



Design Review Board

Minutes

**October 13, 2015
Council Chambers – Lower Level
57 East 1st Street
4:30 PM**

A work session of the Design Review Board was held at the City of Mesa Council Chamber – Lower Level, 57 East 1st Street at 4:30 p.m.

Board Members Present:

Brian Sandstrom – Chair
Sean Banda -Vice-Chair
Eric Paul
Taylor Candland
Randy Carter

Board Members Absent:

Tracy Roedel
Nicole Posten-Thompson

Staff Present:

John Wesley
Tom Ellsworth
Wahid Alam
Kim Steadman
Kaelee Wilson
Mike Gildenstern

Others Present:

Corey Smith
Mike Hall
Michael Jorgensen
Fred Woods

Chairperson Sandstrom welcomed everyone to the Work Session at 4:30 p.m.

- A. Discuss and Provide Direction Regarding Design Review cases:

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes
October 13, 2015**

Item A.1. DR15-033 54th Street Business Park (PLN2015-00243)

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 5349 East Main Street
REQUEST: Review of a proposed new business condominium park
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 2
OWNER: Donald Callender
APPLICANT: DESJ LLC
ARCHITECT: Corey Smith
STAFF PLANNER: Tom Ellsworth

Staff Planner: Tom Ellsworth

Discussion:

Staff member, Tom Ellsworth, presented the case to the Board.

Staff identified the following concerns with the proposed new business condominium park:

1. At the previous meeting, the Board was concerned about the color being dated, and a more seamless integration of the shipping containers into the architecture, and the street-facing bay doors.

Chairperson Sandstrom:

- Confirmed that the shipping containers will be painted, and some will be covered in stucco, while others will retain their original shipping line colors and logos
- Confirmed that minimum insulation values will be met within the containers
- Liked the color palette better, but felt that it was still too plain; suggested adding reveals, chamfer strips, and surface patterning
- Proposed a dark anodized bronze or Galvalume for the door finish
- Liked a milled finish, anodized bronze, or Galvalume material for the lighting fixtures
- Would like to see the doors better integrated into the building
- Proposed pairing an orange color with the brown colored building
- Recommend that the store fronts, doors, and lights exhibit the same general look for consistency

Boardmember Banda:

- Felt that a Galvalume-type color would make materials pop better, and recommended showing more of the elements of the metal shipping containers
- Suggested that the wall packs should be a galvanized material to create a stronger impression
- Proposed using recessed light on the under-hangs

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes
October 13, 2015**

Boardmember Paul:

- Liked the changes and improvements
- Felt that the bronze would work well on the doors and lighting fixtures on the brown-toned building
- Suggested using the light grey color paired with green and a tan look on the brown building
- Commented that the blue and green work well together, and proposed using yellow or orange instead of red when paired with the brown

Boardmember Carter:

- Proposed a milled finish or galvanized steel look on the door
- Didn't like the reddish brown color when paired with brown, citing that they are too close in hue, concerned that the colors will fade over time and blend together
- Suggested changing the brown color, however if the building is kept brown, proposed eliminating the red accent, or brightening the red hue to create a differentiation on the building, such as a burnt orange
- Liked the project

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes
October 13, 2015**

Item A.2. **DR15-034 Development of a new inline retail building at Riverview (PLN2015-00304)**

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1003 North Dobson Road
REQUEST: Review of a proposed inline retail center at Riverview
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 1
OWNER: Sachs Ranch Co. LLC/Hurley Land Co. LLC, owners
APPLICANT: Architecture Design Collaborative
ARCHITECT: Architecture Design Collaborative
STAFF PLANNER: Wahid Alam

Staff Planner: Wahid Alam

Discussion:

Staff member, Wahid Alam, presented the case to the Board.

Staff identified the following concerns with the proposed new in-line retail building:

1. Wanted an incorporation of brick in the architecture to achieve a more traditional look
2. Wanted a better solution for pedestrian connectivity to the street and the rest of the plaza
3. Wanted enhanced canopies and trellises, especially over the outdoor dining area

Chairperson Sandstrom:

- Would like to see a design more along the lines of the existing Riverview aesthetic, to tie it in with the plaza and project that image out to the street
- Proposed using interesting masonry finish patterns, potentially white split-face; and using brown and red brickwork like those seen on the movie theatre within Riverview
- Proposed a variation of masonry to tie it into the existing eclectic Riverview look
- Proposed placing the grease trap interceptor out of and away from the outdoor seating area

