

Tuesday, September 13, 2022
Virtual Platform
57 East 1st Street
4:30 PM

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

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair Paul Johnson
Vice Chair Tanner Green
Boardmember Scott Thomas*
Boardmember J. Seth Placko
Boardmember Jeanette Knudsen
Boardmember Justin Trexler

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Boardmember Dane Astle

STAFF PRESENT:

Evan Balmer
Cassidy Welch
Charlotte Bridges
Jennifer Merrill
Sean Pesek
Josh Grandlienard
Alexis Jacobs

OTHERS PRESENT:

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

Vice Chair Green welcomed everyone to the meeting at 4:34 PM

- 1 Call meeting to order.**
- 2 Consider the Minutes from the August 9, 2022, Design Review Board Meeting.**

A motion to approve the Minutes from August 9, 2022, Design Review Board Meeting was made by Boardmember Trexler and seconded by Boardmember Placko.

Vote: 6 – 0

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES - Johnson – Green – Thomas – Placko – Knudsen – Trexler

NAYS – None

ABSENT– Astle

ABSTAINED – None

- 3 Discuss and take action on the following Design Review Cases:**

- 3-a DRB22-00785 – District 4.** Within the 0 to 100 block of East Main Street (north side) and within the 0 to 100 block of North Center Street (east side). Located north of Main Street and east of Center Street. (4.5± acres). Design Review for a government office. Vince DiBella, Adaptive Architects, Inc., Applicant; City of Mesa, Owner.

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch presented the case.

Chair Johnson invited the applicant to speak.

Deputy City Manager Marc Heirshberg presented the case.

Chair Johnson: Thank you. We're really excited to see this and it is truly a generational building for the City of Mesa. Do the Boardmembers have any additional comments that they'd like to share at this time.

Boardmember Trexler: I think my comments that I made last month still stand. I think it's a really well-designed project. I still don't love the lights on the wall but I would say it is more of a personal preference. And I appreciate that you looked at relocating those, so I don't have any additional comments for today.

Vice Chair Green: Are there any specific changes you want to call out from last month to this month that we should be aware of in terms of changes to design? I'm seeing windows, we talked about the lights, but anything else substantially changed?

Deputy City Manager Marc Heirshberg: I think the only other thing that I mentioned was the copper turning down. That was something you all talked about off the roof line.

Chair Johnson: Would you mind? Is there a graphic that that illustrates that change? I wasn't part of that discussion.

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch: Chair, we have the elevations in the renderings. Those renderings were updated.

Chair Johnson: Right, so the renderings showed the white metal. Yeah, I see. All right, I think on this project, we will take a vote. Any final comments before we do that?

Vice Chair Green: I just have one other comment. I was just curious about how is solar going to be integrated in the building.

Deputy City Manager Marc Heirshberg: We are still studying that to see if it makes sense to do that on this building. We are, as you've seen downtown, adding solar in several spots. So that's something we continue to look at and study as part of our Climate Action Plan. But no definitive plans have been made, whether it would go on this building or not.

Vice Chair Green: Could you comment a little bit about what would drive the location and placement of those and the sizing? Are you trying to offset a certain amount of energy?

Deputy City Manager Marc Heirshberg: We would work with our Energy Resources department to determine what that offset would look like and then scale accordingly.

Vice Chair Green: Thanks for the answers there. I don't have any other questions.

A motion to approve DRB22-00785 was made by Boardmember Knudsen and seconded by Boardmember Trexler.

Vote: 6 - 0

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Johnson - Green - Thomas – Placko - Knudsen – Trexler

NAYS – None

ABSENT– Astle

ABSTAINED – None

- 3-b DRB22-00670 – District 5.** Within the 1200 to 1400 blocks of North Power Road (east side). Located north of Brown Road on the east side of Power Road. (8.3± acres). Design Review for a public safety facility. Aaron Stouffer, Architekton, Applicant; City of Mesa, Owner

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch presented the case.

Chair Johnson invited the applicant to speak.

City Staff Michaela Chelini presented the case.

Boardmember Trexler: I will be recusing myself from this case.

Chair Johnson: I think it's a beautiful project. Very well done, well organized. I actually appreciate the material palette. Very timeless. And it's an exciting project. Board, any additional comments before we take a vote?

Vice Chair Green: Cassidy, I appreciate what you mentioned about the removal of the access to Granada Road. So obviously that's not reflected in what we've seen on the site plan and everything today, my understanding is that still will go through an approval process after this vote correct?

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch: Chair, Vice Chair Green, that's correct. As a part of this request, there is a rezone and site plan review. So, it will have to be approved by both the Planning and Zoning Board and City Council.

Vice Chair Green: One question I have kind of related to the landscaping is I'm assuming that the landscaping that we're seeing on the palette would essentially just carry through that area. The other question that I have is what is happening with the public right-of-way that is going to essentially be closed off? Is that going to remain as a street? Or is there any activity to be done to turn that into landscaping or retention or something?

City Staff Michaela Chelini: That's not a part of the project site. There have been discussions about the possibilities and potential for that area, but nothing has been determined or decided at this time, we are going to have a follow up meeting with the residents directly adjacent to that street and just let them know that connection is going to be taken out of our site plan and let them know they do have opportunities but at this time, we don't have anything ironed out.

Boardmember Placko: Cassidy or the applicant can you guys explain to me what's happening on the north property line? Because we've lost all the plant material up there. There's some vague references to an electrical easement.

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch: Chair, Boardmember Placko there is a 30-foot SRP easement along the north property line.

Boardmember Placko: SRP I or SRP D?

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch: That I do not know.

Boardmember Placko: Okay, there's a big difference

City Staff Michaela Chelini: It is an overhead electric line.

Boardmember Placko: Overhead electric lines, you can still have plants within overhead electric lines.

City Staff Michael Chelini: They've expressed a desire to keep clearances from their areas so that they could maintain access to their lines. But what we did on our end was kind of pull our property wall back and we still have vegetation on the north side, but it was decreased from what you saw previously.

Boardmember Placko: How tall is the perimeter wall because you do have your adjacent residence on that north property. Is that six foot or is that an eight foot? I guess I'm just concerned about light spillage at this point because you don't have any trees knocking down that light. I understand SRP frustrates me so I'm not going to win that fight.

City Staff Michaela Chelini: With the lighting, it would be directional lighting, we'd make sure to do everything within our power to keep it on the site and not spill over into the residence's yards.

Boardmember Placko: I guess if SRP is throwing their weight around, I guess not much we can do.

Chair Johnson: I'm a little confused, because I see landscape shown in only some of the drawings. There's no landscaping on that North property line.

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch: Chair Johnson, the black and white landscape plans are the most updated plans that were included with your packet.

Boardmember Placko: I know you can't have plants underneath SRP power poles. Is it worth it to have plants inside a public safety facility? Probably not unless they're going to get tall enough to screen to provide a benefit to the neighbors to the north. There are setup areas. They're not calling out where the poles are so it's hard for me to tell you there are setup zones, there are wire setup zones or a pole setup zones. But there are areas within that corridor, you can have landscape, depending on the height of the pole, how tall are the poles? Are they 69 KV?

City Staff Michaela Chelini: Boardmember Placko I do not know off the top of my head.

Boardmember Placko: Okay, because you can do stuff within SRP, especially with the distribution guys, you can do stuff within their easements, we've had projects come in here the last couple where they've done stuff within the power pole easements. So, if it's behind the security fence it'd be nice to get something in there at least adjacent to the residences. But if it can't be tall enough than the eight-foot wall, I see it's probably not worth it.

Chair Johnson: You want to just leave it in the hands of the staff and the project team.

Boardmember Placko: Yeah, I guess I would just like you to revisit it.

City Staff Michaela Chelini: I was going to say we can definitely have a follow up meeting with SRP and see if there's further opportunities or considerations.

Boardmember Placko: Are there existing poles there now or is it just easement? Do you have any photos?

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch: Yeah, what you're seeing on the left side of the screen are those poles.

Boardmember Placko: They're pretty low, they're like 12 KV. Okay.

Vice Chair Green: There was a lot of public comment last time about screening from this project and safety and protection. We understand you are kind of balancing between people that don't want light spillage but this is a secure area that needs to be lit well. I feel like that's an important detail to consider. But I understand there's a lot of things you're trying to balance there.

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch: And to clarify, Chair, Vice Chair green, there are requirements in the City Code that all lighting adjacent to residential has to have side shields.

Vice Chair Green: It looks like you guys have addressed a lot of things. I don't know that there's any other concerns that I'd have.

Boardmember Placko: I like what they did on the east.

Vice Chair Green: Generally, I like the project.

A motion to approve DRB22-00670 was made by Boardmember Placko and seconded by Boardmember Knudsen.

Vote: 5 - 0

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Johnson - Green - Thomas – Placko - Knudsen

NAYS – None

ABSENT– Astle

ABSTAINED – Trexler

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

- 4-j DRB22-00685 District 6.** Within the 10900 to 11000 block of East Elliot Road (north side), and within the 3500 block of South Signal Butte Road (east side). Located north of Elliot Road and east of Signal Butte Rd (84± acres). Design Review for an expansion of a water treatment facility. Cameron Rhodes, Black & Veatch, Applicant, City of Mesa, Owner.

Staff Planner Evan Balmer presented the case.

Chair Johnson invited the applicant to speak.

City Staff Jennifer Donahue presented the case.

Vice Chair Green: I just have a question about materials, looking at the specifically the plastic and the canopy materials. Do you have these other locations on the site currently, from when it was built originally?

City Staff Jennifer Donahue: Yes, they're consistent with what is existing out there.

Vice Chair Green: How well are they holding up? That's really where I think I want to start because I know some of these materials start to degrade over a very short period of time. My question is, how have these held up? And is this material you still want to go forward with?

City Staff Jennifer Donahue: I'm not aware of any concerns that anyone at the facility has with the materials that are currently out there.

City Staff Spencer Taylor: Board, I am with the Water Resource Department. The plant is fairly new, finished construction in 2018. It's only had four years wear and tear. In those four years, the materials have held up well as expected, based on the original project.

Chair Johnson: Hearing no additional comments, I believe we will see this again in our next study session.

Evan Balmer: That is correct Chair. I didn't hear any actionable comments. So, we will be following up next month with you.

Chair Johnson: If possible do a little bit more landscaping.

Evan Balmer: I'll do some more research into that and follow up with you. Thank you.

- 4e DRB22-00440 - District 2.** Within the 4700 to 4800 blocks of East Southern Avenue (south side) and within the 1200 block of South 48th Street (west side). Located east of Greenfield Road on the south side of Southern Avenue. (9± acres). Design Review for a multiple residence development. Pew and Lake, Applicant; Sunny Mesa INC, Owner.

