

**Tuesday, April 13, 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 Tanner Green
- *Boardmember J. Seth Placko
- *Boardmember Paul Johnson
- *Boardmember Jeanette Knudsen

MEMBERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT:

Nana Appiah
Lesley Davis
Tom Ellsworth
Rachel Prelog
Charlotte Bridges
Cassidy Welch
Jennifer Gniffke
Kellie Rorex
Chloe Durfee-Sherman
Alexis Jacobs

OTHERS PRESENT:

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

Chair Carter welcomed everyone to the meeting at 4:30 PM

1 Call meeting to order.

2 Consider the Minutes from the March 9, 2021 Design Review Board Meeting.

A motion to approve the Minutes from March 9, 2021 Design Review Board Meeting was made by Boardmember Thomas and seconded by Boardmember Knudsen.

Vote: 7 – 0

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

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

NAYS – None

ABSENT – None

ABSTAINED – None

3 Hear presentation from staff.

Hear a presentation and discuss the Planning Division's work plan, including a list of major land use planning strategies and goals for 2021 and into the future.

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 DRB20-00783 District 4.** Within the 1000 block of East University Drive (south side) and the 300 block of North Miller Street (east side). Located west of Stapley Drive on the south side of University Drive. (2.46 ± acres). Requesting the review of a multiple residence development. Kaelee Wilson, Berry Riddell, LLC, applicant; Alex Carey, Stalwart Acquisitions LLC, owner.

Staff Planner: Kellie Rorex presents the case, seeking alternative compliance for the percentage of primary building material for the building façade.

Chair Carter invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant Wendy Riddell, Kaelee Wilson and others provided background on the project. Meetings with the neighborhood prior to submittal influenced design changes that we see today. The neighbors were very focused on how this project should look to fit the character of the surrounding area.

Vice Chair Banda

- Not a fan of the asphalt shingles – would prefer a more durable/modern material
- Recommend using a standing seam or some sort of tile roof to give it a modern edge
- Will it be central air?
 - Each individual unit would have its own fan coil – roof mounted heat pump that will be concealed behind the mansard roof
- The choice of lighting offsets the architecture nicely

Boardmember Thomas

- Likes this for the neighborhood
- More brick on shout elevation
- Not a huge fan of the asphalt shingle, want the responsible party to be aware of the upkeep on the material they are choosing

Boardmember Placko

- Purple heart / snake plants – be careful where they are used – do not do well in direct sunlight
- There are lots of parking canopies.
- How does it integrate with the architecture of the building?

Boardmember Knudsen

- The roof shingles are blue gray in the color. Use caution on the side of making sure to view in a larger section as she feels it will be noticeable. Recommends a more solid black color
- Great looking project
- Mix of cool and warm colors – Sherwin Williams Unique Gray does not look gray
- Wooden shutters are more of a green and don't go with the pink
- Reconsider the asphalt color. There is too much blue and you might want to go darker on the shutters
 - Applicant Craig Stouffer acknowledged Boardmember Knudsen's comments – in agreeance and will be revising the color palette

Boardmember Green

- Appreciate this building, in close proximity to Boardmember Green
- Landscaping/powerline concerns: Moving the 3 story building closer to University pushes the trees right under the power lines
- Confirmed that the applicant is aware of powerline
 - Applicant said the high power line will remain. Their understanding is that the lower powerline will be moved under ground
- More brick on other elevations of the buildings
- Parking canopies don't seem like they blend very well with the other design – match up the paint color

Boardmember Johnson

- Older homes in the area / post war look - If we hit some details just right it will tie in nicely to the neighborhood
- Window treatment is a great first step
- Like the look of the club house on miller

- Not too concerned with the brick façade or the parking structure look

Chair Carter

- Appreciate the historical reference going into the neighborhood
- Bring a bit more texture to the south side, brick or wainscot
- Shingles are so contrary to the project - recommend a concrete tile or other high texture material

Staff Planner Kellie Rorex summarized the comments:

- More sustainable roofing material than the shingles and goes better with the design
- Not the full 25% for compliance with the design standards, but increase the brick on south
- Purple heart and Snake plant both prefer shaded areas – reconsider the location/plant type
- Look at proposed colors – specifically the shutters and shingles
- Look at tree types under powerline
- Match parking canopies to building design
- Make sure the design is in context to the neighborhood

4-b

DRB20-00790 District 4. Within the 1500 block of East Main Street (north side) and within the 0 to 100 block of North Hunt Drive (west side). Located east of Stapley Drive on the north side of Main Street. (0.8- ± acres). Requesting the review of a restaurant building. Justin Pasternak, JMP Design LLC, applicant; Kenny Ramos, Casa Ramos Inc, owner.

