

**Tuesday, February 9, 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
*Boardmember Jeanette Knudsen

MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

STAFF PRESENT:

Nana Appiah
Lesley Davis
Tom Ellsworth
*Rachel Prelog
Ryan McCann
Wahid Alam
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 January 12, 2021 Design Review Board Meeting.**

A motion to approve the Minutes from January 12, 2021 Design Review Board Meeting was made by Vice Chair Banda and seconded by Boardmember Thomas.

Vote: 5 – 0

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Carter – Banda – Thomas – Johnson – Green

NAYS – None

ABSENT – Placko

ABSTAINED – Knudsen

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 DRB20-00211 District 5. Within the 6800 to 6900 blocks of East University Drive (south side). Located east of Power Road on the south side of University Drive. (1.6± acres). Requesting the review of a multi-tenant commercial building.

Staff Planner Charlotte Bridges presented the case.

Chair Carter invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant John Reddell

- This has been a difficult site to work with
- Had a hard time figuring out what the buildable pad area was
- Lots of easements to work around
- Continued the Bureau of Land Management designated landscaping

Boardmember Thomas

- Has the stucco cap been painted silver and what is the material under the silver?
 - Yes, it is all stucco
- Concerned about the stucco cap
 - Can work with Charlotte Bridges on using metal instead

Boardmember Placko

- Doesn't believe the skyflower plant is on the low water plant list
- No other comments

Boardmember Knudsen

- Why did you choose that shade of red?
 - Went with metal instead of canvas because of maintenance
 - Red was chosen as the accent
- The red that is chosen was very bright
- The rest of the colors are more earth tones

- Try to find more of a dirty red, or toned down shade, but not maroon
- Northern Territory doesn't go with the brick so try to find something else
- The polished silver is a very cool color
 - I have used it on other projects, and it looks good
- I would be careful of the silver, but if you have used it in the past, it might go well
- It is only on the top of the building right?
 - Yes

Vice Chair Banda

- Looks like a QuikTrip campus
- Looks a little dated
- Lighting needs to be lower than 3500K
- 4000K is way too bright

Boardmember Green

- For the west building on the east side, is there any screen wall or fencing around the patio
 - Planning for a future railing around the patio
- Staff should make sure that the railing matches the rest of the building
- Shade should be provided for that patio

Boardmember Johnson

- The metal cap should be metal not stucco

Chair Carter

- Agrees with Vice Chair Banda and wants a more updated look
- Colors look older
- Maybe change the colors a bit to be more updated
- Otherwise, good job on the design

Staff Planner Bridges

- Metal cap to actual metal
- Make sure the skyflower is on the low water plant list or replace it
- Red awnings not so bright
- Reexamine the Northern Territory to blend better
- Color of the railing for patio should match
- More shade for the patio
- Max 3500K light

3-b

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.

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

Chair Carter invited the applicant to speak.

The applicant, Mike Edwards, with The Davis Experience, stated that there were three different tones of glass on the building so in spirit meets the no more than 50% of the same material rule.

The Work Session was opened for public comment:

Douglas Allsworth, 100 Valvoline Way Lexington, KY 40509, spoke in opposition to the project.

The comment card provided from Mr. Allsworth in opposition stated: I represent Perry and Janice Jaicks, who also intend to speak.

I thank you for the opportunity to speak. I represent Perry and Janice Jaicks who reside at 1318 West Mountain View Drive. Their house is immediately to the south of the proposed new buildings, directly across the canal. The design review criteria we are concerned about is the building scale and character and transition to the residential neighborhood.

The Jaicks' are alarmed by the prospect of the new three- and four-story structure a few hundred feet away from their backyard. These new structures are too tall and too big to be constructed so close to a residential neighborhood. The parking garage is likely to generate significant light pollution, not only from the cars that are going in and out, but also from the multiple light poles on the top floor of the structure as well as from the light fixtures on the lower floors, which are only moderately screened under the revised plan. Even in daytime, this is nothing pretty to look at. This is just a big gray building that is 534 feet long, with no real unique design features to make it visually interesting.

All these concerns were raised by the neighbors in October. I do not want to belittle the applicant's gesture of making some changes, but this is still just a big gray box with light poles on top. There is no effective transition to a residential neighborhood and the City's design guidelines are not met here. There is some important history that I think the Board needs to keep in mind. The original site plan was approved for this site in 2007. There was neighborhood input at that time. The neighborhood was concerned about the intensity of this site and that multiple buildings were approved but none taller than two stories.