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard presented the case.

Chair Johnson invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant Sean Lake presented the case.

Jessie Pitcher, 4660 E Garnet Circle: I'm actually a member of the Killian family and Max's my uncle and Mark is my cousin. So, I live directly adjacent to the proposed development I'm obviously one of the most affected neighbors and Lana is next door to me also, we both been over there over 20 years. That whole entire area was actually my grandfather's so my ties to that land go way back. But for the record, I do not support any apartments in this area. We already have eight apartment complexes within a mile of this property totaling over 2100 units just in that little mile there. As far as the design standpoint goes first off, I'd love to see any structures built in the area to be reflected of the land and its history as a farm and the current buildings and the surrounding locale and stuff. I just don't feel that this building quite fits that something more to match the area a little bit more. From a design standpoint, a three-story apartment building will stick out like a sore thumb on this block. There aren't any buildings on this entire block taller than two story and this being a proposed a mid-block project I think it would stand out even more. And I'd like you guys to just imagine with me come down Southern Avenue with me. Just drive with me down Higley starting at that intersection of Southern and Higley on your right and left our one-story retail buildings. Then on your left you'll see a section of a two-story Santa Barbara, kind of style apartment complex. Next to that is a heavily landscaped medical building. Also, one story on your right you're going to see the one-story home so the Retirement Community Sunland Village, coming back to your left is the one-story school Franklin-Brimhall. Past that is a one-story dental office with a church behind it. And then bam, the next thing you would see is a 40-foot-tall three-story building span in Southern Avenue for over 300 feet in length with a huge depth along 48th Street of more than 450 feet. But as you can see from the scale of the building sitting on the property that's probably about right. Beyond this on both sides of the street, you have one story again, all the homes alongside Southern on both sides are one story all the buildings long sides on Southern are one story until you have almost a Greenfield Road. There's no breaks in this building whatsoever. It's just a huge expanse of wall. One long, huge building both down that little stretch 48th and Southern the height is just one foot shy of 40 feet tall. So, it's not like we're talking three stores with eight-foot-tall

ceilings, we're talking taller ceilings, plus the extra height to screen the back and the other you know things that would be on the top of the building. This would just be a huge eyesore in the neighborhood. And I asked the board to go personally go down there, check it out in person, drive down the road, check out the size, the scale the proposed property. I don't support this project. And I kindly thank you guys for your time tonight.

Chair Johnson: Thank you for your comments. Would you like to make any comments?

Lana Dalton, 4661 E Garnet Circle: I've lived there for 30 years I love my neighborhood. I live in a custom home community called Sunny Mesa One, would really be nice if we had a Sunny Mesa Two on the other side of the wall. And there's an elementary school junior high school right there would be nice to have some permanent single-family homes there. And we have enough 55 plus communities. We have enough apartments. Thank you very much. I'd like some single-family homes.

Chair Johnson: Thank you, Josh, would you just clarify for us, what is the current height restriction in the current zoning?

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard: There is a proposed rezone to RM-3-PAD and the standard height for that would be 40 feet.

Chair Johnson: Okay, what is it currently? What's the zoning say?

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard: For RS-35 it is 30 feet in height.

Chair Johnson: Thank you for your comments. Okay, so then there are a couple of written comments that I'd like to read it for this project.

Molina Delgado from 4646 East Garnet Circle: She would like us to read this comment and she is opposed. "There are many reasons as to why I oppose this project: 1. Highly saturated apartments - There are already 8 apartment complexes with over 2100 units within a mile of the farm. 2. There is not another 3-story building on this entire block, Higley to Greenfield. Not appropriate for a middle of the block property. 3. Traffic during school start/end hours is already busy. This would add an additional 1000+ cars in our area. We have walkers, bikers and kids to/from school. I would much rather support single family housing, single or double story (with single next to the Sunny Mesa wall)."

Cindy Siems from 4743 East Harmony Circle: She would like us to read this comment and she was opposed. "This area is not zoned for multifamily living - this area is already too congested and traffic will be horrible behind my house (48th street) - I do not want a stop light in my back yard or speed bumps on the streets! This should be AT MOST single-family homes. A retirement complex and apartment complex SHOULD NOT be next door to an elementary school! I sympathize with the landowner who is trying to make the most money he can for his property- but it is NOT the right thing to do for the community! We live in a custom neighborhood and these apartments will be looking in our back yards!"

Richard Everhart, 4703 E. Flossmoor Circle: He would like us to read a comment and he is opposed. "We are opposed to this project for many reasons, not the least of which is the proposed architectural design. The rendered style is totally out of character with

the surrounding residential neighborhoods and looks more like a hospital with helipads. The height of 3 stories is totally inappropriate and unacceptable for the area and is a direct assault on the back yard privacy of all the homes that back up to Southern Avenue. They must be limited to 2 stories maximum. Also, the landscape buffer along Southern should be wider and populated with a mix of fast-growing pine and Desert Trees.”

Applicant Mark Killian: It's my farm. You know I find it very ironic that some of the neighbors are saying this is out of character for the area. If you go one mile north on the north end of Southern Village, you will find the Sunland Village Towers four stories right next to single family homes. I've lived there for 45 years. I've never heard one complaint about those towers, not one. And they're right across the street from a whole bunch of single-family homes. And I've never heard anybody say that that has diminished the value of their property or created problems. If you look at the architecture of those buildings, it certainly doesn't fit the architecture of Sunland Village. So, what I'm here to say to you simply is the City has already set a precedent in this area. And Sparrow has gone to great lengths to mitigate the concerns of the neighbors. And I think it's an excellent project. Between the two projects, you're talking about \$100 million project for the City of Mesa \$100 million project, which will provide revenue and jobs and opportunities. I've lived there all my life and most of this area was our family farm. And if we hadn't have sold off the farm animals, people wouldn't be there today. But I will tell you this, the developments that we have been involved in, in those projects have all been excellent. And I welcome you to come down there and see what we've done. The things that we've done for the neighborhoods and the things that we've developed and so my plea is, is that we're doing something here that adds to the community, doesn't detract it's perfectly consistent with every office building, every neighborhood that we have developed in that model and half and I'll be happy to take you around the farm and show you those and show you those developments. So, I'd hope you'd look favorably at this project. You know again, it's a retirement project fits with the neighborhood, Sunland Village all retirement and so it fits the characteristics of the neighborhood. I think I'd be happy to answer any questions if you have any more.

Chair Johnson: Do we have any questions for Mr. Killian? Thank you for your comment. Okay, I'd like to open it up to the Board. There are more comment cards, please come up.

Elaine Botnen, 4711 E Flossmoor Circle: My house backs right onto Southern and I have a garden. And if anybody in a three-story apartment can look down from their balcony, they'll have a nice view of my back garden and all the other gardens on Flossmoor Circle. There are no more except for the towers. It would stand out like a sore thumb like that young lady says. So that is my total objection. But also, for the trees. You cut down citrus trees. Are you going to replace them with more citrus trees? Grown trees are expensive and take a while to grow. Any fruit tree has to have a lot of water, which I'm led to believe that Arizona is a little short. My other comments are who's going to take care of these trees? Would it be the HOA for the buildings? Who's going to water them prune them? Again, we're bound to water. So, pine trees don't need that much water. But fruit trees do. Um, I don't know about any neighborhood meetings, but I've never been invited to one. And I've lived there for a year. And I bought my house last September. And no one ever mentioned anything about what was going to be built across the road. So those are my objections.

Chair Johnson: Thank you for your comments. And then we have Miss Catherine Puckett.

Catherine Puckett, 3363 E Page Avenue, Gilbert AZ: I'm a friend of Elaine's I'm Catherine Puckett. I live in Gilbert. number one, the line-of-sight drawing appears to depict the view to the west side of the site. We respectfully request the committee to consider requiring a line-of-sight drawing to the north side of the property facing Sunland Village. There is a very real concern for the Sunland Village homeowners that a three-story project is being built across the street to there is no dedicated slide with the design concept of a ground level Street View from Southern Avenue. The citizens of Sunland Village would appreciate that very much is that possible? Three, the line-of-sight drawing shows an elm tree but the site plan indicates quote citrus orchard unquote at the West property line, please clarify. Four does anyone know what the approximate height of the current citrus trees that line Southern? And how does that compare to the proposed citrus trees at delivery? And how does that compare to an elm tree. Five Southern Avenue is beautifully tree lined presently. We respectfully request as much dense number of trees be required to put in that area. Since this plan will be stripping away the wonderful view that every Sunland Village resident when they walk along Southern Avenue will be not allowed to see anymore. The drawing only shows 24 trees at the north end of the site. Six due to this loss for Sunland Village, we also request the committee consider increasing to 50% from 25%, the number of 36 inch or larger box trees and that those larger trees be planted along Southern Avenue rather than on 48th Street. In other words, more and bigger please. A couple of housekeeping items one on page five in the proposal there's a typo or something missing. It says 3.5-acre large lot with an existing on is on part of the parcel in this request. Please advise to parcel one shows a jog in the southeast corner of the sitemap the site plan does not seem to show a jog that I can see the one with all the trees. What will be located in this area and we'll have anything there that this committee would need to consider today in terms of design. And lastly, there appears to be a discrepancy in the development units 25 Point One versus 23. But could someone clarify is that because the number of units were lowered since that first proposal was written?

Chair Johnson: Thank you for comments. Josh, too, there's a lot of specifics there. Are you able to access the minutes that for that? Or do you need some?

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard: So, I know specifically, the unit count has been reduced. And I know, Mr. Lake will certainly be able to provide a little more info for us. The Applicant have made a point to reduce the amount of units and reduce the overall density of this project, they have reduced the number of units based off the current site plan supplied.

Chair Johnson: You have the Planning and Zoning coming up? Are there additional neighborhood meetings already?

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard: Yes, there will be additional, they haven't been set of time. But please feel free to leave your contacts on the blue cards, we can make sure we reach out to you as part of the process.

Catherine Puckett, 3363 E Page Avenue, Gilbert AZ: Yeah, another concern, I didn't know how much time I would have been that I did look at the Excel spreadsheet that showed which neighborhoods would be invited. And it was by far a very small list some

three random people and then a whole bunch of HOAs. But as my friend Elaine here has said she was not invited to any neighborhood meetings. And the minutes also show of the online documents that there was some concern on the part of this committee that neighborhood meetings are required. So, we'd like to see some information about that if possible.

Chair Johnson: All right. Well, thank you, ladies for your comments. We'd love to have the applicant come up and respond to some of these things. Please.