Staff Planner Charlotte Bridges presented the case.

Chair Carter invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant Justin Pasternak speaks on the intent to create a residential feel to the restaurant and that he is excited about the project.

Chair Carter leaves the meeting at 5:23 pm

Boardmember Green

- Great looking building
- Modern flare – like the lines and the way the building feels

Boardmember Johnson

- Fantastic project
- A lot of care was taken and will be great in Mesa

Boardmember Thomas

- Like the front street elevation

- Fan of metal roof
- Like the front entry

Boardmember Placko

- How deep are the retention basins?
 - South – pretty limited – Max 1' -1.5',
- plants being used in this area do not like a lot of water
- Try to keep plants out of the basin, and put the trees down there
- Concern with granite color and size
- Recommend a larger aggregate size – mahogany sounds dark but should be ok

Boardmember Knudsen

- Great building
- Nice additions
- Nicely done renderings
- No recommendations or concerns on the colors

Vice Chair Banda

- Use more of a screen material for landscaping
- Compliments the building and it's street presence
- A halo lit sign would be good on this building
- Be wary of the use of the light fixture, it doesn't vibe with the overall architecture

Staff Planner Charlotte Bridges summarized the comments:

- Landscaping –
 - replace the quarter minus aggregate shown on the plan with a screen aggregate, which would be half inch to three quarter inch in size
 - place the shrubs on the slopes of the retention basins and keep the trees in the base just to help the survival rate of that material
- Reevaluation of lighting

4-c

DRB20-00894 District 6. Within the 3800 to 4000 blocks of South Power Road (east side). Located south of Elliot Road on the east side of Power Road. (39.5± acres). Requesting the review of an industrial development. Jack Gilmore, Gilmore Planning and Landscape Architecture, applicant; Power Lender Partners LLC, owner.

Staff Planner: Wahid Alam – Principal Planner Tom Ellsworth presents.

Vice Chair Banda asks for the Applicant to speak.

Applicant Jack Gilmore and team – no additions to the presentation

Boardmember Johnson

- Good articulation
- For the façade facing power road, provide additional depth to building entry
- Like textures and color
- No other changes needed

Boardmember Thomas

- What is the depth of the tilt pop outs, it is hard to tell
- Looking at elevations recommend staff looks at it carefully to verify articulation
- Breaking up small retention basins – like that helps with flow on site
- What is the building material in the area shown with red slats on Building 1?
 - Powder coat or electric static to avoid rust over time

Boardmember Knudsen

- Color palette is fabulous
- Very nice job
- Nice looking buildings

Boardmember Green

- South landscaping where it bumps up to the adjacent property – is that meant to be access or is there another reason we can't do screening
 - Applicant response - Roosevelt Water Conservation District canal 20' easement need to have separation and access road for building
- Making sure you are inline w/ forms and colors of the site
- No major concerns on buildings – they are boxes, but decorative
- Recommend alternating heights on the parapets
- Lighting needs to highlight the architecture

Boardmember Placko

- Is there a screen wall for the southeast building
 - Applicant 8' screen wall – easement is inside the wall
- Roosevelt Water Conservation District might have concern with the choice of the mesquite tree in the canal
- Recommend using shrub in place of the mesquite trees along the canal
 - Applicant said hopsie has been considered
- Is there a screen for back of house operation on north side
- Move the trees from the south side of bldg. 4 to the north side

Vice Chair Banda

- Likes that each building is a little bit unique
- Favorite is building 4
- With building 3, treatment of gray paneling on the west side doesn't look as good
- Design will come down to the lighting and accent lighting
- End caps could be emphasized more
- Is there any kind of vertical articulation
 - Will look into that

Principal Planner, Tom Ellsworth summarized the comments:

- Verify the depths of the articulation for vertical and horizontal articulation
- Verify the finish for the shade fins
- Verify what appears to be a hole in the landscaping on the south elevation, is there a conflict with the Roosevelt Water Conservation District canal easement
- Verify the site wall detail to make sure that it's compatible with the architecture of the building
- Emphasize the end cap articulation
- Look at use of the Mesquite on the south side of building 4, possibly moving to the north side

4-d

DRB21-00052 District 6. Within the 8800 to 9100 blocks of East Ray Road (north side) and within the 4900 block of South Ellsworth Road (west side). Located north of Ray Road and West of Ellsworth Road. (35.2± acres). Requesting the review of an industrial development. Josh Tracy, Ryan Companies US, applicant; Michael Brown, Prairie Dog Investment III LLC, owner.

Staff Planner Jennifer Gniffke presented the case.