This was a compromise to allow for commercial development adjacent to a residential neighborhood. All the buildings were two stories or smaller. I thought site plan review is within the scope of the DRB for one, but two, the transition to a residential neighborhood is a specific design guideline to avoid big differences between buildings, scale, and character as well as providing for a harmonious transition in scale and character between different districts.

What had happened here is a site plan was approved in 2007 providing for 443,000 square feet of building area and multiple buildings of two stories or lower to go in after phase one was developed. There were, I believe, six administrative site plan amendments. With due respect, members of the board, the design criteria is not met by this site, we urge you to recognize that.

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

I'm going to try to focus my comments specifically on the design criteria from the City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance section 11-71-6, the review criteria. Looking at criteria number three, does the parking garage's overall design provide architectural interest in areas visible from streets, sidewalks and public areas? No, it does not. A 530-foot long dark grey building with dark grey accents isn't exactly architecturally interesting. Criteria number five, is the parking garage designed internally and visually consistent with and fully integrated with the other buildings? No, it is not. The garage has no architectural relationship with the other buildings other than the color of being gray. This building has none of the visually interesting elements that the existing or proposed office building has. This board already unanimously indicated the parking garages lack of design in the last full DRB hearing, but I see no improvements here.

Criteria number six, is the garage compatible with neighboring development by avoiding big differences and building scale and character and does it provide a harmonious transition in scale and character between different districts? No, it does not. There is a huge difference here in the scale and character of the parking garage and office building versus the residential homes to the south. And there is no transition of scale or character unless you think the two proposed buildings that will be the largest and tallest buildings in the center are an appropriate transition to the adjacent homes.

Criteria number seven, is the parking garage a well-articulated structure that presents well designed building facades on all sides, roof lines, and building heights that promote compatibility among neighboring land uses within the same or different districts? Absolutely not. The garage has no articulation, is not a well-designed façade on any side, has a monotonous roofline, and is too tall to be compatible with the predominantly one-story neighboring homes. Criteria number eight, does the garage create visual variety and relief avoiding a large scale bulky or box like appearance? No, it is a large box. I would like to request that perhaps you call on Janice Jaicks for the next speaker. Her comments were prepared in coordination with mine so that would be nice if she could read hers next.

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

The comment card provided from Mrs. Jaicks in opposition stated: I am very opposed to the mass of the proposed parking garage. The light pollution will be objectionable with the cars (it already is an issue with existing new Waypoint 3/4 building. The lights are on all times of the night, I have attached a picture of the lot next to me at 6:30am) not to mention the noise from more cars and more garbage collection. I ask for one story maximum on the parking garage and two story on the office building that will be behind it. Thank you.

My name is Janice Jaicks, I'm at 1318 West Mountain View Drive. Question for the Board, would you want this in your backyard? No matter how many flowers you try to cover it with, it is a four story open parking garage with minimal screening that will shine car lights and garage lighting into your backyard. A 534-foot long, 365,000 square foot monolith with no design whatsoever. No breaking about the facade and unending monotonous 534-foot roofline, no relation to the other buildings in the center other than color completely devoid of any contextual relationship with a long-standing residential neighborhood.

Would you like that in your backyard? I am sure your answer is probably no. What we are faced with is a developer who's gotten greedy. I am sorry to say that, but we feel it's true. The City approved master plan has been built out, it's done. The prior developer chose to develop option one from the 2014 administrative amendment that allowed two office buildings along the south side with surface parking in between. That is what is there today, the master plan is complete.

Now a new developer comes in wanting more over a half a million square feet more. I argue that this is design. With the new 152,000 square foot office building and 365,000 square foot parking garage, neither of these new buildings were ever contemplated in the 2007 approval, or even in the six administrative amendments. We are resigned to what's there even today, even if we had no knowledge or any opportunity of the other six amendments that happened since 2007. And remember, the 2007 site plan that was presented to the surrounding neighborhoods included only two-story buildings and the developer represented that to the neighbors that the buildings would be two stories.

Yes, the neighbors did bring up this issue in 2007. They asked whether the buildings would be too tall and impact their quality of life in both the 2007 neighborhood meeting and again at the public hearing. The developer told the neighbors not to worry about the building height because all the buildings would be two stories.