Applicant Sean Lake: Chairman, I know we're here to talk about architecture. Yes. But if you'd like I can clarify a couple of those things really quick. We have had to neighborhood meetings and we have submitted assists will submit a citizen participation report that evidence is all the meetings not only the two required neighborhood means but everything else, and I'm happy to meet with them and show them that information. If I could go to the site plan, there was a question about the 3.5 acres, you can see the carve out in the L on that. That's actually Max Killian's home. It is now I believe David Killian's home that will remain so. When she says what else is going to happen on that will remain so largely the biggest neighbor, this project is the Kilian family, because they own that carve out of that L and that house will remain and those citrus and everything on that will go the ranch or the farm is what's going away. That's been there for many, many decades. The height issue that was requested in a single-family district 30 feet is the maximum height of a residential structure, as we all know, that's measured halfway point between the peak and the eave. And so effectively, it could be more than 30 feet. But that's really the zoning district and I think in this district 40 We're about 36 is the height that we're proposing to the tuck top of our parapet walls. And we are at 208 units. So yes, we have reduced the density.

Applicants Architect Kimberly Hellekson: Yeah, and along those points we do, it's at 36 feet in height as a whole, we do have a little bit of bump ups to at the at the front clubhouse and then at some of the corners and that's to help add architectural interest so you don't get a flat facade. And we do have some articulation with the building facade to get some in and out to help break it up that along with the stone in the front and then we also have the stucco and the different the neutral palette system there just to provide interest. And then we do the in the bump ups also to help hide the HVAC that is on the roof so that they're not on the ground. It's all hidden behind so you don't have to see any of that there. And to some of the points too that were brought up the building we do have double row of parking along southern Avenue and that helps push the building back just a little bit. So, there are just a few units you'd get part of the clubhouse there and then there's a few units that do face towards southern but in our site section you can see the distance between the single-family residence and then our apartments facing southern

Chair Johnson: Okay, thank you. If you wouldn't mind just remaining up here while the board poses any questions that we might have board, open it up to you. Scott, are you on? Would you like to kick this off?

Boardmember Thomas: I am very pleased to see the renderings. They really help a lot with a lot of these multifamily or larger unit projects like this, to be able to really see the ins and outs. I'm very pleased with the way it looks. I spent quite a bit of time this morning going through the cases. And I think it looks great. I don't have any issue at all with this project. I think that it'll work well for what Mesa is looking for.

Chair Johnson: Okay, thank you, Scott.

Vice Chair Green: Chair, I'll just take a couple comments. So first I wanted to thank those from the community that participate. We're here to talk about really a lot more of how this looks and how it integrates with the neighborhood from that standpoint, as opposed to the usage. So, my comments are directed at that I have a couple questions that came up in the site plan I'm seeing on this what looks like an orchard area, there's two different things that I'm seeing one says orchard and other says retention basin to me, those don't seem like those that would be a compatible use. It's got to be one or the other. So, I guess my question is....

Boardmember Placko: Orchard if there are existing trees, if you're protecting the existing tree, right,

Vice Chair Green: so, it's an orchard. Okay, Orchard is what your intention is.

Applicant Sean Lake: And so now that our goal is to preserve as many of those trees as we possibly can we have talked about taking some out and replacing it with a different tree that grows taller. But for the most part is preserving that orchard. Sure.

Vice Chair Green: So, I guess my question kind of leads into water retention, this is this is a massive project. Where's all the water going? Is it all going towards the orchard? Are you going to inundate these trees with water during a storm? Or is there going to be other methods for handling this? Right?

Boardmember Placko: It's a great idea to put some of the water towards those trees. Yeah, but my concern was you would get too much water. I'm sure they're probably used for flooding area, their irrigation. So, there's probably a certain amount of volume you can store there.

Vice Chair Green: Absolutely. I'm positive. There's flood irrigation here.

Sterling Margetts: I can go ahead and kind of clarify your request there. So, the sites can use a combination of both underground and some surface, okay, so there will be subsurface in that area, it's really limited to that western portion of the site. It's not taking everything and just dumping it there. They are actually the two will actually equalize. And so, it'll actually, that's more of like kind of the very end of where all the retention will be. But the majority will go on an underground system.

Vice Chair Green: Is the orchard intended to be kind of an amenity space where people are accessing this to access the fruit? Or is this kind of, it's just something pretty to look at

Applicant Sean Lake: More of the latter than the primary, obviously, there will be fruit that can be utilized and the residents are welcome to come and pick the fruit. But that's a lot of fruit. For you know, that number of units. And so, my guess is the first row of trees straight from the parking area will be able to satisfy that need.

Vice Chair Green: The second comment is related to the sight lines is kind of where I draw my, my personal line in terms of that. So, I appreciate what is being done to try to address that. The concerns I still have is, I feel like this sight line study, at least what I've

seen of the sight line study doesn't adequately address how far into the yard you can see there's always going to be some line of sight. The question is, to what point are what is screened by the shade trees or by the screening plantation or by the screen wall? To the privacy of the neighboring citizens, if they've got a one story or two-story building, really helping to address what has been seen, right? that's something I feel strongly about is the intention of privacy and security, I think is critical here. the ideal situation is we don't even need to have a sightline study, because there is no sightline, right, recognizing that there may be vertical structures, but how do you how do you alleviate some of that privacy and security concerns?

Applicant Sean Lake: That's an excellent question we have looked at the closest units are the two-story units on that end cap is 185 feet away. And that's there will be no balconies on that West Side, the only balconies will be facing north and south. But that sight line from that side of the building 185 feet away, we'll go through the southern portion of David Killian's home, which has a new RV garage and trees that exist that are there plus the orchard. And so, you're at 185 feet away to the property line, to a side yard to somebody, I think is very well screened. And you can see from the line-of-sight drawings, that there is there's no way that anybody is going to look into anybody's side or backyard from that far away for the from the closest units 185 feet away for the building.

Vice Chair Green: I think that's really like what I'm trying to say is that's where I feel like it's important to make sure that that is clear.

Chair Johnson: Do you feel like what's shown in front of you addresses that concern?

Vice Chair Green: No, I don't feel like it does. And part of why I say that is when I see is on the property side. I recognize that. But the concern is the sight line is not for the property. It's for the adjacent owners. To be frank, I think that's really the intent of the sightline studies to address the concerns from the neighbors, right. What I'm seeing is I see dimensions on the site side, I don't see dimensions on the properties and the neighboring property side, if the concern is there to try to protect your screen them, I feel like that should be just a little bit more comprehensive in terms of that. Regarding the screen, I appreciate the north south a balcony structures, I appreciate the side screening on those balconies to make sure there's not visible. And really, I feel like that would be where I would encourage the direction to continue is just to make sure that that that is clearly thought through. If there's any way for any way to see, can we screen that any better at on the property through landscaping, or through wall so that it no, you know, no nullifies this concern. So that's something I just feel strongly about. But I feel confident in being able to tell you to work with Josh, based on those recommendations. The last the last thing I'll mention is just the garages and canopies. I feel like the garage is kind of lacking. In terms of architectural design and details. It feels very flat along the Western or the eastern side there. I don't see anything; it shows me the top-down view of this. I don't see a floor plan or anything. But what I'm counting is what eight garages in a row or so something like that. how has this been broken up? I feel like it's very flat along that eastern wall recognizing there's trees there. But I feel like there could be we always talked about foresight and architecture seeing within the front. Is there something to do to break this up? Ins and outs or spacing this out having some visual interest somewhere along there. You know, tying this into the building and perhaps it brings in additional materials there. I don't I don't know exactly. The question there was, I see a

single post design and some other pictures that looked like two post designs for the structure, the vertical structure. Can you clarify what design it will be?

Applicants Architect Kimberly Hellekson: It would be the single post that you see right there.

Vice Chair Green: Okay. Okay. And I think my only concern with that is as long as the materials are in coordination with the rest of the facility, I think that's, that's sufficient. So, I know that was a lot but that's, that's all I have for now.

Chair Johnson: Thank you. Any additional comments?

Boardmember Placko: Yeah, I'm going to take a crack at this. Okay. So, I just want to clarify, we are you're protecting the existing citrus there in the southwest corner. So, you're not putting in Myers lemons. Okay, from a screen perspective, that's a good thing because the Myers lemons are going to show up about three feet tall when you planted them, and that wasn't going to get you any screening. What is the age and health of these trees? have existing trees on site?

Applicant Mark Killian: Yeah, the ones that we're talking about my grandfather planted those trees back in the 30s. So, they're pretty old they're beginning to start to show their age. We've taken very good care of those orchards over the years, and there is irrigation available to them. If they put them on drip, they should do just fine.

Boardmember Placko: You mean flood irrigation?

Applicant Mark Killian: It depends on what the developer wants to do. If they want to flood, it'll work. If they want to do drip, we can make that work too. Okay, that's not a problem. I wanted to tell you about the screening. Right now, there's a huge ash tree in my brother and my dad's backyard that screens that neighborhood, huge. And we recommend and planning shamel ash in the corner, two shamels on David's side and on sparrows' side, to help create that screening that you've talked about.

Applicant Sean Lake: And we can look at certain areas that are to plant some new trees, keep existing trees so that we can have screening not only now, but in the future,

Boardmember Placko: I can tell you, there's nothing better than a mature citrus tree to screen because I've got mature citrus trees in my yard, I would suggest putting them on bubblers not drip, because if they've been on flood irrigation, they're going to want that water deep, you put them on to surface drip, and they're going to, they're not going to like it. I am a little bit concerned now you're going to hand them over to a commercial maintenance company, that that's kind of where I'm driving at and the age and the health and how that's going to. So yeah, there might need to be some selective removals of the ones that aren't doing that great, and maybe get some other some other stuff in there.

Applicant Mark Killian: I want to go back to the drainage issue. That whole quarter section, which is a part of the family farm, we worked with the City of Mesa and help acquire the retention basin at 60 the freeway, we help pay for that. we were able to get that land purchase for the city, we helped build that retention basin. And that whole quarter section drains into that retention basin. So, their retention issues that you're talking about that property, both Lenar and Sparrow can drain into existing drain that

goes down 48th Street, into the ditch on the north side of the freeway and then go right on down to the to the retention basin. That's why none of those homes in that quarter section have to have retention on their homes, is because of what we did, because of the foresight my dad had and protect our neighbors. And so that should answer your question about the drainage issues. Now, the other part of that too, is David's keeping those orange trees around his house. And he'll be working with Sparrow because he'll still get irrigation. And if they want to work something out where the water can go under the wall and help irrigate those trees. They can do that. Very simple.