Vice Chair Banda asks for the Applicant to speak.

Applicant Gary Hays noted he had nothing to add. He and Nicole Darling were available for questions.

Boardmember Johnson

- Not enough effort to break down the scale of the building/boxes
- Could use more articulation to provide more push and pull on the building
- It could be the glazing and/or parapet walls that move
- Articulation is doing the bare minimum
- No issue with color palette

Boardmember Green

- Parapets just go up and down – need more in and out, push and pull
- Adding visual depth will go a long way for the alternative compliance

Boardmember Thomas

- Issue with the flatness of the building
- Understand building being flat for the dock side, but has a hard time with the non dock side being flat
- Need in and out articulation

Boardmember Knudsen

- Agree with the other board members about building
- Color palette is cool and well coordinated

Boardmember Placko

- Good job on the use and location of use of sweet acacia
- Shrubs and ground cover / lack of accents
 - Shrubs are flowing
 - Need more texture
 - Desert spoons / agave / prickly pear
- Buildings are a 40' monstrosity and they need to reconfigure landscape to support building size
- On Ray large landscaping is decomposed granite area
- It needs more texture w/ larger rock

Vice Chair Banda

- Focus on positives
 - 1st impression there is use of form liner to break up paneling
- Agree with board that we need more articulation

Question for staff - How do we approach making sure that they do accomplish those with just comments that we're giving them? Is there a way we can see an update on this before we move forward officially?

Planning Director Appiah

- The review process is not going to change
- The boardmembers review and make recommendations
- The staff and developer will take the recommendations and make appropriate changes
- Asked that the board provide clear direction on the changes they would like to see

Vice Chair Banda

- To the board – Have we given staff clear direction so that the appropriate changes can be made?

Boardmember Thomas

- Building needs some articulation to move in and out, it is too flat on the non-dock sides

Boardmember Johnson

- At least 3 or 4 feet for the in and out of the articulation if not larger
- Building 2 – the dock side of that building is highly visible
- That side of the building needs to be watched by staff

Applicant – Gary Hayes

- This is an oddly shaped lot
- Is under the Mixed Use Community District in the Mesa Gateway development
- Does believe that there is articulation on the plans

Applicant – Nicole Darling

- There is articulation present in the buildings

Vice Chair Banda

- Want to see more horizontal articulation specifically on the office corners

Applicant – Nicole Darling

- We wanted to stay away from the layer cake look
- Every third panel does have undulation and is layered and does come out
- The lighter color does have plane change and undulation
- Would be happy to provide better view

Boardmember Thomas

- In the notes, it calls out for possible future knock out for store front
 - Wanted to keep the future use variable
 - Does not impact the undulation
- How much depth are we referring to?
 - Is about 9.5 inches
- Does say a 10 inch recess
- Feels like there needs to be several feet of articulation
- Apologized for not seeing this articulation, but feels like it needs more

Boardmember Green

- The alternative compliance is for the parapet detailing
- There is not detailing for the parapet

- The in and out are 10 inches
- Given the scale of the building, the parapet detailing either needs to be there or there needs to be larger ins and outs

Vice Chair Banda

- The office is just tacked on material

Boardmember Johnson

- The offices could be more detailed
- Given the scale, the movement is just too small
- If the undulations that are happening be done at a larger scale, that would help a lot
- The parapets are an opportunity
- The offices are an opportunity

Vice Chair Banda

- I do like the form liner
- Not enough movement

Staff Planner Jennifer Gniffke summarized the comments:

- Main concern is with building articulation
- There needs to be more push/pull (in/out) on exterior walls to provide more articulation
- More detailing added into parapet
- Overall building looks flat
- Cool palette, well coordinated colors
- Landscaping lacks accent plants
- Plants are clustered leaving lots of empty space close to the buildings
- Granite size could be changed to better match natural surroundings away from buildings
- Office spaces need a design enhancement

4-e

DRB21-00094 District 6. Within the 1700 block of South Crismon Road (west side). Located north of Baseline Road on the west side of Crismon Road. (11± acres). Requesting the review of apartments within a mixed-use development. Reese Anderson, Pew and Lake, PLC, applicant; OMPC Unit Owners Association, owner.

Staff Planner: Wahid Alam – Principal Planner Tom Ellsworth presents.

Vice Chair Banda asked for the applicant to speak.