Then, six secret administrative changes later, we are now looking at a four-story parking garage and another three-story office building. Your own design guidelines are not met by this parking garage. As it stated, as Shawna Boyle stated, by this monstrosity with little design. Ryan McCann has a few pictures that were sent in by us by a design artist, so I want to make sure they get shown. Thank you for your time.

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

The comment card provided from Mr. Jaicks in opposition stated: The proposed parking garage is too high and too wide for a neighborhood. The light pollution, noise pollution and view obstruction is going to be an issue for my home and all the others on our street. Also, I'm confused as to why the landscaping was offered to us as a compromise, and now it appears to have gone away.

Thank you, Chairman and Boardmembers. My name is Perry Jaicks and I live in 1318 West Mountain View. You just heard from my wife. I was hoping Ryan McCann could bring up the drawings we sent in so I can explain them. I just want to explain to you what this is. I know that the architects and the developers on Waypoint had a company go out and scan this, but I scanned these myself. These are a little bit more rookie-ish than the than Waypoint ones, but I wanted to prove to you that this is at a higher level than what they talked about. As far as a guideline, you can see the handrail on there with the building imposed in the background.

As you can see, this is offensive compared to what we had when we built these houses. What we are looking at right now, you can also see the

height of the building to the left of that. There are other pictures there, I want to show what it would look like standing on our backyard. Ryan, if you can show another picture. It is the next one down from that. Anyway, I wanted to show you that this is built in taking some liberties about exactly where the finished grade would be, when they build this across the canal, that this is what we are looking at.

If you look at Waypoint, the views of the garage are taken with a drone. They are looking at this building from 70 to 110 feet above the ground and it does not give you a view of what life would be like when I am in my backyard with my family. So, I take a little bit of offense as that is what they are trying to show. And then on top of that, if you look at the building, there are going to be light poles on top of that, that will be on all night long for security reasons. Even though you can stagger the upper deck of your building back, it still does not look like this when you're standing on the ground.

So, Boardmembers you are more than welcome to come to our house and stand there so we can show it to you. You have heard a lot of what everybody else has said. I think Phil wants to get on. If there's any more time left, I'd like to have him talk about it. So, thank you very much Board and Chair Carter for taking my phone call.

Philip Bramsen, 1510 W Desert Bloom Drive, spoke in opposition to the project.

My name is Phil Bramsen. My mother, Maureen Schultz resides at 1242 West Mountain View. This home was constructed 40 plus years ago by her late husband. My mother has lived in the City of Mesa for over 70 years. We are opposed to the Waypoint 5 development as it is currently being proposed by the developer and their architects. The intensity and height of the Waypoint project has increased dramatically since its inception. The square footage of the four existing buildings are what was contemplated for five or six buildings. The impact on the adjoining neighborhood is dramatic.

Several homes are less than 300 feet from proposed parking structure. These homes are closer to the parking garage than some of the office buildings the garage serves. The underlying zoning may allow this, but I would not. I would argue that the price, proximity, height and mass are simply not appropriate. I would support, a suggestion that the parking garage be a maximum of two stories, one surface level and one underground as the developers have over parked the site from what is required by City of Mesa Code.

This has been done for marketing reasons and have increased rental rates all at the expense of the adjoining neighborhood. If this is essential to them, they can construct the building with a poor portion of the structure underground. I am talking about height and I still think we have said about three times now that we consider it to be building design.

I do not believe there is any way to sufficiently buffer the residential by landscaping of walls, the night is going to be changed forever by all the lights on and within the structure while allowing headlights in the early morning and evening shine directly in the master bedroom. The homes designed with north facing amenities take advantage of the natural views, I would ask the developer to decrease the height of the proposed office building by eliminating the third floor and thereby conforming with the previously constructed and approved buildings one and two.

This would also decrease the amount of required parking spaces and decrease the size of the parking structure, whether above or below ground. This neighborhood to the south has a lot of history. Over the years several prominent Mesans have lived and raise their families here. It exists on land that truly gave Mesa its name. The applicant has historically done their best to ignore the neighborhood as evidenced by the last phase of development in 2014 and 2016. Thank you.

Ruth Ann Showalter, 1262 W Mountain View, spoke in opposition to the project.

