

**Tuesday, January 12, 2021
Virtual Platform
57 East 1st Street
4:30 PM**

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

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Boardmember Jeanette Knudsen

STAFF PRESENT:

Nana Appiah
Lesley Davis
Tom Ellsworth
*Rachel Prelog
Ryan McCann
Evan Balmer
Cassidy Welch
Charlotte Bridges
Kellie Rorex
Chloe Durfee-Sherman

OTHERS PRESENT:

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

Chair Carter welcomed everyone to the meeting at 4:31 PM

- 1 Call meeting to order.**
- 2 Consider the Minutes from the December 15, 2020 Design Review Board Meeting.**

A motion to approve the Minutes from December 15, 2020 Design Review Board Meeting was made by Boardmember Thomas and seconded by Vice Chair Banda.

Vote: 6 – 0

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Carter – Banda – Thomas – Placko – Johnson – Green

NAYS – None

ABSENT – Knudsen

ABSTAINED – None

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

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

- 3-a DRB20-00511 District 1.** Within the 1200 to 1400 blocks of West Bass Pro Drive (south side) and the 1100 block of North Alma School Road (west side). Located south of the 202 Red Mountain Freeway on the west side of Alma School Road. (30.9± acres) Requesting the review of a new office building and parking garage within an existing office development. Mike Edwards, applicant; Riverview Point L P, owner.

Chair Carter invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant Michael Edwards

- Request for a continuance to February 9th, 2021 Design Review Board Meeting

Planning Director Appiah

- Noted staff agrees and recommended to continue to February 9th, 2021

Chair Carter

- DR20-00511 will be continued to February 9th, 2021 Design Review Board Meeting

- 3-b DRB20-00563 District 6.** Within the 5300 block of South Power Road (east side). Located South of Ray Road and east of Power Road. (2.4± acres) Requesting review of a hotel. Taylor Earl, Earl and Curley, applicant; Mesa Hotel Partners, LLC, owner.

Staff Planner Balmer presented the case.

Chair Carter invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant: Taylor Earl

- Need to add height to be more visible from Power Road

- Building needs to be more attractive
- The varied roof line and the sign element help
- Provide front to back movement and variability
- Focus on the pedestrian scale
- Good parking

Boardmember Johnson

- Likes the material palette
- Feels disjointed through building form
- If going with shed roof, stay with that roof form instead of the other
- The entry gets lost
- Wants a Porte-cochere to be more integral with the building design

Boardmember Green

- Agrees with Boardmember Johnson about the Porte-cochere
- Agree that the entry gets lost
- Design does a good job of meeting design guidelines

Vice Chair Banda

- Where are the asphalt shingles on the palette?
- Good articulation and front to back movement
- Feels like the design creates competing brands
- The color palette looks washed out and dated
- The dual brands are not unified
- Like the varying roof line and movement for building
- Needs more cohesiveness

Boardmember Placko

- Like the landscape
- Good mix of plant materials
- Are parking blocks going to be put in the parking stalls to prevent overhang?
- A lot of trees along the south and east property lines are planted right at the curb so there will be an overhang of about 2.5 ft

Boardmember Thomas

- Porte-cochere is disconnected
- At first glance, very drab and muted
- Likes roof line and movement
- The soffits don't have any thickness in the walls

Chair Carter

- Surprised with color scheme
- The right-hand side with "Sleep Inn" is better articulated than the left hand side

- MainStay needs to come up a little bit
- Feels like two different buildings that need to be unified
- Meets design guidelines and would be a benefit to Mesa
- Look forward to updated version

Staff planner Balmer

- Work on the Porte-cochere
- Create a more cohesive design with the two brands
- Increase thickness of soffit
- Trees need to be pulled back if no parking stops

Vice Chair Banda

- Don't think asphalt shingles should be used
- Stay away from 4,000 Kelvin

Chair Carter

- Agrees with eliminating the asphalt shingles

3-c

DRB20-00697 District 3. Within the 100 block of South Dobson Road (west side). Located south of Main Street on the west side of Dobson Road. (2.5± acres). Requesting the review of a multi-tenant commercial building. Rick Daugherty, 3rd Story Architecture; WJC LLC, owner.