Vice Chair Green: I appreciate the comments.

Chair Johnson: Okay. Boardmember Trexler did you have any comments?

Boardmember Trexler: Did I hear that there was a rezoning as a part of this project to allow for the greater height of this?

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard: It's not for the height. It's for the multiple residents versus a single residence.

Boardmember Trexler: Gotcha. Okay. Yeah, other than that, I just wanted to kind of echo some of the comments that have already been made. I think the sightlines study is helpful, but I agree, it doesn't tell the whole story because in this meeting, we're more concerned with the views from the apartments to the backyards of the existing residents, so that'd be more helpful. And then there are trees that have been some talk of trees, screening views, and of course trees. is how to screen views but they're not continuous, you know, there's going to be some gaps in between the trees. So just wanted to bring that up as far as the design of the actual buildings. I have no objections in regard to the design, I think the color palette is pleasing.

Chair Johnson: Yeah, I'd like to chime in on that. I think from a micro level, I really appreciate the design, the detail into the design, the material palette, I favor all those things. The thing I'm having a hard time it with really has to do with zoning and the density. And in particular, the massing of the building as it travels along 48th Street, because I do think that that will be very visible even from Southern, as you're driving westbound on Southern, you're going to see a very long, repetitive massing. And I do think that that's out of character with the neighborhood as it currently sits. So, I'd like you to really take a look at that. And, and I think with some geometry shifting, you could probably adjust that where whether the ends of the building project out a little bit more or something but right now that that whatever it is 480- or 500-feet length of building I feel like is not fitting with the neighborhood. Other than that, I do appreciate kind of the movement the balconies all the detailing with the different trim work, it's very well done. Does anyone have anything to add?

Boardmember Knudsen: I think the color palettes well done. It's light, its airy.

Chair Johnson: If you wouldn't mind just giving us a brief synopsis and maybe include what the neighborhoods can expect from a step forward standpoint.

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard provided the following summary:

- Citizens would prefer a farmhouse or southwestern design

- DRB Board had no concerns with the main structure's design elements, however Chair Johnson has concerns about the massing of the singular structure
- Concerns about the flat elements of the proposed detached garages
- Concerns about the quality of the line-of-sight exhibits
- Want to ensure that the proposed orchard has proper irrigation and is able to maintain the health of the trees or replace unhealthy trees with ones that will provide screening

4-a DRB21-01173 - District 5. Within the 3600 to 3700 blocks of North Higley Road (east side) and within the 5200 to 5400 block of East Thomas Road (south side). Located on the southeast corner of Thomas Road and Higley Road. (10± acres). Design Review for a boat and recreational vehicle storage facility. Horrocks Engineers, Applicant; R&S Development Group, LLC, Owner.

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard presented the case.

Chair Johnson invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant Russell Skuse presented the case.

Art Jordan, 4018 N Pinnacle Hills Circle: I'm a local architect and landscape designer and I live in Las Sendas. So, I use Thomas Road frequently to access getting back on the 202 I've studied the site significantly and basically, I'm for it. But I think there's an opportunity here in any of the DRB members that have traveled in that area. they are finishing up Blandford development, which is first class and it's pretty nice. there's still a lot of land desert brittle Bush type land along Thomas that is yet to be sold and developed. And so, what we have is you have the example that Blandford does with no one telling them to do it. And they will take care of the arterial landscaping come down a little further, you have Red Mountain commerce center that is never built out. And they don't spend five bucks a year taking care of their interior landscaping. And then a very unusual sight from the standpoint that apparently the city of Mesa owns the west end of this all the way to Higley. I think that the landscaping package that the developer is going to do along Thomas needs to be continued down to the corner. Otherwise, it'll never get done. And right now, it's just rubble dirt with weeds in it. And for the minor amount of money that it would take to continue that landscaping down where the challenge and why I support it. If you stand at the 202 and Higley. And look, Southwest, you see suns sunny acres are you know, we're all in support of that development. But they're leasing out their land and currently have 20 trailer trucks parked in there, they spend no money maintaining their property. The same view is now going to be on here is coming down Thomas, you'll screen it great, turn the corner go up to 202, It'll work. But then when you look back, and you're traveling east on the 202, so the only thing I've come up with, they're planning on putting Gama grass on the downhill side. hydroseeding had probably, let's make sure we can keep it alive for a year or two. it'll take care of itself, which probably means they don't need an irrigation system. So, I want to repeat I see it as an opportunity. It is an appropriate rezoning of a property that could have sat fallow for a lot of years. So done correctly, along Thomas and Higley. I'm all in favor, but I want to repeat maybe the city of Mesa has got an extra buck and a half to help out on the

landscaping on their property. Let's make sure we got some micro landscaping that talks about the quality. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chair Johnson: I think that's great. Thank you. Okay, any comments from the board?

Boardmember Trexler: My only comment is on the material palette. I think it could, you know, usually we're asking for more variation materials, I think this could use a little, potentially a little less Variation especially in the sidewall. I appreciate the block the patterning in the block. But my personal preference would be to just use block and not stone veneer and a block. the building is, you know, it's a fairly small building, especially in relation to the site and there's a good amount of going on. So, I think just a general comment in regard to the materials is they could be simplified.

Chair Johnson: Thank you, Boardmember Trexler. Any comments on the landscaping?

Boardmember Placko: I don't really have too many comments on the landscape. The palettes you know, pretty native. It's what's pretty, I think it fits inside. my one question is the seed mix? They don't define what's in the seed mix. Okay. So that would be, you know, getting some clarity on that. What exactly are they planning on doing? You know, the app, the person who spoke suggested some trees in there, maybe there's maybe there could be some trees in the seed mix, they would need to be Palo Verde, desert mesquites, you know, something real native that can survive without water.

Chair Johnson: So, thank you. Any additional comments from board?

Vice Chair Green: the only comment I had is wanted to confirm it looks like the majority of this is paved. Is that correct?

Boardmember Placko: It was seeded by ADOT when did the pull it out. And it's looks like some trees have grown down in the low area.

Vice Chair Green: Yeah. I think my comment would just be if there's ways to Blend it together. I think we would rather than an abrupt stop, I think would be great.

Chair Johnson: Is there canopies related to the storage of the boats here.

Chair Johnson: Can we find out it maybe the applicant can answer the height of the canopies.

Applicant Russell Skuse: Maybe 16 feet.

Chair Johnson: I guess my only comment would be the lighting under those canopies if they are in a building that is done with a warm temperature lighting. Just to work with staff to make sure that that's not overdone.

Vice Chair Green: Chair if I might add, maybe I'm missing the package. I didn't see any drawings of canopies. For a site where 98% of it is canopies are going to be paved and

then mix of canopies. I think it'd be helpful to have canopies as part of the drawing package for future reference.

Applicant Russell Skuse: the only canopy, the darker area is where the canopies. Those are the only canopies on the site.

Chair Johnson: I don't if you wouldn't mind giving us a synopsis.

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard provided the following summary:

- Blend the proposed landscaping along the northern portion of the site with the City of Mesa ROW on the western side of the property
- Include Palo Verde, Desert Mesquites or similar trees in the seed mix
- Provide a warm light for the lighting proposed within the parking canopies
- Consider removing the veneer from the proposed screen wall

4-b DRB22-00044 - District 4. Within the 1600 block of South Stapley Drive (east side). Located south of the US 60 Superstition Freeway on the east side of Stapley Drive. (1.5± acres). Design Review for a restaurant. Yelena Fiester, GreenbergFarrow, applicant; DSW Grand/Spectrum, LLC, owner.

Staff Planner Evan Balmer presented the case.

Chair Johnson invited the applicant to speak.

Chair Johnson: Any questions or comments from the board? I'm curious what's driving this project.

Evan Balmer: Chair, the existing restaurant is too small to meet the needs of Texas Roadhouse. This will be a larger building.

Chair Johnson: I don't have any personal issues or questions other than that. Anyone else?

Boardmember Trexler: It's in a fairly built out retail, restaurant, and entertainment type area, so I think it fits. It must fit in. There's already a Texas Roadhouse out there. I have no objections.

Boardmember Thomas: I think the only thing I would say is, there's going to be a newer one. It's just going to be bigger. What's going to be nicer than the old one that's sitting there?

Vice Chair Green: I think the only question I had was, it looks like the roofing material is just gonna stay. Is it just sealed or coated? Galvalume? Or is it going to be colored painted?

Evan Balmer: To my knowledge it's not painted. It's sealed galvalume.

Vice Chair Green: I don't have any other concerns.

Boardmember Placko: On the plant legend, they're using something called a Spartan Juniper. I don't know what this plant is, but I doubt it grows here. I suspect if they're looking for something tall and columnar that maybe they're looking for something more like an Italian Cypress. And also where the old building is, it kind of bugs me a little bit that there's no trees in there. They've got one mesquite tree on the entire project and I feel like a Texas Roadhouse should be set among mesquite trees.

Boardmember Knudsen: I don't have any issues with the project at all.

Chair Johnson: All right, Evan, would you mind summarizing?

Evan Balmer provided the following summary of comments:

- Revise the landscape plan to include trees where the existing restaurant is located
- Replace the Spartan Juniper trees with a different species better suited to the environment.

4-c DRB22-00248 – District 6. Within the 8100 to 8200 blocks of East Germann Road (north side). Located west of Hawes Road on the north side of Germann Road. (10± acres). Design Review for an industrial development. Robert Winton, Winton Architects, Inc, Applicant; Republic Equity Funds LLC, Owner.

Staff Planner Jennifer Merrill presented the case.

Chair Johnson invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant Mike Forst presents the case.

Chair Johnson: Thank you. I'll turn to the board for any comments.

Boardmember Trexler: I have a question on the masonry. The regular CMU says this occurs with the white colored horizontal bands. So, we know that that's going to be painted white, I assume is the primary masonry either the split faced or center scored, painted or integral color at all.

Applicant Mike Frost: It's all painted. The white band is smooth. The medium gray is the center score and the dark gray split faced.

Chair Johnson: Which of those are painted? Are they all painted?

Applicant Mike Forst: They're all painted.

Boardmember Knudsen: I want to thank you for the renderings really helped bring the project to life.

Chair Johnson: So, did you have any additional comment on that? Question?

Boardmember Trexler: No, it's just one comment about the primary masonry there. It may just be the rendering. But it looks like just regular gray masonry. When you know renderings, you understand it's hard to get the colors just right.

Applicant Mike Forst: So yeah, I have zoomed-in you can see the center scored texture, but it's a little hard from the Street View.

Boardmember Trexler: Okay, thank you.