The comment card provided from Ms. Showalter in opposition stated: We appreciate the original "delay" from the 10/13/2020 DRB hearing, when the Board quickly recognized during public comment that heads were spinning across our project-adjacent neighborhood, having only just been notified the week before that this Waypoint 5 application existed. But this short period since, of trying to work with the applicant on our concerns, has barely given us a chance to get our own bearings as a neighborhood group of simple but alarmed residents. Please, please afford us this additional 60-day extension to afford us time to adequately present our position.

My name is Ruth Ann Showalter. I am at 1262 West Mountain View Drive. Almost smack in the middle of the of this proposed development. I'd like to comment, like my neighbors, on the massing, the landscaping, and the lighting of this project. But first if it's appropriate, I'd also like to comment on our requests from the last meeting for continuance. I don't know if it's possible for me to object to the minutes from last month, but in those minutes, only the applicant was allowed to speak. It's misrepresents that the applicant was the one requesting the continuance when indeed, it only happened because of our neighborhood as the opponents, and the lawyer that was hired, Mr. Douglas Allsworth. Thank you for putting together a letter showing the history that the applicant has continually done the bare minimum as far as notifications to us sometimes even missing what really should be there, the deadline of a project that started the pre submittal process way back on February 5th. This is important to us to have on record and I would really like that letter that you received from Mr. Ellsworth last month, to be added to the minutes so that it shows. That is why the continuance happened.

I'd like a reconsideration because we asked for 60-day continuance, not 30 days. Now, I appreciate that back on October 13, Mr. Chairman, you especially recognized and acknowledged right away, that our neighborhood had only just learned about the project about a week and a half before the Design Review Board meeting and that pushed it into a citizen participation review process. That gave us some time. But that just gave us time to have two meetings with the developer, where time was limited, partly because of this whole COVID thing that we have to go through. We did not really get to thoroughly explore everything with them about this project.

And in fact, after a Citizen Participation Plan is done, it's a requirement that they must write up the minutes of the Citizen Participation Plan and submit that to the city before things can go forward any further and that has not happened. I've even confirmed this with Ryan McCann. I had said I'd like to see the submission so that we can make our own comments to see whether we're represented correctly.

We need more time. Really like that 60 days, instead of just the 30 days you've given us, because the system is stacked against us. We need more time to develop more relationships with the people on the City Council and the Board. Thank you.

The applicant's representative, Adam Baugh, Withey Morris, PLC, gave his presentation.

Members of the Commission, it's important that you understand that this isn't a zoning case, but there are entitlements here that allow us to go forward with this type of proposal. Ryan, jump ahead to the DRB meeting feedback slide. This is the feedback you gave us last time. This is why we made the changes related to the design. You had comments about height, screening, colors, parking ratios, solar canopies, pole lighting, vehicle lighting, trash location, landscape along the canal, and line of sight studying photo exhibits. I list this because it is important that I show I heard your feedback. And we then address those issues. So you go to the next slide.

We did two virtual neighbor meetings, a couple meetings in person on the property while we visited in the backyards. We took drone footage, photos taken at the height of the backyard, we did renderings as well. Let us go the next slide. And what you will see are the changes we made. We specifically lowered the garage level on the style side of that garage, so it is tiered. We remove the solar panel structures as required by the Commission or the Design Review Board. We added perforated metal panel screens on the south of the garage as was specifically pointed out in the lighting concerns that were made by the neighbors. We changed the colors on the south face to be more muted. We remove the refuse enclosures from behind the structures to other places on the property. We increase the landscape island on the backside of that and we increase the landscape plantings along the canal. We actually reduced the garage by 100 spaces and we added a pedestrian pathway in that area. If you go to the next slide, I think this helps you illustrate and show this is what is before for the third story canopies and the trash bins. If you go to the next one, you can see that the tiered level is 26 feet tall. For comparison, that building just west of us is 50 feet tall. The two story building east of us is 35 feet tall.

Now, I know this meets all the criteria of your zoning ordinance that the Design Review Board reviews. I want it to be helpful and clear that we heard your feedback last month and we specifically did all the things that were pointed out to us, so that we provided a more appropriately scaled and better architecturally designed building and development. I know you've asked me to be brief, so I think I'll just end it with that. But clearly, we've heard your concerns and want to be responsive and let you know that at the end, we've done several things. I know that regardless of what I have done, it's probably not going to be sufficient to solve the broader concern that I've heard from the community, but it has not been without effort. It has not been without responsive changes for that feedback. So, I appreciate the consideration you've given me to share this and I'll end it there.

