



guideline, or it's prepared ahead of time, to the point where we can fit it within the time frame.

Vice Chair Banda stated that part of the banter and play, though, is that you make a comment, and I go, well, you know, it's going to open up a discussion. Here's my comment, it opens it up. The presentation that took the longest today was one that we had no comments, you know, it was just one of the things that I would be cautious of. Because sometimes, scaling of the building, with a million square feet, it has a lot of comments, it's difficult to address it holistically versus a smaller building. I think the one that took too long was that Wendy's. I think that one was beat down a couple different ways. Because we weren't agreeing. And a time limit there would have created them left without clear direction.

Boardmember Astle reminded the group not to forget that the chair still has the discretion. So if there's a moment where we feel like we didn't quite get there, there'd be room to add time.

Vice Chair Banda added like today, after last month's discussion, I was actually keeping an eye on the time on my phone.

Boardmember Green stated, I was just going to say, I do not disagree with any of the comments. I think in the Wendy's particular case, if we looked at that, some of the things we've talked about, for example, having more clearly defined information on the district or where it's going, will help resolve some of that coming in. That's not even stuff we have to then deal with. We can communicate with the staff and as a Board to have those conversations. I don't know what the proper ways to do that is, to be honest. But if we have those conversations so we have a good understanding.

Vice Chair Banda stated that Boardmember Green was right. If they say, hey, the Fiesta Districts going to have this, this is normal, you know. We're not looking for your normal neighborhood design. If that was brought up initially, that was the direction that they were looking for, I think we would have seen different buildings to begin with. I think it was halfway there. But the facade treatments were not there on it.

Boardmember Astle stated that that specific case was a hard one because it's less defined. And the reality is in the pre application meeting, and a standard situation staff would guide when it's defined to get a building that we need to see. This case was just a little different. And I think we could never quite plan for it. But I like where it went.

Boardmember Green stated once again, Director Appiah to your point, I think if we want to as a Board, if we want to get down to, a three-hour meeting. I think the only appropriate way to handle it, at least right now is you got to put time limits on things.

Planning Director Appiah addressed the board. Chair, Boardmembers, first of all, I'm not saying the board is not doing a good job. We acknowledge all feedback the Board provides, but I think we can do better than maintaining the status quo. What I'm asking

from you is to look at other ways. So, a couple of actual concerns that we have to work together to fix is the reason why the City Council approved the design guidelines. It is to create a predictable environment that any developer, any resident looking at the City of Mesa should have a very good understanding of what the City actually looks for. If the developer comes to a meeting and spend one hour on a design, there is something wrong with the Planning Division review, there's something wrong with a City design standards. There's something wrong with our system, and it needs to be fixed. That's the one of the reasons why am I asking what are the things that are keeping these meetings going so long? We know the design guidelines have been approved for two years. We will continue to review, revisit and fix certain things that are broken. So that's one thing because, for me, my goal has always been we talked about three major things: timeliness, predictability, and consistency. If we have these three, then we are moving forward, but if a developer cannot have a predictable environment, then there's something we have to continue to do to fix it. So that's what I am saying. Basically, do we look at a time for each project? Do we look at a checklist and Boardmember Astle, as you said, at the end of the day, the Chair has a prerogative to say, well, this requires more time. Also, it gives us the opportunity for projects where you need to spend more time on it. You can spend more time, but it looks like we can think about ways you guys can make recommendation to us, we will look into it. And in the coming months, we can find out which ways to really improve the system.

Vice Chair Banda stated noted that we didn't touch on neighbors. We only had one public comment today. And public comment can often detract from the time. I've seen meetings run different ways depending on who the Chair was, having a timer on them to 3 minutes, he exceeded that. But I wasn't timing on when it started. If I had some sort of clue into that I should have timed them. I could have said Mr. Hitchens, you have three minutes, and I would have told him that right in the beginning. The other thing too, is I would elect a spokesperson, when you have 20 people in a room talking about something. It is also important to tell the public that the focus of the meeting is design. Because most people have issues not with the design, but the use. That's going to be almost every single time.

Boardmember Green said that the reason, in my opinion, it's going long is because there's a difference in opinions on what the building should look like. And once again, I think I would be curious to see if we did an overlay of the city, what percentage has design guidelines approved.

Planning Director Dr Nana Appiah stated actually we are probably going to start looking into the various areas that have those specific guidelines, and then create kind of a checklist. So whenever there's a project in that area, we have the checklist for you, because I know when we were reviewing Cadence, and I think it was Eastmark and Cadence, some of you had not seen the design guidelines, I think some of you are willing to make that recommendation, but then realize that if approved the color palette if approved guide design guidelines. So that's one of the things we can start looking and even if we need to create a checklist for the actual design guideline. So, in every packet, you guys have it and can go through that one person raises and issue then the

other person doesn't repeat. If we don't repeat some of the issues, that will help and we'll try it out.

Boardmember Green stated that I think to that point, for a developer coming in should be able to understand what is required if they want to build at Alma School and Southern versus, Ray and Power. It's just a very different locale but understanding clearly what they would be expected to meet or kind of feel that is supposed to fit into, I think would be helpful.

Vice Chair Banda stated that speaking of time limits, I think we've kind of reached a consensus.

Planning Director Dr Nana Appiah let the board know that we will continue our discussion another time, we'll come up with certain recommendations get feedback from you.

Vice Chair Banda asked do we have a motion to adjourn the hearing?

## **8 Adjournment**

Boardmember Green moved to adjourn the meeting and was seconded by Boardmember Placko. Without objection, the meeting was adjourned at 7:25 PM.