Staff Planner Welch presented the case and noted the applicant has requested consideration for Alternative Compliance for the material requirements.

Chair Carter invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant Rick Daugherty

- Continuation of Mekong plaza
- They have requested a variance for a landscape reduction on the south side and will put in bamboo
- Parking in back for staff, deliveries, and trash pick up

Boardmember Green

- Does a great job in matching the intent of the existing plaza
- Concerned with the landscaping located on the west side of the building
- How will that landscaping be treated?

Vice Chair Banda

- Doesn't believe that the drive access will be disjointed
- Wants to make sure lighting is there for the staff parking

- Appreciates that the design is cohesive with the rest of the plaza
- Exposed raceways are not allowed
- Like the monument sign proposal
- Really like the elevations

Boardmember Johnson

- Likes that it matches existing
- No concerns with alternative compliance
- The detail in the existing architecture is very important. Is that being brought to the new building?
 - Yes
 - The front restaurant has room for character based on the possible tenant that moves in.
 - The depth of the property makes it challenging
- The drawings should commit applicant to providing the architectural detailing

Boardmember Thomas

- Likes the trellises
- Wants more of the archways and other details from the rest of the plaza to be brought in
- If done, will be very cohesive

Boardmember Placko

- What is the water source
 - City water
- Concern with the bamboo with city water and there is no other bamboo in the plaza
- Doesn't think they should waste city water on it
- Pot bush would be better
 - Applicant noted it is more of a theme/aesthetic
- Mesquite trees are also possibly a problem with neighbor on south property line

Chair Carter

- Agree with what everyone else has said

Staff Planner Welch

- Boardmember Placko, what species should replace the mesquite on southern property line?

Boardmember Placko

- Mastic or a mulga, but the gray may be a problem given everything is green

Staff Planner Welch

- Will work with applicant to bring details from plaza into new proposal
- Consistent with the lighting
- Will look at comment regarding bamboo and mesquite

Boardmember Placko

- Heavenly bamboo should not be used unless on approved list

3-d DRB20-00707 District 1. Within the 1100 block of North Dobson Road (east side). Located south of the Red Mountain 202 Freeway on the east side of Dobson. (1± acres). Requesting the review of a restaurant with a drive-thru. Steven Albrecht, PM Design Inc., applicant; Sachs Ranch Co. LLC/Hurley Land Co. LLC, owner. **(Continued to the February 9, 2021 meeting)**

3-e DRB20-00768 District 6. Within the 8400 to 8800 blocks of East Elliot Road (north side) and within the 3400 to 3600 blocks of South Hawes Road (east side). Located east of Hawes Road and north of Elliot Road (77± acres). Requesting the review of two industrial buildings. Eric Zitny, Ware Malcomb, applicant; Loop 202 & Elliot Road Parcel #2 LLC, owner.

Staff Planner Welch presented the case and noted the applicant has requested consideration for Alternative Compliance for the material requirements and the requirements for the parapets.

Chair Carter invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant Eric Zitny

- Noted the additional landscaping on Elliot
- Also the additional glazing

Boardmember Placko

- Complimented the applicant on the number of large-scale trees

Boardmember Johnson

- Noted it is a huge building but likes the breaking of planes
- Likes articulation of corners and glass between planes
- The rendering looks like the building grows in height in the center vs the elevation where it looks like the outside is higher
 - The applicant clarified it is both. The corners on the south side are highlighted with a taller parapet line while the center of the building is taller on the north side
- Would work better to bring more attention to the corners than the center so it does not look like a wedding cake
- Wants movement on the 6ft screen wall

- Currently no articulation, will look very large

Vice Chair Banda

- Agrees with Boardmember Johnson on the wall comment
- Okay with alternative compliance on parapet details
- Building has more of a modern feeling
- Screen wall falls flat, very dated
- Could offset the screen wall, have movement
- Agree about the wedding cake feel
- More emphasis on ends would look better
- Likes the modern light sconces
- Well done building

Boardmember Green

- Well done
- Likes the light sconces
- Lighting plays a huge part and could help with the detailing especially at night
- Hard to tell screen wall colors
- Screen wall, especially on Elliot needs more work
- Landscaping is well done