Chair Carter

- Confirmed the height for the zoning district?

Staff Planner McCann

- Explained it is specific to the plan approved in the PEP PAD district

Boardmember Thomas

- Like the design and the glass
- Agrees with the architect about the different colored glass and counts to the 50%
- Appreciates the effort from the applicant
- The screening does help, but is not architecturally interesting
- The perf screening is just flat metal
- Watermark project off Rural and the 202 did a great job on their parking garage
- Appreciates the garage drop down and the lack of solar panels

Boardmember Placko

- Pleased the applicant upsized the trees
- Most trees proposed are evergreen and will help screen
- Question to Ryan – is it over parked?

Staff Planner McCann

- Does exceed minimum parking and the code allows for that

Boardmember Placko

- Wants more trees to help with heat and environmental impact
- Confirmed the parking structure is 3 floors on the south and 4 on the north
- I am sensitive to that massing

Boardmember Knudsen

- Like the colors of the building
- Was concerned about the ice cube silver, but with the other colors it will look nice

Boardmember Green

- Wants to acknowledge citizens and sympathizes with them
- Understands that you can't sculpt the façade of the garage, but thinks more should be done
- Likes the building

Boardmember Johnson

- Does staff believe that the garage does meet the design guidelines?

Staff Planner McCann

- Confirmed that it does meet the intent of the guidelines

Boardmember Johnson

- Does the garage follow the same guidelines as a building

Staff Planner McCann

- It does typically need to meet those same guidelines

Dr. Appiah

- Boardmember Johnson, can you please repeat your question as it is a loaded question

Boardmember Johnson

- If the guidelines were applied the same, more variation and movement would be needed
- The materials also would need to be changed to follow those guidelines
- Wanted to make sure the garage is not violating any standards

Dr. Appiah

- Thanks for the clarification
- The garage is not really a building
- Cannot use the same guidelines as it is a garage and a different kind of building

Boardmember Johnson

- Thanks for the clarification
- More articulation is needed on the garage
- The perforated metal needs to be changed as it takes away from the natural articulation between floors

Vice Chair Banda

- Concerned about seeing the lighting from below
- Height and site plan concerns will have to be addressed with the City Council
- Need to address south side of the structure

Chair Carter

- Believes that the garage is such a huge building, it should be treated as a building with the design guidelines
- The AT Still parking garage project is a good parking garage example
- No issues with the building
- Do not see care taken to the south side of the garage for the neighbors
- Missing design that could make it better
- Everything is extremely horizontal
- Could do different colors of perforated metal or something else to break it up

Staff Planner McCann

- Look at the garage screening
- Look at texture or pop outs
- Articulate it a bit more to break up the horizontal plane
- No comments on the building
- Look at the garage and how to break up the façade
- Look at different options for the perforated metal

Dr. Appiah

- On the screening materials, board asked for us to look into different materials of higher quality
- Look at more articulation for the garage

Boardmember Thomas

- Wants applicant to look at either Coor slab or T-pack for a form-board structure to help break up the horizontal look

Vice Chair Banda

- Repeats that the AT Still garage at Recker and Baseline would be a good example. It is a similar situation
- Could create some sort of a diffused stairwell
- Helps create sense of a visual screening from the south
- Could use a perf material to be a visual blocker
- Other examples are available

The Planning and Zoning Board will review the request for Site Plan approval on February 24, 2021 at 4:00 PM at their scheduled hearing.

3-c 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. **(Continue to the March 9, 2021 meeting)**

3-d DRB20-00823 District 6. Within the 10700 block of East Guadalupe Road (south side). Located west of Signal Butte Road on the south side of Guadalupe Road. (0.8± acres). Requesting the review of an automobile/vehicle service and repair facility. Hayley Bancroft, Greenberg Farrow, applicant; Tina Kelty, KEMF GB PAD LLC, owner.

Staff Planner Wahid Alam presented the case.