Chair Johnson: So, I'll say I think I think this is really nice little project. And I appreciate the work with a neighbor, especially to make sure that landscaping kind of is contiguous. I think it would be better if it was integral color, as opposed to paint. But I mean, you're already doing a lot. And so, one suggestion, I would say is if you wanted to consider integral color on maybe the street facing building, and then step down to something else on the back to balance your cost out. I think that'd be worth considering. That's all I have.

Vice Chair Green: Chair, maybe I'll just add, I echo some of the sentiment about the integral color. I would love to see it in real color. But I understand there's costs that you're trying to balance out with, with a variety of things. I think part of the reason I say that, though, is because part of the alternative compliance is the texturing. I appreciate the scoring patterns, and you know what you have for the texturing. But I think some of it will get lost when you covered up with paint. You start to lose the granularity of the block when it gets covered and painted. I'm not saying you should change that. I think I would just prefer to see that. And the only other comment so I don't have any issue with the alternative compliance. Either way, whether it's painted or integral, or the landscaping, regarding the downspouts helped me understand why if they're encouraged to be internalized and why aren't they?

Applicant Mike Forst: In this case, they won't be visible from the street because they're internalized into the truck courts, the back of the buildings face each other. And we prefer downspouts for a couple of reasons. One, it keeps the water out of the building. Whereas roof drains bring it into the building. So, if you have leaks and such that ends up into the building, and then with warehouse projects they interrupt racking and use of the interior space which straight lines are always best in a warehouse. So, we felt that given that it's internal to the truck courts and away from the streets and facing buildings face each other that architecturally it wouldn't detract from the aesthetics of the project.

Boardmember Trexler: You said it interrupts racking, like the racks in the

Applicant Mike Forst: Internal roof drains, are six or eight-inch pipes coming down the inside of the wall. So, interrupts space?

Boardmember Thomas: Are your roof drains? They look like the roof drains look like they're within a foot to two feet of your doors. How much racking are you going to have that close to the doors?

Chair Johnson: I'll chime in here; I really don't see those as being an issue on this project. This is a very deep, narrow site. I can't imagine that the public would interface with those with that detail at all.

Vice Chair Green: Yeah, and chair to your point. I agree. I we generally like to see them internalized. And there's a reason for that. But my feeling is the same. I just I think maybe it's more of a comment to staff. I don't feel like this is necessarily a this does a good job of setting precedent for what it is. But it doesn't mean it's applicable to a wide variety of industrial buildings. I think that's the statement, I would make their message to staff.

Boardmember Trexler: And I would just say one more, it's kind of hard to tell from the rendering if they would really be visible or not. I'm reading this right. Is there another building beyond this building we're seeing here and there would be the loading docks facing each other, in the unloading area two buildings back-to-back. So, as you're if you're driving down Germann, you know, potentially, you could look back there and see those roof drains potentially, but it's not a hill I'm going to die on

Boardmember Placko: On the landscape palette you're using the agave Webberii, which is a large agave. It's eight to 10 feet in diameter. And I'm seeing it used especially on buildings one, buildings three and four. And building two it's being used a lot at the entry point and along the sidewalks. And it's hard for me to gauge scale. But I'm concerned that you've got too many of these things packed in there too tightly. So, I think you might need to ask the landscape architect to actually draw them to the proper scale. And I think you might see they're going to be into the sidewalk. Also, the there's the tree placement, especially the Cascalotes up near the building, they're planted on top of Bougainvillea is you want the Bougainvillea open to the sun where they can grow and be sunny. So, they need to shift the trees around. So, he's not putting things on top of the Agaves and the Bougainvillea just be a little more careful with where he's placing things. The east side of building one and two, two, there used to be a parking lot there. There's not now there's a landscape buffer, but then there used to be a parking lot because it look, he's got a foundation planting all along the east side of those two buildings. As if there was a six-foot-wide planter at point with a sidewalk. So, I think that could all be loosened up. I would keep the Bougainvilleas, but I'd probably get rid of all that geometric grid in there because you've got 40 feet of landscape space. You don't need that. Yeah, foundation plantings there, like you do the rest of the building.

Applicant Mike Forst: I wonder if that's because originally, we had two drives. And so, it was a drive on both sides. It'd be like if the city asked us to work with the neighbor to share his drive.

Boardmember Placko: That's when I looked at it. There's just a straight, straight line, like there was a sidewalk there and he was planting up against a sidewalk or a parking lot or something. So, I think you could lose a little bit because you've got all that frontage landscaping there. So, you really don't need that foundational planting there in that location. So that's all I have.

Chair Johnson: Thank you. Okay, well, Jennifer, would you like to summarize, comments?

Staff Planner Jennifer Merrill:

- The integral color block is preferred, especially for building one.

- The requests for alternative compliance and alternative landscape plan are supported by the board, as are the requests to have the downspouts external to these buildings because of their location and the shape of the site.
- And the trees should be drawn to the proper scale
- The Agave Weberii has very sharp terminal spines and shouldn't be placed close to pedestrian areas
- Shift the trees so they don't overlap with the shrubs, particularly Bougainvillea and the Agaves.
- The landscaping east of buildings one and two needs to be better integrated so that it doesn't appear to be foundation base right up against the building.

4-d DRB22-00438 - District 6. Within the 7800 to 7900 blocks of East Pecos Road (south side) and within the 7800 to 7900 blocks of East Germann Road (north side). Located east of Sossaman Road on the south side of Pecos Road. (40.2± acres). Design Review for an industrial development. Don Andrews, Andrews Design Group, Inc., applicant; CV AZ PECOS PROPERTY OWNER, LLC., owner.

Staff planner Sean Pesek presented the case.

Chair Johnson invited the applicant to speak.

Boardmember Knudsen: Do you have a rendering?

Chair Johnson: I think there's a rendering on page three in the presentation?

Staff Planner Sean Pesek: This project is very similar to one you saw a month ago. It's also on Germann Road, but the design is essentially the same. So, I think the thought from the applicant and architect was just to use this rendering as visual of what it probably will look like.

Chair Johnson: Where's the other project?

Applicant Zory Grigoryan: It's on the corner of Ellsworth in Jermaine about 1000 feet east of Ellsworth. It was a part of the August 9 meeting it we're considering them internally as sister projects. So, the design review board was pretty accepting of that design so we kind of mimicked it and incorporated some of the comments from that last Meeting into these updates.

Boardmember Knudsen: I would appreciate it when you have sister projects that you reference it so that I can go back and look, because I only saw this one rendering. And you know, some of these buildings are pretty long, and the ins and outs, and I was having a hard time visualizing. So, in the future, that would be much appreciated.

Applicant Zory Grigoryan: Yes, ma'am. Thank you.

Boardmember Knudsen: It's a nice color board to thank you. Thank you.

Boardmember Thomas: So, when I saw this project, I did recognize it from last month. And I'm going to make the same comment that I did last month, which is the back and the two sides have zero articulation, there's no movement up or down, or in the sides. If you look at the floor plans are completely flat. If you look at the next two industrial projects that we have tonight, both of them have articulation in the back, both up and down, and in and out on the sides and back. So, this building is going to be very flat and very plain. And that's the exact same comments that I made last month.

Chair Johnson: I've got a question, since I wasn't here last month was the site arrangement of the building similar on the sister project is this one.

Applicant David Cox: This project is a long, narrow site. So, the other one is shaped like a square. Our layout is a little more restricted.

Chair Johnson: I think you'd have a problem with just based on the configuration of this site, is that the dock face of the building really does have a lot of exposure. So, I think we would like what I would like to see in that type of situation is that that dock face really does get more articulation per comments like were shared from Board Member Thomas.

Applicant David Cox: Is that does that apply to building II on the west side?

Chair Johnson: Yeah, that's the one I was particularly concerned about. So, as you drive by you pass the project eastbound. You see a side of the building that's that doesn't have any articulation.

Applicant Zory Grigoryan: I think one of the comments we had similar to last month was to provide an 8' screen wall with landscaping in front. That was kind of the design direction that we were given to address this situation.

Applicant David Cox: Yeah, we did add color differentiation that the dark blue onto the back, we did look at we also have canopies that we show back there that do provide some articulation also. And we, of course, we have the change in material as we go along. These are long, some of these are long, narrow buildings. And so, we wanted to emphasize those breaks, and not to provide to break up that facade.

Applicant Zory Grigoryan: If you look at the third slide, you can see the difference in materials where it's kind of a light gray and then it gets into dark gray formliner. If you'd like an accent color, they're like along the left edge because that's where it's more prominent. We can do something like that. But to be completely honest, it's not entirely functional to have the truck Doc's jog back and forth and a lot of other buildings that we've driven around have a linear truck dock design because you do have a lot of openings on the back. So, considering the use and orientation of the backside of that building, I think graphically we could do something to kind of meet the Design Review Board's concerns and needs, but our articulation would have to be on the front side of the building as opposed to the bank.

Chair Johnson: I understand. So, complexity of the issue. Did you want to say something Scott?

Boardmember Thomas: I do. So, building E is over 1000 feet long. And you've got the truck dock area that's going to be seen from Germann, that's 40-foot-tall building that's completely flat along the top, I understand what you're saying about the ins and outs but you can take two panels and step them in to where they're only eight inches. Second, if it's flat like that, across that whole thing, it's going to be an eyesore when you're driving down Germann. And then the north side of I believe it's building a and b, you're going to have the same thing along Pecos Road, that you're going to be able to see those buildings also completely flat, along Pecos. And again, those are 40 foot tall. So even if you have an eight-foot-high screen wall and landscaping, you're still going to see 20 feet on top of that building.

Chair Johnson: Yeah, I mean, I sympathize with the functional issues here. But normally, when we do see those loading docks, we do see kind of site consideration to make them internal. I don't know if I've seen one here. In fact, it's quite this exposed. Did any of the other board members have any comment on this issue?

Boardmember Trexler: I just wanted to say I agree with the opinions that have been expressed on the flat facade. I think in the interest of time, I will reiterate what's already been said other than I agree.

Chair Johnson: You know, we've seen movement in the parapet before as a solution. It's not one that I'm super fond of. But we've seen that as a way to articulate that side, and even slight shifts in the panel, from the exterior side, I think that would be something that the board would advocate for.

Vice Chair Green: Chairman, if I might ask a question. So, I'm feel like I'm taking a little bit of a step back, I just went back and scan through the minutes from last meeting as well, you know, looking at reviewing some of the comments there. But help me understand the screen wall, because you mentioned the screen wall. And we discussed it last time for the other building, but help me understand what's happening with that the height what it looks like, because we don't I mean, we don't have very much detail on that

Applicant David Cox: part of our submittal included a view from that side, and it shows the landscaping. We stepped the wall back for pockets of landscaping also on there is an opaque gate that we have, you know to allow trucks in and out that each building is indeed designed to be a distribution building instead of a flex industrial like the other four. Also, the adjacent property to the west is also light industrial, so we would anticipate seeing similar buildings.