Boardmember Thomas

- Okay with building so far
- Likes the building
- Doesn't want to see projects that look like this over and over in Mesa
- Would be interested in seeing how off-site improvements affect traffic

Chair Carter

- No comments

Staff Planner Welch

- Bring emphasis on the corner areas
- Add articulation and architecture to the screen wall
- Bring existing design to the screen walls
- Paint dock doors to match

3-f

DRB20-00777 District 6. Within the 1400 block of south Crismon Road (west side). Located south of Southern Avenue on the west side of Crismon. (1± acres). Requesting a review of a restaurant with a drive-thru. Holly Keilman, Eegees, applicant; KFH Crismon & Hampton LLC, owner.

Staff Planner Rorex presents.

Chair Carter invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant Holly Keilman

Boardmember Thomas

- Excited to see this project come together in this location
- Likes the 5 and Diner look

Boardmember Placko

- Out front there are whale's tongue agaves, how much room do they have to grow?
- If not at least 5 feet, look at different plant for that space

Boardmember Green

- Excited for the Eegees
- Thinks it is far enough away from hotel that should not be considered
- Looks good on its own

Vice Chair Banda

- Fun building
- Drive through Porte-cochere looks spindly
- Needs a thicker metal there
- 50s theme, but opportunity for sign to be laser cut metal and backlit would look fun
- Excited to see an Eegees here in Mesa

Boardmember Johnson

- Great building
- Like the selection of materials especially the glazed brick
- In the rendering looking from Crismon Road, consider balancing the design more
- Strong roof line on the north face
- The Porte-cochere falls off on the back side

Chair Carter

- Fun building

Staff Planner Rorex

- The drive thru should be bigger to match
- Think about possibilities for a sign
- If less than a 5 ft wide space for whale's tongue agave, use something different

3-g

DRB20-00826 District 6. Within the 7100 block of East Seaver Avenue (north side). Located east of Power Road and north of Ray Road. (10± acres). Requesting the review of a new industrial building. Karen Ohmann, applicant; PHX-MESA GATEWAY AIRPORT 193 LLC, owner.

Staff Planner Bridges presented the case and noted the applicant has requested consideration for Alternative Compliance for the material requirements, the roof articulation, and the wall articulation.

Chair Carter invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant Karen Ohmann

- Designed for 1-4 tenants
- Added pedestrian level interest
- Trying to also maintain the industrial functionality
- Worked to increase the visual accents

Boardmember Johnson

- Likes the south face
- Wish to see more detail from the canopies
- Successfully highlighted entrances
- Not justification for alternative compliance waiver on the north side
- Color palette is bold, unsure if that is good or bad

Boardmember Green

- Color palette is a concern. Consider adjusting the colors
- Not in support of alternative compliance waiver on north side

Vice Chair Banda

- Colors are fun from east and south elevations
- North elevation color banding does not have the form liner
- Use form liner on the north to help create more movement
- Like the corner treatment and the glass
- Does not like masonry wall
- Use colors interspaced with other colors/CMU on screen wall
- Likes the white

Boardmember Placko

- Too few shrubs
- Concern - North property line doesn't have visual screening along truck side
- Concern about putting mesquite trees in narrow basket, they don't have the root mass to hold the tree up
- Think about tall columnar trees or tall evergreen trees

Boardmember Thomas

- Like the integral wall colors with the doors
- Also concerned with north elevation. There are major areas with no articulation when there could be some
- Like the white store front material and how it plays with the glass

Chair Carter

- No additional comments, agrees with all that have been made

Staff Planner Bridges

- Concern with lack of articulation on the north side
- Reexamine the color palette
- Look at material for masonry wall
- Look at using integral blocks
- Revisit the mesquite trees
- Add additional shrub variety throughout the site

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

5 Planning Director Update:

5-a Presentation of recently approved projects.

Presentation continued to the February 9, 2021 meeting.

5-b Ongoing Projects.

6 Adjournment

Vice Chair Banda moved to adjourn the meeting and was seconded by Boardmember Green. Without objection, the meeting was adjourned at 6:07 PM.