Chair Carter invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant: Kent Lupton

- Nothing to add. Wahid did a great presentation

Boardmember Placko

- Liked the landscape Plan.
- No additional comments

Boardmember Knudsen

- Amarillo white is a little off to go with the gray colors
- Look at a beige with a green undertones
- Color on the doors may need to be looked at
- Amarillo white is too warm
- Reconsider cooler color

Boardmember Green

- No comments

Boardmember Johnson

- On the metal panel corner elements, look like they might be tower elements
- Reading from the plan, it doesn't seem like it is moving
- The corner with cement board pilasters looks thin, either consider widening them and taking them to the ground or stop at the top of the wainscot and let the stone wrap around the base of the building
- Amarillo white is off and something is off between the stone and the rest of the building
- Warm or cool, not both
- Nice building

Vice Chair Banda

- Appreciates the lighting package, but there could be more opportunity to make the architecture more interesting with lighting
- Suggested all exterior light fixtures to be less than 4000 K

Boardmember Thomas

- Doesn't like the two main doors
- Dumpster gate, are they see through?

Staff Planner Alam

- Mesa requires it to be opaque

Chair Carter

- Likes the proposed design

Wahid

- No comments on landscaping
- Look at the color Amarillo, white concern
- The stone elements
- The two doors on the north side
- Pick up some interesting architectural lighting
- Opaque dumpster gate

3-e

DRB20-00878 District 6. Within the 3200 block of South Ellsworth Road (east side) and within the 9200 block of East Prairie Avenue (north side). Located north of Elliot Road on the east side of Ellsworth Road. (±3 acres). Requesting the review of a data center. Dawn Hart, applicant; Comarch Inc., owner.

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch presented the case.

Chair Carter invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant: Applicants representing Gensler & Comarch were in attendance. Applicants gave a short presentation.

- This is their first building to be built in the US
- Worked hard to make it look nice

Boardmember Knudsen

- Would like to delay comment as no material board was provided

Boardmember Green

- Confirmed that the screening fence on the north side of the building, will they be closed fencing?

Staff Planner Welch

- Yes

Boardmember Green

- Appreciated the design of this data center
- Improve the west elevation facing Ellsworth Road with additional architectural features.

Boardmember Johnson

- This is a great piece of architecture coming to Mesa
- Concerned a little with the west façade
- Would like to hear from architect

Jay Silverburg – applicant/architect

- Project has three major components
- Wanted to look at each of the pieces as separate architecture
- Shade structures and solar pops up creates a pavilion for the entry
- High quality of concrete in the tilt up

Boardmember Johnson

- Thinks it will be beautiful
- Maybe look closer at the site wall
- Consider possibly pushing and pulling that surface or adding another color on the west side
- Great job and look forward to seeing it

Vice Chair Banda

- A rendering would have been helpful
- Love the materials
- Can tell it is a flagship project
- Top notch lighting
- If there is signage, it needs to be unique like the building, this includes a monument sign if proposed
- Agrees with comments from Boardmember Johnson for detailing on the western side

Boardmember Thomas

- Having seen several data centers, really like this design
- What is the height of the security fence and will it be arched?
 - in the fence is in the 6 ft height range
- On the north side will be more transparent and about 40 inches
- If the fence does need to be taller, hope for no arch at the top as will pull from architecture

Boardmember Placko

- Planting plan does reflect modern structure
- Worried that as plants start to die, the design will be more random

- Is the retention basin meant to store water?
- Do have a rain feature on the south side and does capture the water in the basin and will help with irrigation
- Is it flat or sloped
 - It is mostly flat
- Encourage use of rip rap in the basin at the south corner
- Would like to hold this project up as how not to over park a data center

Boardmember Knudsen

- Want to agree with Johnson about the west side
- A rendering would have been helpful
- Think it will be a great project

Chair Carter

- Confirmed the building is setback 15 ft back from Ellsworth Road
- Agreed more could be done on the west elevation

Staff Planner Welch

- Wrap the architecture to west side to make that more interesting along Ellsworth
- Improved wall design
- Signage design needs to tie in with architecture
- Will look at the planting in the basin do if the plants die, it is not apparent

3-f

DRB20-00893 District 6. Within the 11100 to 11600 blocks of East Pecos Road (south side), within the 11100 to 11600 blocks of East Germann Road (north side) and within the 6800 to 7600 blocks of the South Meridian Road alignment (west side). Located west of the Meridian Road alignment, south of Pecos Road and north of Germann Road. (229± acres) Requesting the review of new industrial buildings within an existing industrial development. Andy Sarat, applicant; Commercial Metals Company, owner.

Staff Planner Ryan McCann presented the case.