Vice Chair Green: I appreciate that clarification. I echo the sentiment that's been shared on the flatness of the building. It's a flat building from that perspective. But I think the element that I feel like I've been caught up more in is the screen wall detailing.

Applicant David Cox: We have included detailing on the screen wall. We accent it with coins of the split face. In addition to other accents.

Vice Chair Green: Which would you consider your main entrance? Pecos or Germann?

Applicant David Cox: Germann will be the entry for the distribution building and Pecos for the flex industrial.

Applicant Zory Grigoryan: So vehicular traffic is going to come down the middle off of Pecos, because that's where all of the kind of business and worker parking is. And then only the large building, i.e., the vehicular parking is on the right-hand side, and then the truck floor will be on the left.

Vice Chair Green: That's why I'm asking about that - we're concerned about sightlines of somebody on street level, looking at this building and seeing a long flat building. I would agree that I think there is a little bit more that can be done to try to articulate this in and out maybe with some stack panels, similar to what board member Thomas said. But you need to focus your attention on the perimeter wall detailing. I think we can do a little bit more on that backside.

Applicant David Cox: Yeah, I'd like to point out to that on from Germann, when you when you're traveling down, the window of sight is fairly narrow. So, you really have to look quickly to see the view that has been mentioned, but I appreciate that. Concerns about the offsets.

Boardmember Trexler: Is this eight-foot screen wall around the entire property line?

Applicant David Cox: Yeah, are we required to have an eight-foot screen wall around the entire property line.

Chair Johnson: Okay. Any other comments from the board?

Boardmember Placko: I just want to follow up on board member Johnson's comment. The perimeter wall is mostly gray, but there's some split face accents. Are they also gray? Are they different?

Applicant David Cox: They're, they're a darker gray.

Boardmember Placko: Okay, so gray's dominant across the entire site. Walls and buildings.

Boardmember Knudsen: actually, according to this lighting, you definitely have the blue, but that's more of a green. That's, that's a green gray. And then the tan is also on the green side. So yeah, and that's one of the comments I had was to check the actual color board because its "red" is gray on the tablet. And you have more color on there than, than what it actually shows up. Here. So yeah. And they play very nicely together. But it's great. Great.

Chair Johnson: It's, so you're okay, with what we saw on the material board. As far as the green hue,

Boardmember Knudsen: I would prefer to see it in the natural light. Render the color. But I think the colors, from what I can see, they did a good job blending. Cool. So yeah, I'm good with colors.

Boardmember Placko: I have one other comment on the landscape. I think it would be a good idea. If you took the green cloud sage out of the parking lot islands.

Chair Johnson: Okay, so just to summarize on our end before you provide your summary, Sean, I think what I've heard is, generally there was not a concern with alternative compliance as far as one material, but we do have concern about that west facade of building II.

Boardmember Thomas: Jonathan. Yes. I honestly, I have concerns with the north elevations that are along Pecos and the west elevation at Germann, with those being flat.

Chair Johnson: I'm not following that, Scott, because I see on the north and south facades, I see the office articulation. Am I Am I missing something?

Applicant Zory Grigoryan: Can you go back one more slide please? Or go to the site plan and I'll walk through it. You can see that in the corners. There. We've put a jog in and jog out and we've done storefront corners at building a and b at the edges. The interior courtyards face each other. So like Dave was explaining like you're going to have to zip through and look in if you're not turning there. And we have the CMU block wall with the truck access blocking it. So, where the four buildings are facing each other, the truck walls are kind of right in the middle. And that has a privacy gate and block wall. We sent the detail to Sean I've been trying to see it find it so I could show it to you. But there is in in the middle of those two buildings that gets an eight-foot-tall wall, so I don't know how much of it you're going to see when I drive by.

Chair Johnson: I think we need to clarify that. But the west facade of building V is more visible when you're far away from the building, you know, a couple 100 yards, right? You don't see a screen wall as six or seven feet tall. You're looking at a building that's 20 plus feet tall. So, there's a lot of walls there that is highly visible. So, I think in the interest of time, I think we should move on. But, Sean, I think that you have some things to work on with the applicant as far as those particular moves. I don't think that there's an issue as far as the use of materials, but the articulation and as a code reads the parapet movement, I think needs to be addressed.

Staff Planner Sean Pesek: Okay, yeah, that sounds that we can work on that with the architect for building one.

Applicant David Cox: One thing, also, if I might want, we looked at articulation, of course, in light industrial, we're stuck at 40 feet. So, we have little dips in it, and we have change in material. And we have the five-foot offsets on the public side that are at all the entries for articulation.

Chair Johnson: Yeah, I don't think there's an issue on those other buildings.

Applicant Zory Grigoryan: So, you're concerned about the west face of building because that's where we would see the most coming this way.

Chair Johnson: Sean, would you mind giving us a summary?

Staff planner Sean Pesek provided the following summary of comments:

- Add more articulation to the west facade of building V
- Provide enhanced landscaping along the west perimeter yard
- Provide more wall articulation on the western perimeter wall
- Replace cloud sage with a different tree species

4f DRB22-00644 - District 2. Within the 5700 to 5900 blocks of East Baseline Road (north side), within the 1800 to 1900 blocks of South Sunview (west side), and within the 5700 to 5900 blocks of East Inverness Avenue (south side). Located west of Recker Road on the north side of Baseline Road. (10± acres). Design Review for a multiple residence development. Charles Huellmantel, Huellmantel & Affiliates, applicant; VHS Acquisition Subsidiary Number 11, Inc., owner.

Staff planner Cassidy Welch presented the case.

Chair Johnson invited the applicant to speak.

Vice Chair Green: I think this actually looks really nice. I think this is well thought through, there's good articulation. I think the material palette seems to be compatible with what you're trying to do. And I appreciate it. I think that's all I would have to say.

Chair Johnson: I'll echo it, I think it's a good-looking project and articulated well. I think for the area, it's fitting. As far as this character of building in that area, I think that it's good fit. I did want to ask, are we in compliance as far as garage doors and numbers of garage doors and alignment?

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch: Chair Johnson, as a part of their rezone they are requesting a PAD overlay, which includes some deviations from development standards. One of which is the number of garage doors adjacent to each other.

Chair Johnson: I'd say just looking at this small landscape plan that I have on my screen if there is opportunity for some internal landscaping to break up the inside kind of tenant side of the project, I think that that would be welcomed and just soften the architecture from the inside of the development.

Applicant Charles Huellmantel: We're happy to work with staff to accomplish that.

Boardmember Thomas: I think the project looks great. What's the height of those perimeter trees going to get over time? Because it'd be great if they got close to that 40-foot height. I'm just not sure that's realistic was some species here in Arizona

Boardmember Placko: Well, they've got some Sissoos in there so they'll get pretty tall. They got some Chilean Mesquites so if they're given them enough room to grow, they'll mitigate the mass of the building. I think they'll do the job. It just might be a few years

Boardmember Knudsen: I do have a question on the material and color board. It looks like there's white, this product right there. It looks like it's white tile. Where does that go?

Applicant Charles Huellmantel: So, some of the areas like here, we will have the other material.

Chair Johnson: Okay, so for the benefit of Scott on the phone, he's pointed to the portals. Stone framing that's occurring on the light tan elements.

Boardmember Trexler: And is that fiber cement? Or is that tile? I don't see tile on the list here.

Applicant Charles Huellmantel: I think it is the fiber cement, we can certainly get more cut sheets to your staff.

Boardmember Knudsen: Great. Thank you for addressing that. The color palette looks good.

Boardmember Trexler: I agree. I think it's a nice-looking project. It's testament to tasteful use of materials. Nice selection of color palette, and a very orderly well thought out elevation. It's not trying to do too much just tastefully done. Good job. Thank you.

Vice Chair Green: Chair, just one other comment I was going to make on the carports. I'm seeing two conflicting details. I just want to clarify which one it is on the carport site plan detail. It says it's a fluorescent bulb. But in light package, it says it's going to be it appears to be an LED light fixture.

Applicant Charles Huellmantel: Can you clarify which LED light fixture?

Vice Chair Green: It's just in the site plan document I saw. It showed a fluorescent bulb mounted in the carport. But I was just going to recommend it to be LED.

Staff Planner Cassidy Welch did not provide a summary of comments from the board.

4-g DRB22-00673 - District 6. Within the 7600 to 8000 blocks of East Elliot Road (north side) and within the 3300 to 3600 blocks of South 80th Street (west side). Located east

of Sossaman Road on the north side of Elliot Road. (58+ acres). Design Review for an industrial development. Pew and Lake, Applicant; TLC Foundation LP, Owner.

Staff planner Josh Grandlienard presented the case.

Chair Johnson invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant Randy Hilleboe presented the case.

Boardmember Knudsen: No rendering? I'd really appreciate a rendering.

Chair Johnson: Yeah, these projects, I know that they're like you, you think you could just comprehend them pretty quickly, because they're all very similar. But it's always helpful to see it in 3D, even for kind of a seasoned people up here, but it's always helpful.

Vice Chair Green: Josh question for you on the so the height of 40 feet tends to be a common, this is showing up to 45. And I'm assuming that's all within the zoning allowance.

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard: Yeah. So as part of the PAD, that they're requesting for the light industrial, there is a modification to allow for the increased height. And that's mainly for that parapet dealing, detailing as well as to screen any service elements.

Vice Chair Green: So, I guess my comments, I'll just direct it towards the alternative compliance, I don't generally I don't have many issues with alternative compliance. My concern is mostly coming back to the articulation. Right. And I feel like this is articulated pretty well, especially at the corners, and the up and down across the, across the facade, where I feel like he could use more is on the back side. And this is similar to the last project. I think this one, excuse me, I think this one handles it better., the bottom elevation there where you have the dark, grayish color there, that kind of dark gray, green, right there in that location, I feel like even something as simple as moving that out, or in could start to break up the entire elongation of this building. And it does start to feel like it's two different buildings, maybe a little bit at that point. But maybe even something as simple that can help. But I feel like my comments would echo a lot of what was said in the first in the project. We saw already tonight that you heard a lot of comments on.

Applicant Randy Hilleboe: So, in the overall site layout, we went to great lengths to kind of hide these corridors where the truck courts are. So, if you look between one and two that's tucked in behind building six, between three and four were tucked behind building seven. So, we have kind of concealed those so we don't have that mass. flat wall through there. Yeah, the only place I would see as being potentially exposed is along 80th and we've got some real nice landscaping along 80th Street there in between buildings five and eight.