Applicant: Reese Anderson, and team

- Thanks for the presentation
- Look forward to questions

Public Comment:

Staffmember Lesley Davis read public comments into the record:

Betsy Vidmar – Card Read: I am a retired real estate broker and am concerned that Crismon Commons decreases the value of the single family homes adjacent to it. To make it more tolerable for Sierra Ranch 2 homes I would like an 8 foot tall wall at the developers expense, use of evergreen trees in at least a 48 boxed size, Paint the buildings in lighter colors, use down directional lighting, and use non-glare windows and glass on Western windows. Balconies should also have solid bottom walls to block storage views.

Robert Rodriguez – Card Read: We strongly request the following to the Design Review Board for consideration of the project impact and our view. 1. 8 feet same color wall by reinforcement or new 2. Removal of existing Palo Verde trees. Replace with non-evasive, canopied evergreen perimeter trees 42-60 box size. 3. Perimeter parking wall/hedge for headlight deflection and safety. 4. Shielded LED lighting on all levels to avoid spotlight effect. 5. Screened lower part of balconies to avoid view of contents. 6. Color hues to match existing abutting properties. **Spoke:** neighbors are concerned with the palo verde trees – raised/new wall, request replace palo verde with evergreen. Wants the wall to be raised

Boardmember Green

- no concerns for the development

Public Comment:

Steve Knapp – called in and spoke: Okay, so as far as the existing trees they planted all these palo verdes behind me and all the way down this wall and I could tell you that when the palo verde trees are blooming these minimally five hours for me to clean up my pool. You know an hour out here today and I could show you pictures of what's already back in the pool and the trees that are on either side of putting in some kind of an evergreen which would be very helpful. Also, then going to the wall. If you want to try to raise our existing walls, I'm in construction, these walls will not handle it. With what the trees if you plant next to the wall, the roots growing underneath and raising and cracking the walls, but I would suggest is moving setback of a wall and putting up their own privacy wall at 10 to 12 feet and leaving like you know, a six to eight foot gap so they wouldn't even have to landscape, go back there twice a year, sprayers vegetation. I wouldn't think the cost would be that much different between

coming and raising our walls versus building your own. And Ken from overland construction told us they always like to be good neighbors. So don't plant trees back here that makes your problem our problem.

Boardmember Placko

- You are using trees like ash, which are high water usage, and not consistent with the city's low water list
- Every tree drops something at some time
- Could switch from palo verde to elm, but will have problem with any tree
- Complimented the use of tibou tree
- The palette is well balanced between accents and shrub material

Vice Chair Banda

- What about the fencing idea?

Boardmember Placko

- Don't like creating a low visibility alley
- That creates a problem with standards for Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)

Boardmember Thomas

- Confirmed that HVAC units on the roof will be screened in the location they have them?
- Parapets don't look very large to cover the number of HVAC units
- Concern of visibility of the HVAC units
- Suggest the balcony be more visible but make sure tenants don't use as storage

Boardmember Knudsen

- It is a dark color palette
- Confused by the renderings, which have more warm browns and the actual color palette has more dark grays
- Renderings show the really dark finish and the color in person is much lighter
 - Mike Anderson, applicant – the renderings do come across darker than the intended material We want to use the lighter material on the board
- Where is the dark bronze going to be used?
 - On the balconies, roof of club house and amenity features
- Think about the use of bronze, it doesn't necessarily go with your color palette
- Where is the wood product, the underside of the eaves and soffit?

Boardmember Johnson

- Beautiful product
- Use of Ameristone looks like a tile
- Large expanses of eaves

Vice Chair Banda

- Recommending an enhancement to the existing wall vs requesting a second wall be added
 - Applicant – We have tried to get all neighbors to buy in on replacement of the wall and install an 8' wall. We– need buy in from all neighbors, but have already received a rejection

Principal Planner Tom Ellsworth summarized the comments:

- Work with neighbors on wall height and landscaping
- Suggestion of other trees – Texas ebony / Mulga (anything on the palette)
- Location of the existing trees and how close they are to the wall (12' is too close for palo verde)
- Make sure mechanical units are fully screened
- Reconsider use of bronze
- Provide a tiling update for board member Johnson

4-f

DRB21-00120 District 6. Within the 8100 block of East Ray Road (south side). Located west of Hawes Road on the south side of Ray Road. (18.1± acres). Requesting the review of an industrial building. Eric Zitny, Ware Malcomb, applicant; Marwest Enterprises, LLC, owner.

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch presented the case.

Vice Chair Banda invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant: Eric Zitny added comment about materials being used on piece that jets out.