Chair Carter invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant: Andy Surat, Director of operations at CMC Steel and Rod Jarvis with Earl and Curly, PC

- Excited to more than double our facilities here in Mesa
- Look forward to working together on this project

Rod Jarvis

- The first phase of the plant and volume of recycling drives the design
- 4,000 to 6,000 tons
- Going from 64 acres to 84 acres

- The mill building is set back 1100 sq ft
- This is a very “green” use

The Work Session was opened for public comment:

Ken Smith, 6816 E Brown Road, spoke in support to the project.

The comment card provided from Mr. Smith in support stated:

Two main concerns: Why isn't the City of Mesa requiring CMC to build a Perimeter Fence and to provide proper Landscaping as a buffer? Why is not the C of M requiring that the west side of Meridian Road be built at the same time as the east side of Meridian Rd that is being built by the C of Q C? I am a personal injury attorney. The C of M is on legal notice that of forcing six lanes of traffic into two lanes of traffic north of German Rd is an inherently and unreasonably dangerous road design. Deaths and costly lawsuits to follow!

Thank you, Chair. Thank you, counsel. My name is Ken Smith. I'm a fifth-generation resident of Mesa. I own land just east of CMC Still. I'm thrilled about the progress CMC Stills making and I'm excited about their expansion. I just have a question for the board. And that would be what, as far as it goes with the architecture, what is the architecture for a buffer zone? On the east side and south side of the expansion of CMC? Still? I heard talk about the landscaping for the new entrance and the locker room but no landscaping along the east side, northern side boundaries of Pecos and Meridian.

Staff Planner McCann

- Noted there is an existing development agreement to defer the landscaping on Pecos Road, Germann Road, and Meridian Road

Chair Carter

- Is there any landscape buffer required on the east side in the development agreement?

Staff Planner McCann

- That is part of the developmental agreement
- At said time, the developer would be required to install

Chair Carter

- Do you know how big it is?

Principle Planner Ellsworth

- As part of the 2007 case there is a Bonus Intensity Zone (BIZ)
- The BIZ included a landscape plan for Pecos Road, Germann Road, and Meridian Road
- Ryan is referring to the phasing of the landscaping
- The landscaping has been deferred as part of the agreement

- I believe the width of the landscaping was 30 ft at the time, but would need to check
- Berming and landscaping were included in the landscape plan
- Will be phased in, either with the timing of the agreement or when deemed appropriate by the City

Chair Carter

- That's pretty loose

Ken Smith

- When is the city going to require CMC Steel to put in landscaping, a buffer, or a CMU wall

Dr. Appiah

- The development agreement authorizes the City to work with the developer and we will continue to work with the developer
- When deemed appropriate, at the right time, we will have the developer put the landscaping in
- It was deferred to make sure the landscaping would not have to be taken out again due to construction

Ken Smith

- So you can't say when it will happen?

Dr. Appiah

- We will continue to work with the property owner
- As of today we do not know

Ken Smith

- Are you talking about Germann or Meridian?

Dr. Appiah

- I am talking about the development agreement.
- Pecos and Germann for your question

Ken Smith

- Are you aware that Meridian Road will be built soon
- Within the next year and a half
- They are going to start in April
- We request an 8 ft perimeter wall, and we don't care if it is red

Chair Carter

- We need to move on to the building discussion
- When Meridian is built, the development agreement will probably be called to be enforced

Boardmember Green

- Comments that were brought up should be considered

Boardmember Johnson

- Not familiar with the design in this area
- There is a lot of chain-link
- Would eventually like to see the landscaping in and fencing provided
- One building looks like it has more premium materials and that is not needed

- It could go back to the way it looked before

Vice Chair Banda

- Is an industrial application so am unfamiliar with the design for those purposes
- Need to lean on staff for landscaping when that goes in
- Hope for natural landscaping instead of formal
- Does need to be screened with landscaping or something else

Boardmember Thomas

- Would agree with the neighbor about Meridian Road and how fast it will develop
- If the city doesn't push on this, there will be an eyesore on Meridian
- Noted that this type of industrial building was outside of his experience range

Boardmember Placko

- Very difficult landscape plan to read
- No specifics provided
- Quantities don't match the plans
- Need to redo the landscape plan
- Be very careful with yucca baccata/banana yucca. They are not fun to walk into.
- Banana yucca would be great on the perimeter
- Would recommend red yucca
- Need to thin out valentine bush for both parking lots and around the scale house