Vice Chair Green: Yeah, and I would agree with you on that. I think generally Eightieth Street is where you're going to see most of the truck docks, right, especially along their building sixth, seventh and eighth, right. So, my, my feeling I feel similar to you, but this is a 45-foot-tall building, right? I mean, it's it doesn't matter how many trees you put in front of it, you're still going to see some of it.

Chair Johnson: I think this is a totally different scenario than what we saw on the other one and even on the 80th street. I mean, if you if you just do a perspective line, like let's say you're on 80th Street at 600 yards north of the corner, you start up again, it's about the architecture and how much is exposed. I don't disagree with the comment as far as articulation being welcomed, but I feel like this is a different scenario.

Boardmember Thomas: I also want to say, I mean, the articulation on this building, I mean, the up and down movement on the back side of these buildings is night and day difference than the last project we saw. I mean, they've got some great up and down articulation on this. And on the ends of these buildings, the way that they come in and out. It's not completely flat. Along those, if you look at the floor plans in the site plan, those buildings are coming in and out to the furthest point in the middle. Randy, what do you say five feet or more in the middle?

Applicant Randy Hilleboe: I believe it's six feet there.

Boardmember Thomas: So, I mean, there's a, there's a big difference, I think in these than the other projects that we saw that were a complete rectangle, and completely flat all the way around and one flat elevation all the way around.

Chair Johnson: you do have significant areas of knockout panel, what is the intent if that were to ever get knocked out?

Applicant Randy Hilleboe: It would be for additional office space, if a tenant goes into the corner, say that's a single occupant or two occupants. They want to put their main office there in that corner at gate 11. They can knock those out to add some additional windows for natural lighting into their space.

Chair Johnson: Yeah, that's what I kind of anticipated. Okay.

Boardmember Knudsen: On your color board there is the charcoal briquette. That's pretty black. Have you taken or researched the paint on how fast it'll fade on you?

Applicant Randy Hilleboe: We've worked with Dunn Edwards in the past on other projects that are pretty dark, and they've been able to get the right mixture.

Boardmember Knudsen: Dunn Edwards is really good at supplying paint that won't fade. So yeah, I just noticed that there's quite a bit of that black and black has a tendency to fade really, really quick. Okay, I'm glad you addressed that.

Boardmember Placko: So, in terms of landscape, I think I'm going to compare the previous project positively to this one. This one means a lot more foundation planning between the sidewalk in the building, what's there is extremely minimal. And it's the same plant the same six or eight plants just repeated over and over and over. And there's they might do well on the south, Jehovah will do well on the South in the West, but they might not do so well on the north and the east. So, you just need some more some more thought as to what's happening up against the buildings, and a lot more plant material probably needs to be put in there.

Chair Johnson: Okay, I don't see any other comments coming in. So, Josh, if you wouldn't mind giving us quick summary.

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard provided the following summary:

- Additional articulation on back side
- Provide rendering
- Provide additional landscaping in the landscape base with additional plant types

4-h DRB22-00679 - District 1. Within the 3900 to 4000 blocks of East Oasis Circle (south side) and within the 2800 to 2900 blocks of North Norwalk (west side). Located north of McDowell Road and west of Greenfield Road. (0.34± acres). Design review for an industrial development. Greg Hitchens, applicant; ViewPoint Resort, LLC., owner.

Staff planner Sean Pesek presented the case.

Chair Johnson invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant Nathan Palmer presented the case.

Boardmember Knudsen: I think it's well done. It's a very nice building. I think it'll be a great addition to the area

Vice Chair Green: So, I was going to say we swapped red for blue this time. Is that Is that correct?

Applicant Nathan Palmer: This one is actually for our personal office space. And the blue on the rendering came out a little brighter than what it will be actually it's a bit more of a gray blue in our office logos. But it'll be a shade of blue for sure.

Vice Chair Green: I think it looks good. I don't have any concerns with it. Thank you.

Boardmember Trexler: Just question on the materials. The it looks like in the rendering there. The masonry, the CMU on the corner of the building is painted blue. Is that accurate? Yes. Okay. And then you have regular CMU Gray and scored CMU gray. Those are just standard color. Gray CMU?

Applicant Nathan Palmer: That's correct. Yeah, just natural gray. So, it has more of an organic feel the score is going to be on the pillars and the standard is on the rest of the building. Thank you.

Chair Johnson: Scott, do you have any comments?

Applicant Nathan Palmer: I don't, not on this one.

Chair Johnson: Okay, now a quick one. Thank you so much for your project. Can we get a summary?

Staff Planner Sean Pesek did not provide a summary of comments from the board.

- 4-i DRB22-00683 - District 6.** Within the 3700 to 3900 blocks of South Sossaman Road (east side). Located south of Elliot Road on the east side of Sossaman Road. (20± acres). Design Review to expand an existing mini-storage facility with boat and recreational vehicle storage. Tim Quigley, Happy Wife Storage, LLC., applicant; Happy Wife Storage, LLC., owner.

Staff planner Sean Pesek presented the case.

Chair Johnson invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant Phil Gollon presented the case.

Boardmember Knudsen: The yellow the color yellow, is that the striping?

Applicant Phil Gollon: It's the bollards.

Boardmember Knudsen: I didn't see it on the elevations.

Applicant Phil Gollon: So, between the doors they have the bollards.

Chair Johnson: Well, what is the length of that detached garage? It looks like the corner of it is right on the setback line. But then the setback line isn't perpendicular to it. Maybe there becomes some relief as he was building. I'm looking at it on Sossaman Road. I don't know if you have the ability to zoom in.

Boardmember Thomas: Hey, Paul, it looks to me like it's about 300 foot long.

Chair Johnson: Yeah. So, I feel like there's an opportunity to break that building into chunks.

Applicant Phil Gollon: So that's the top. And we had originally worked with Lesley on this project for the design. So, we added those panels, lip metal panels, that's what's breaking up that elevation.

Chair Johnson: And those, those are all on the same plane, but the materials is what's changing. Does a building move in and out or just the material?

Applicant Phil Gollon: Yeah, so the brown areas there, that's popping out. I see. Yeah, so you have he had the metal panels, and then you have the mystery that's beyond it. And then with the accent striping.

Staff Planner Sean Pesek did not have a summary of comments from the board.

- 4-k DRB22-00721 – District 2.** Within the 4100 block of East Valley Auto Drive (west side). Located west of Greenfield Road and north of Baseline Road. (2.5± acres). Design

review for an industrial development. Paul Almond, Almond ADG Architects, applicant; Bradley/Jamie Bigelow, owner.

Staff planner Evan Balmer presented the case.

Chair Johnson invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant Paul Almond presented the case.

Boardmember Trexler: I think it's very nicely done. It's a big box but that's the function of the building is it suits the plan? Is there a material board?

Boardmember Trexler: I'll talk about the materials in just a second. But I think the design is nice, the elevations look really nice. I wonder if the darker colors, the darker colored portions of the elevation that pop up a little bit? If those could in plan just pop out? Looking at the plan, I didn't see that. But that would be my primary comment is where they pop up on the elevation, if they could also have some change in plane.

Applicant Paul Almond: Those panels are actually three inches thicker. So, they will create a shadow line. And then we're also looking at pulling them out all the way and actually overlapping the panel so that we would have a full 11 inches.

Boardmember Trexler: The that would look really nice. And I saw a comment about reusing the brick. Is that accurate?

Applicant Paul Almond: It will just have the look of aged brick.

Boardmember Trexler: Got it. Thank you.

Vice Chair Green: I don't find myself saying this very often, but I appreciate how simple the building is. I think it's clean. It's got clean lines. appreciate this and I'm looking forward to seeing it

Boardmember Thomas: I like the building. I'm going to agree with Vice Chair green it is very simple for what it is. I think it's a great infill project where it's going, I'm pleased with it.

Chair Johnson: The landscape plan is bordering on a little too simple, to be honest. I think that you should very, very much take into account those comments about shifting that plane; I think that's going to help quite a bit. I think that the other thing that would be helpful with a building this minimal, which I actually am a fan of minimal architecture, but to embrace landscaping as your way to soften the project. If you have very narrow landscaping beds that are adjacent to the building if there's any way to get those to the width that could accept some trees closer to the building, I think that that would be worth a look.

Boardmember Placko: Along the frontage they got some trees not just between the sidewalk and the building but between the sidewalk and the curb. Then they've got some

trees in the turf area, maybe they could add another tree closer to the building the turf area.

Chair Johnson: I think if you looked at, you might be okay. I'd be tempted to put in some reveal lines into your light material., how do you feel about that? Is that too much?

Boardmember Trexler: The darker material has the form liner. So, it has a texture to it. I think you could definitely bring up some vertical scoring on the lighter color material.

Boardmember Knudsen: I would I disagree with you. I'm not a fan of the building. The color palette is black and gray and needs life. It definitely needs green. It needs color to bring it to life. Otherwise, it looks there's just no interest to it. I think the plants will really make a difference. And it is very, very simple. So, I agree with you.

Chair Johnson: Is that the east side that has the most visible presence?

Boardmember Placko: From the street.

Chair Johnson: They have a lineup of trees and they have the turf. There's some thought there as far as creating some softness, but if there's any suggestions that you have, I think that would be helpful.

Boardmember Trexler: Just one additional thought on the brick. It looks like kind of a standard red brick. And as you know, grays and blacks can be a warm gray, a cool gray. So, I would just encourage you, or maybe already have to get samples of that brick and samples of the paint colors you're going to work with and try out a few to make sure that the brick is working with the actual colors that you're using for the darker gray and the lighter gray.

Boardmember Knudsen: Well, I would recommend green-gray. Because, like you said, there's blue-gray, there's purple,-gray, there's green- gray, there's black, or brown, brown and black. The red and the green are opposite on the color wheel, so when you put them together, they vibrate, which will bring life to it. You might want to take a look on the greener side. Because it's kind of on the cooler side of the gray.

Applicant Paul Almond: The rendering nor the colored elevation really shows it, but if you're comparing grey within all the Dunn Edwards greys, these are the warmest greys.

Applicant Paul Almond: The darkest one on the metal is called Charcoal Smudge and it goes within that same palette.

Boardmember Knudsen: Don't follow the little strip. Just go through and take a look and put it with the with the brick.

Boardmember Placko: Can I jump in here? Can you guys explain a little bit what's happening on the west side of the site there in the back. It looks like there's some

storage yards. That's created some fenced off storage yards. But then on the landscape plan it shows trees in there.