Boardmember Banda:

- Suggested creating a pad for dining, or extra landscaping on the perimeter of the building
- Would like to see more detail on the main entry and Dobson side, maybe additional lighting, create more dimension to create a reveal
- Suggested placing a seating area on Bass Pro Drive
- Proposed wrapping the design elements (canopies, brickwork) from the east side around to the south side of the building to carry over that “old town” look
- Suggested adding additional lighting on the building, specifically the south side façade

Boardmember Candland:

- Would like to see a more decorative cap on the columns

Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes October 13, 2015

Boardmember Paul:

- Would like to see a little more detail in the architecture
- Proposed implementing patterning and banding with the brickwork, to create dimension on the façade
- Would like to see the design continue around the corner of the building to the western elevation as well as to the side facing the entrance drive on the south

Boardmember Carter:

- Concerned that the building has a contemporary look that doesn't fit in with the rest of the complex
- Would like to see more flamboyance, reveal lines, or more dramatic cornices and columns; possibly an accentuation with a pyramid top
- Would like to see a more decorative nature in the design
- Liked the direction of the architecture, as it serves as a bridge between the classic Riverview plaza design and the contemporary-designed car dealerships across the street
- Concerned about the long drive-thru that wraps around the building, suggested beefing up the landscape to minimize the visual impact

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes
October 13, 2015**

Item A.3. **DR15-036 Development of a new drive-thru restaurant (PLN2015-0346)**

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2210 West Southern Avenue
REQUEST: Review of a proposed retail and restaurant space
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 3
OWNER: GDC San Jose & Southern, LLC, Garrett Development Corporation
APPLICANT: RCAA
ARCHITECT: Neal Feaser
STAFF PLANNER: Kim Steadman

Staff Planner: Kim Steadman

Staff Recommendation: Continuance to the November 10, 2015 Meeting

Board Decision: Continued to the November 10, 2015 Meeting Vote: (5-0) (Boardmembers Roedel and Thompson Excused)

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes
October 13, 2015**

Item A.4. DR15-030 Arizona Propane (PLN2015-00238)

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 10900 Block of East Pecos Road
REQUEST: Review of a proposed propane facility
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 6
OWNER: Martin and Barbara Dawson
APPLICANT: Michael Hall Architects
ARCHITECT: Mike Hall
STAFF PLANNER: Wahid Alam

Discussion:

Staff member, Wahid Alam, presented the case to the Board.

Chairperson Sandstrom:

- Recommended using a heavier gauge metal panel (currently 2" in use)
- Felt that this building will set a precedent for future buildings in the area, was very impressed with the design

Boardmember Carter:

- Impressed with the new design

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes
October 13, 2015**

Item A.5. DR15-037 Development of a new car wash (PLN2015-00349)

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 6735 East McDowell Road
REQUEST: Review of a proposed car wash
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 5
OWNER: Superstition Promenade LLC
APPLICANT: MDJ Studios
ARCHITECT: Michael Jorgensen
STAFF PLANNER: Tom Ellsworth

Discussion:

Staff member, Tom Ellsworth, presented the case to the Board.

Chairperson Sandstrom:

- Confirmed with the applicant that the metal roof will be gray
- Stated that the building now has an identity, and is much improved from the elevations seen at the September Work Session
- Liked the limitation of colors used in the design

Boardmember Banda:

- Confirmed that the lighting used will match the “hats” found installed on the older components of the plaza
- Felt that the new design reads well, confirmed with the applicant that the tower height was reduced by 4’, and stated that the tower is now better integrated into the rest of the design

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes
October 13, 2015**

Item A.6. **DR15-038 Jacinto Lofts @ Mesa Shores (PLN2015-00399)**

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2136 East Baseline Road
REQUEST: Review of a proposed multi-family environment
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 3
OWNER: Genica Arizona LLC
APPLICANT: Woods Associates Architects, LLC
ARCHITECT: Fred Woods
STAFF PLANNER: Kim Steadman

Staff Planner: Kim Steadman

Staff identified the following concerns with the proposed lofts:

- Concerned that the fireplace pop-outs are too insignificant
- Concerned about some of the entries from garages to the living spaces being placed on the side of the units, creating a less than intuitive ingress/egress program

Chairperson Sandstrom:

- Concerned with the excessive use of the yellow color throughout the project, but liked how the yellow and brown hues complement the stone
- Liked the massing of the building, and liked the direction of the design
- Liked how the fixtures are tied into the architecture, but would like to see them at a more residential scale
- Proposed the use of side lighting
- Concerned with arbitrarily coming up with different color patterns, proposed using one primary color per building, but incorporating reversals of color patterns from unit to unit

Boardmember Banda:

- Wanted to see differentiation, but likes the color palate, especially as a component to way-find
- Liked the detail of the project, especially how the chimneys are accented with ornate design features
- Confirmed that the canopies and overhangs will be painted flat metal
- Would like to see the ends of the chimney anchored, but acknowledged the challenge of accommodating garage access
- Proposed a variation of color palettes within the actual subdivision

Boardmember Paul:

- Liked all four sides of the architecture, and was impressed with the detail
- Confirmed with the applicant that neighbors are concerned about a 3 story building, but the application explained that the articulation and stair-stepping in the architecture softens the impact
- Like the articulation, the scale, and the break of horizontal lines
- Liked the integration of classic and contemporary design elements

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes
October 13, 2015**

- B. Call to Order
Chairperson Sandstrom called the meeting to order at 5:23 p.m.
- C. Consider the Minutes from the September 8, 2015 meeting
On a motion by Boardmember Paul, seconded by Boardmember Carter, the Board unanimously approved the September 8, 2015 minutes. Vote-(approved 5-0) (Absent: Boardmember Roedel and Thompson)
- D. Discuss and take action on the following Design Review cases:
- E. Other Business

Item E.1. **Discussion of Residential Small Lot Product**

Staff Member Kaelee Wilson provided the Board with a handout of examples of Residential Small Lot Product, which in some instances, the Board referred to:

Chairperson Sandstrom:

- Gave an example of a house under construction on 8th Street and Una Avenue in Tempe exhibits how a nice contemporary house can be constructed using mass-produced, readily available materials, without a high cost
- Felt that Mesa should push for more progressive design, and possibly provide some literature illustrating a modern architecture palette for contemporary small house urban living to developers
- Proposed incorporating green screens with homes, even with the maintenance issues, they would provide shade on walls and breaks up one-dimensional planes of stucco
- Liked the color variation when shown in the sample designs,
- Liked example #7 because it featured three distinct colors, creating visual interest

Boardmember Banda:

- Felt that small lot product should be more ornate
- Felt that the architectural elements must remain consistent to the style of the homes i.e. craftsman windows and doors on craftsman architecture
- Would like to see more and better wraparound architecture, reveals on windows, specialty wood elements, variation of materials, garages deemphasized, and more accentuation in the elevations
- Proposed mandatory corner lot design feature treatment upgrades

Boardmember Carter:

- Felt that much small lot product is composed of too much plain architecture, not enough design
- Concerned that the back sides of houses on the edges of subdivisions are not detailed enough, as they face prominently on to the street
- Felt that there is too much of an extreme entrance on packet example #8; also felt that the

Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes October 13, 2015

example is basically just an extreme ranch style house, playing on 1980-1990s models, keeping the same design details, and merely compressing them together

- Stated that overhangs are needed on Spanish hacienda style houses
- Felt that when residential product is allowed to encroach into front yards, there needs to be porches to engage the public environment and to increase neighborliness
- Felt that packet sample #1 on the bottom of the page is terrible; he saw it as a 1950's ranch style house squeezed into to small lot, and the design is too flat, not enough fascia,
- Felt that the citizens of Mesa should be compensated through quality of design and amenities, in exchange for the allowance of an increased residential density in small lot developments

Boardmember Candland:

- Did not like packet examples #2 and #8 in the handout (packet sample #8 had horrible left/right elevations, it was too plain, and had no functional windows on the sides of the house. Packet sample #8 also had too plain of a rear elevation)
- While wary of using a universal set of standards, but on specific Spanish hacienda/colonial models, an overhang on the roof is necessary
- Would like to see a greater variation of materials
- Citing packet sample #1 and #8, he noted a lack of variety in the used materials; also stated that the ledges should not be optional, but mandated, as well as roof overhangs as they are expected to be present in this particular type of architecture

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes
October 13, 2015**

F. Other Business

G. Adjournment

The Work Session was paused at 5:23 p.m. to accommodate a discussion on residential small lot product, and then reconvened at 5:45. p.m. After reconvening, the Work Session was adjourned at 6:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Gildenstern
Planning Assistant

mg