Boardmember Knudsen

- Confirmed that they are going to continue the material that is all ready out there in the new development

Chair Carter

- About time for that development agreement to kick in

Staff Planner McCann

- Staff will take a look at the development agreement and when appropriate, screening and landscaping will be evaluated
- Take a look at the proposed landscaping near the locker room
- Thin out the valentine bush
- Take a look at the yucca baccata and add more red yucca

Close the Work Session 7:07 pm

Open the Design Review Board meeting 7:07pm

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

- 4-a** **DRB21-00031 District 3.** 2425 South Dobson Road. Located south of Baseline Road on the east side of Dobson Road. (17.6± acres). Review of a proposed addition to the Dobson Ranch Library. Richard Clutter, emc2 Architects, Applicant; City of Mesa, Owner.

Staff Planner Bridges presented the case.

Chair Carter invited the applicant to speak.

Richard Clutter, Emc2 Group Architects, spoke to the Board.

Richard Clutter

I just want to hit on the points that we discussed in the work study session. There were three items or four items that were brought up.

The board took exception to the steel columns and felt like we should bring back concrete columns and address some of the traditional look of the building. We have changed out the steel columns round concrete columns of the same size as the original columns. To bring that back and to pay deference to that existing building.

There was discussion about the signage. We've tried to vary the sign size, the lettering size, and the and the proportions to make it a little more interesting. This will be lighted signage. There was discussion about the intersection of materials on the elevation, not liking the way that works. We've revised to offset the colors where they intersect and overlap them, try to create a little bit more depth and interest in the front elevation of the building. Finally, there was discussion about using a Swan Hill species for the olive, our landscape architect has informed us that the swan hills species is hard to find and it's not grown commercially anymore, he'd be happy to use it, but he doesn't think they'll be able to procure it. Those are the four main points, and we'd be happy to talk about anything else that you want to discuss on the project.

Chair Carter

Thank you, Richard. Let's see what comments there are from board members. We'll start with Boardmember Johnson.

Boardmember Johnson

I just have a couple things if you could forgive me, I haven't dug deep into this design yet. But if you could clarify just a few things for me. On the West facade where it looks a little more milky, almost like frosted, is that a screen in front of the glass? Can you talk through what is happening there?

Richard Clutter

Yes, that's a perforated metal screen. That is because we have a direct west exposure on that glass there. So, we are trying to mitigate some of the sun coming in on the west side.

Boardmember Johnson

How is that screen supported? Does it have a frame system or something like that?

Richard Clutter

Yes, it does. There's a steel frame that goes up the full height and it goes up to the soffit.

Boardmember Johnson

It must be perforated. But is it corrugated as well?

Richard Clutter

It's just perforated right now.

Boardmember Johnson

Okay, I'd be careful with just a flat perforated panel, I think you're going to see a lot of oil canning deflection in that. You might look at a micro perforation or micro corrugation or something like that. What is happening as you walk down between the pillars and the glazing if you were to look straight up. What is the treatment of that ceiling? Is that like an open truss? What am I seeing there?

Richard Clutter

That's open truss with the perforated metal soffit on it. It's roof over on the top side, but the underside is perforated metal again.

Boardmember Johnson

Okay, so you do not see sky through that perforated metal panel. Do you see the underside of the roof? I would say you guys have come a long way. I think it's looking pretty good. It still feels there are parts of this that aesthetically feel a little clunky to me, just the way that the forms come together. But chalk that up to my personal preference. I think you guys are headed in the right direction and I support this design.

Vice Chair Banda

I'd like to thank the development services director Christine Zielonka, who reached out to me on this one. This is coming further along. I do appreciate you guys taking into account the signage and the font We're actually starting to see something a little bit more unique. I do like integrating more of the concrete. I think this is better than just seeing straight metal where it feels very foreign to the rest of the world.

A motion to approve DRB21-00031 by Boardmember Thomas with a condition that the applicant revise the light fixtures to a non-industrial style but modern fixture that is architecturally sensitive to the building design. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Banda.

Vote: 7 – 0

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

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

NAYS – None

ABSTAINED – None

ABSENT – None

Scott Thomas left meeting at 7:24pm

5 Planning Director Update:

5-a Presentation of recently approved projects.

Principal Planner Ellsworth gave this presentation.

- Comments from Board that the presentation was very helpful

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 7:32 PM.