Applicant Paul Almond: Very fancy storage yards.

Boardmember Placko: It really doesn't really make sense to put trees in a storage area.

Applicant Paul Almond: It doesn't but the back 20 feet is a landscape strip that we're required to landscape. And you're right we've had this discussion and it didn't make much sense to us either.

Boardmember Placko: I think the other question I have is, have you thought about the parking lot screen wall location? Specifically, I'm not sure it's a good idea to put a painted CMU wall in grass. How are you going to irrigate it? Because the water is going to hit the CMU and the efflorescence is going to come back in no matter what you paint that it's going to become white. My suggestion would be to push the part of the screen wall towards the parking lot and separate it from the grass and put in a concrete head or something so that you're not over spraying. There's a little parking lot island. Now to Paul's comment about the southeast part here, if you took out some turf and jogged that path to the east slightly, you could create a little more planter space next to the building. That might be enough space add another a tree or two. Or if you wanted to put in something that was flowering, Texas Mountain Laurels or Cascalote. If you go to Cascalote, do the smoothie because you're close to a pedestrian route and you don't want thorns.

Applicant Paul Almond: Excellent.

Chair Johnson: You have a refined architectural palette that's very simple and because of that, I feel like the landscape design should respond to that as well. The way that the turf is designed, I think more geometric fields of landscape that would be bordered by planter beds with agave or something like that Would be a more modern approach. Take that theme that you've established with your architecture and pull it into your hardscape and landscape design.

Evan Balmer provided the following summary of comments:

- Add horizontal movement to the dark grey portions
- Add score lines to break up the lighter grey.
- Choose a green-gray to complement the red brick.
- Expand the foundation base to incorporate additional trees.
- Utilize a geometric design for the turf areas.
- Relocate the parking screen wall so that it does not get overspray.

- 4I DRB22-00763 - District 1.** Within the 3400 to 3500 blocks of North Greenfield Road (west side) and within the 4100 to 4400 blocks of East Virginia Street. Located north of McDowell Road on the west side of Greenfield Road. (54± acres). Design review for an industrial development. Balmer Architectural Group, Applicant; Sunbelt Land Holdings LP, Owner.

Staff planner Josh Grandlienard presented the case.

Chair Johnson invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant Elias Flake presented the case.

Chair Johnson: Mr. Chuck Clark, are you here?

Kyle Clark, 4150 E Quartz Circle: We're the neighbor right there to the south of building six. So, our only concern is we're a welding fabrication shop, you know, we've got 10 acres that we've been in the been there since '81. I'm not planning on going away, my father was here, he started the company in '75 in Mesa. So, I'm not planning on going nowhere. We've got sparks, we've got welders, we've got plasmas running, that we just, you know a concern to me with the building looking right in our plant when it could be looking out over the freeway having a better view. And that's looking at trucks. That's really all we wanted to just bring up, you know, just from, from my eyes, I guess a safety standpoint, our guys are wearing hoods, when they're using that you got somebody looking out in office staring at it all day, it's not going to be good for their eyes. Just kind of wanted to bring that up. And hopefully it gets considered and I don't know if this is right meeting even.

Chair Johnson: We really appreciate that comment. Thank you. All right.

Boardmember Trexler: Thank you. Just a clarification. You mentioned views what is the concern with understand the welding issue? Was there a concern about this new building blocking your view?

Kyle Clark, 4150 E Quartz Circle: We don't even need landscaping back there. And from my fence line is you know, I mean, nothing's ever going to be there other than the fabrication shop.

Chair Johnson: Sure, you're concerned with the people in the in...

Kyle Clark, 4150 E Quartz Circle: The office building, looking out on my shop, getting that view. I mean, my suggestion would be to shift the view to face the 202.

Boardmember Trexler: It's actually a really pretty view out there.

Kyle Clark, 4150 E Quartz Circle: We talked about buying that years ago, we tried to, you know, from the city and put our office out there have an elevated office structure out there.

Chair Johnson: We'll appreciate you hanging out with us and sharing that comment. Okay. I guess let's open up to the board for any comments.

Vice Chair Green: I think you guys have treated the building, generally speaking really well. The things we mentioned the articulation in the back, I see some of that in and out. I like the facades. If I was to get nitpicky, the awnings that are over the I see some awnings that look to be cantilever I see some that are hung. I would ask is why not match those to one or the other? But that's just a nitpicky thing at that point. You know, considering the public comment. You know, I don't know that that's probably something to consider is if you're having people that are going to be in an office space, or in a setting where they're, they're looking out the windows or working inside and looking now, you might want to consider shielding or something that especially if there's no shielding on the adjacent property for arc welds, that's, that's probably a health and safety concern. So yeah, maybe consider that, see how you can take that into consideration. So that's mine without

Chair Johnson: any other comments?

Boardmember Trexler: I agree. I think it's nicely designed building on the material board. There's CMU, is that for a site wall? Or where's that happening?

Applicant Elias Flake: Yes, the CMU is for parking screen walls and the trash enclosures. They're four-inch-high courses. Generally, we're alternating the bands, and then it is sealed. Left in the natural gray state. And then in the gates for the trash enclosures are black steel, so they'll rust over time. Likewise, we have some interrupting fins within the parking screen walls that are also black COR-TEN steel.

Boardmember Trexler: Sounds very nice. Thank you.

Chair Johnson: What is the site? What are some baseball diamonds looks like some soccer fields?

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard: It's a city park.

Chair Johnson: Yeah, I really appreciate the neighbors' comments I do. You know, you sort of have two opposing issues. And I think I'll leave it to you guys to decide what's best on that. But I think that for sure you should be considering that that safety issue for your tenants.

Boardmember Knudsen: Thank you for the rendering. That was very helpful. And I think it's a nice-looking building.

Boardmember Placko: Really only have one comment on the landscaping. It's kind of a minor one. But you don't need to use the cascalote smoothie here, the thornless cascalote. Just use the standard. Because the thornless is hard to get anyway. And they're not using it next to pedestrian routes on this project. So just go with the standard.

Chair Johnson: Hey, Scott, do you have anything?

Boardmember Thomas: I'm going to agree with board member green. It's getting late. I'm not going to drag on any more with this. It looks great. I like it.

Chair Johnson: Well, if you wouldn't mind giving us a summary. I think there's all the comments.

Staff Planner Josh Grandlienard provided the following summary:

- Consider shielding building 6 due to the flash welding of the user to the south
- Consider replacing the thornless cascalotes with regular since they can be hard to find
- Consider matching the proposed awing types

4m DRB22-00768 – District 6. Within the 8100 to 8200 blocks of East Pecos Road (south side) and within the 7200 to 7300 blocks of South 80th Street (east side). (23± acres). Located east of Sossaman Road on the south side of Pecos Road. Design Review for an industrial development. Carlos Elias, LGE Deign Group, Applicant; CENTRIS MESA 80TH AND PECOS LLC, Owner.

Staff planner Charlotte Bridges presented the case.

Chair Johnson invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant Carlos Elias presented the case.

Chair Johnson: Do we have any comments, questions?

Vice Chair Green: It looks like there are reliefs of glazing scattered throughout the building. I want to confirm that it is glazing, it's not painted or something like that, right?

Applicant Carlos Elias: Yes, it's glazing. We wanted to bring more natural light as part of having a green initiative. These big industrial projects usually have no natural light for employees that work inside. We wanted to scatter some glazing throughout the elevation, rather than just concentrated it in the corners.

Vice Chair Green: I think that's great. I can get behind this building and I'll leave it to others for color and other opinions. But I think in terms of form and what you've outlined in terms of the function, I can get behind that.

Staff Planner Charlotte Bridges: Chair, Board members, I want to apologize. I had a color material slide in in the presentation, but I don't know what happened to it. The color and materials board is included with the building elevations in the packet. There is also a detail of the proposed form liners.

Vice Chair Green: It seems like there's enough texturing and what not happening that I feel comfortable with your alternate compliance.

Boardmember Trexler: I agree. I think this is a very nicely designed elevation, very rational. The proportions are nice. It is using primarily one material, but I think you've used that material nicely. I agree that I'm good with the alternative compliance.

Boardmember Knudsen: Your color palette's well done. You did a good job with it.

Boardmember Placko: Regarding the south property line. It looks like there is a 15-foot landscape yard and the parking the truck parking is impeding into that 15-foot landscape area.

Applicant Carlos Elias: Yes, we are screening that yard. There is a section of the ordinance saying that within the storage yard, landscape material is not required.

Boardmember Placko: You don't need landscape there?

Applicant Carlos Elias: Not withing the screened yard.

Boardmember Placko: What I'm seeing is not going to work because I know the semis backup and the trees are overhanging into that area, they are not fitting the space. I see a future problem.

Applicant Carlos Elias: The view on the landscape plan might be cropped so you don't see that there's enough room for the row the trees beyond the screen wall.

Boardmember Placko: Does the parking go right to the screen wall? You are putting landscape outside the screen wall? It looks like it gets tight there. From what I'm seeing, you're actually planting off property. I'm not sure what your neighbors will think when your plants are dropping all their stuff on their land. The site to the south is not developed. Are you aware of any plans for that property?

Staff Planner Charlotte Bridges: Not that I'm aware of.

Boardmember Placko: On the east side, the planting is thicker and it gets thinner to the west. I'm not sure what the requirements are for landscape plantings in that area, so I will leave that to Charlotte. I don't really have concerns with the palette.

Chair Johnson: I think the use of the material is actually very elegant, well done with the scattering of the glazing and the rhythm, and the joint lines are very nicely done.

Boardmember Thomas: I think it's well done as well. I like the use of the lighter color on the top of the walls. My only concern is in the future, if it gets painted differently and becomes a darker color to blend across the top, it's going to be a flat facade, like we have seen earlier. But the other breaks in the wall, the reveals and everything else work really well and I think it looks good.

Chair Johnson: As a note of appreciation, what your firm does from a design standpoint for our communities, I think is fantastic.

Applicant Carlos Elias: We try to push the envelope a little bit on these industrials.

Chair Johnson: Any other comments from the Board? Can we get a summary?

Staff Planner Charlotte Bridges provided the following summary of comments:

- Work with the applicant to review the landscaping material along the south property line.

5 Planning Director Update:

5a Discussed the upcoming changes to how citizen comments are accepted.

5b Discussed the possibility of going from one monthly meeting to two monthly meetings. No resolution was reached at this time.

6 Adjournment: Vice Chair Green moved to adjourn the meeting and was seconded by Boardmember Placko. Without objection, the meeting was adjourned at 8:34 PM.