Boardmember Johnson

- Can you describe the material used for the omega lights
 - Applicant Eric Zitny – metal material that will be used around the main entry to accent
- No comments on material or articulation, good design
- Well balanced building

Boardmember Green

- Articulation could increase
- Lack of parapet detailing
- Dock area looks gated, make sure it is well integrated

Boardmember Thomas

- Like the change up
- Severely dislikes the white dock doors – should be painted to match walls
- Make sure the back side has articulation as it will be visible
- The landing project looks good

Boardmember Knudsen

- Color palette is well done
- Appreciate the Yankees navy
- It's a handsome building

Boardmember Placko

- The trees are very “deserty”. I like it
- Bring in some more shrub to accent
- Need more accent material and more cacti
- Front of the building is a good example of how to place trees
- Loosen up shrub design

Boardmember Johnson

- Good emphasis on the articulation of the wall plane

Vice Chair Banda

- The horizontal articulation works on the north wall
- The south wall needs more articulation
- Concern that the rear is too plain.
- I don't see much of a variation
- Can we do a little more to the rear to make it match the front

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch summarized the comments:

- Concerns with plainness of the south elevation
- Need for increased height, articulation, colors
- Paint dock doors to match
- Make sure screen wall is architecturally integrated
- Loosened up shrubs to give a more natural aesthetic

4-g

DRB21-00179 District 3. Within the 2300 block of East Southern Avenue (south side) and within the 1200 block of South 24th Street (west side). Located east of Gilbert Road on the south side of Southern Avenue. Requesting the review of a medical office building. Dorothy Shupe, Sketch Architecture Company, applicant; Max Germaine, JMAX Properties LLC, owner.

Staff Planner: Charlotte Bridges presents seeking alt compliance for façade on 3 distinct materials and no single material exceeding 50% of façade.

Applicant, Rob Burgheimer requested to make a presentation of a revised building elevation.

Boardmember Green

- Don't see a problem with alternative compliance requests
- The façade has 3 different materials
- New building has more squared architecture vs the arches in the old design
- Entry gets lost on west elevation
- Suggests a hip roof over entry way

Boardmember Green left meeting at 7:49 PM

Boardmember Johnson

- Great job matching the existing building from a material standpoint
- Like the new building design without incorporating the hip roof and arches
- Thoughtful choice of windows
- Design works well on site
- Potential improvement – painted metal vs painted stucco
- Applicant – directed by staff to modernize the building design and tie it into the old building

Boardmember Knudsen

- Is color number 3, exterior metal Anchor Gray, over the windows and doors?
 - Yes, the metal work and the doors are both that color
 - The doors could actually be the same as the base as that might look better
- The color looked out of place
 - We can replace that to be the same tan of the building
- Good job otherwise

Boardmember Placko

- Compliment on protecting existing plants
- How is the builder going to stage site and keep plants protected?
- Green fountain grass should be removed from legend. It is invasive species. Alternative plant options could be – deer grass or mullein bergenia

Boardmember Thomas

- Stone on south elevation is a lot
- Don't mind the modernism
- Front tower element that you can see from the east elevation will they carry the stone from the south elevation?
- Caution the contractor to make sure they adhere the dry stacking stone properly

Vice Chair Banda

- What was the original design for the south elevation?
- You could accomplish a great deal by tying the 2 buildings together

Staff Planner Charlotte Bridges summarized the comments:

- Provide balance on the stone work
- Work on the color of the doors
- Remove invasive fountain grass and replace with offered suggestions or similar
- Apply dry stack properly

4-h

DRB21-00182 District 5. Within the 7500 block of East Broadway Road (south side). Located west of Sossaman Road on the south side of Broadway Road. (2.2± acres). Requesting the review of a medical office building. Todd Lawrence, TechMD Consultants, applicant; Charles Jost, Southwest Cardiovascular Associates, owner.

Staff Planner: Wahid Alam – Principal Planner Tom Ellsworth presents.

Vice Chair Banda asks for the Applicant to speak.

Applicant Dave Dunworth was available for questions.

Boardmember Johnson

- No issues with the design

Boardmember Placko

- No comments on landscape

Boardmember Knudson

- The evergreen glass is really cool

Boardmember Thomas

- Looks great matches first building

Vice Chair Banda

- No comments

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

6 Planning Director Update:

Planning Director, Dr. Nana Appiah, gave an update for board about getting vaccinated and coming back in person. Option for hybrid in person/zoom meeting.

The board members indicated they were supportive of coming back in or doing the hybrid option, especially for being out of town or if they can't get there in person. Nana noted that Zoom will continue to be an option and that applicants and the public will not yet be joining in person. They will continue on Zoom for now.

Nana introduced Alexis Jacobs as the new Planning Technician who will be supporting the Design Review Board.

7 Adjournment

Boardmember Placko moved to adjourn the meeting and was seconded by Boardmember Knudsen. Without objection, the meeting was adjourned at 8:17 PM.