



Design Review Board

Minutes

**September 8, 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
Tracy Roedel
Randy Carter
Nicole Posten-Thompson

Board Members Absent:

Taylor Candland

Staff Present:

John Wesley
Tom Ellsworth
Wahid Alam
Mike Gildenstern

Others Present:

Michael Jorgensen
Curt Ench

Chairperson Sandstrom welcomed everyone to the Work Session at 4:31 p.m.

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

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes
September 8, 2015**

Item A.1. **DR15-034 Development of a new inline retail building at Riverview (PLN2015-00238)**

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

Staff Recommendation: Continued to the October 13, 2015 Work Session

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes
September 8, 2015**

**Item A.2. DR15-035 Development of a new conference center for Save the Family
(PLN2015-0330)**

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 125 East University Drive
REQUEST: Review of a proposed conference center for Save the Family
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 4
OWNER: City of Mesa
APPLICANT: Treehouse Design Group LLC
ARCHITECT: Treehouse Design Group LLC
STAFF PLANNER: Wahid Alam

Discussion:

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

Staff identified the following concerns with the proposed conference center:

1. Staff was concerned about the use of somewhat complimentary brick on the proposed building

Boardmember Posten-Thompson:

- Inquired about the proper fire rating on the walls of the proposed conference center because it is located so close to the existing building
- Would like to see the same brick and design features used on the proposed building as the adjacent building because they are located so close together, and owned by the same entity and on the same office campus

Chairperson Sandstrom:

- Was concerned about the safety of the proposed alleyway during off-business hours, but was assured by the applicant that it is CPTED compliant
- Asked about lighting other than the lighting on the building
- Proposed using similar materials on the store fronts (anodized silver, comparable accent lighting) to promote consistency between the buildings
- Liked the metal roof with the low pitch standing seam
- Felt that the proposed building made good use of the lot, and that the project is headed in the right direction
- Suggested lacing in white metal beams to the façade
- Would like to see more unique material used on the building
- Proposed that the applicant use darker hues, create a few different options, then submit to Planning Staff for review

Boardmember Banda:

- Confirmed that the downspouts will be internalized
- Concerned that the north side of the existing adjacent building is obscured by landscaping in the plaza, and suggested that maybe the proposed landscaping can complement the future building better without screening it so excessively

Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes September 8, 2015

Boardmember Roedel:

- Liked the design of the building and how it integrates with the adjacent building

Boardmember Paul:

- Inquired about the use of the alley on the right side, along with access to parking, and confirmed that there is an entry way accessed on the plaza
- Confirmed that the courtyard to the south is owned by Save the Family
- Liked the compatibility of the design with the existing companion building
- Suggested using white grout for the brickwork
- Confirmed that the structure will be primarily constructed of steel joist and studs
- Confirmed with applicant that brick will be used on the south, east, and west sides
- Suggested arranging windows in a more vertical array to help the proposed building be more complementary to the existing adjacent taller building
- Suggested that the buildings should either be significantly divergent of each other or they should match better
- Proposed using one color from the existing building for consistency, and then diverge from there

Boardmember Carter:

- Confirmed that the intention of the new building is to communicate it's own personal identity as opposed to blending in with the existing building
- Proposed that the brick used on the new structure should be more dissimilar to help distinguish the new building as a separate use
- Concerned that the colors on the proposed building are dissimilar enough so that it is disconcerting
- Proposed either using colors that are more different to accentuate and define the new building as a separate use, or colors that are more similar to enhance the consistency of the project
- Wanted to see a little more pop and spice in the building to differentiate it from the existing building

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes
September 8, 2015**

Item A.3. **DR15-036 Development of a new drive-thru restaurant (PLN2015-00346)**

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2210 West Southern Avenue
REQUEST: Review of a proposed retail and restaurant space
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 3
OWNER: Grinell College Trustees
APPLICANT: RCAA
ARCHITECT: Neal Feaser
STAFF PLANNER: Tom Ellsworth

Staff Planner: Kim Steadman

Staff Recommendation: Continued to the October 13, 2015 Work Session

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes
September 8, 2015**

Item A.4. 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: Wahid Alam

Discussion:

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

Staff identified the following concerns with the proposed carwash:

- Staff would like to see the vacuums located internally on the site like those seen at the proposed Broadway and Dobson carwash
- Explained that there are site plan and circulation issues with the project, but those challenges will be addressed at the Planning and Zoning Meeting

Chairperson Sandstrom:

- Would like to see an alternate color palate
- Would like to see less colors used on the proposed building, and suggested working with the owner to possibly use only 3 instead of the 8 offered
- Felt that the proposed building doesn't have its own identity
- Felt that the proposed tower is too tall
- Would like to see sloping columns on the proposed building like those used in other parts of the plaza
- Proposed a more profound awning to accommodate more impactful signage on the carwash

Boardmember Posten-Thompson:

- Concerned that the rooflines don't match the existing classical rooflines on the rest of the plaza
- Felt that the overhangs are too shallow, and proposed larger ones to provide more shade
- Wanted a more playful architecture
- Proposed adding a window so the observer can see the cars going through the carwash
- Didn't like the circulation on the site
- Confirmed with the applicant that the proposed vacuum canopies are going to be yellow or blue

Boardmember Roedel:

- Concerned that the proposed color palate is out of character with the rest of the complex, the intersection, and with the greater general area

Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes September 8, 2015

Boardmember Carter:

- Confirmed with Staffmember Alam that typically the existing center is used as a guide to influence design of new buildings on a site
- Didn't like the haphazard approach with the stone columns
- Didn't like the blue color on the building
- Felt that the facia was too thin, and suggested extending it out a little further, to be more harmonious with the center
- Didn't like the materials, and felt that the design aesthetics conflict with each other

Boardmember Paul:

- Confirmed that the colors proposed are not mandated by franchise requirements
- Wanted a more contemporary, innovative design
- Didn't like the presence that the building has on the street, and suggested larger windows
- Felt that the lighting doesn't speak to the architecture, as it appears too modern for the more traditional structure
- Proposed a squared off cornice, to give it a more contemporary look

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes
September 8, 2015**

Item A.5. **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

Staff Planner: Wahid Alam

Staff Recommendation: Continuance to the October 13, 2015 Meeting

Board Decision: Continued to the October 13, 2015 Meeting Vote: (6-0)

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes
September 8, 2015**

Item A.6. **DR15-033 Development of a business condominium 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

Staff Recommendation: Continuance to the October 13, 2015 Meeting

Board Decision: Continued to the October 13, 2015 Meeting Vote: (6-0)

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes
September 8, 2015**

- B. Call to Order
Chairperson Sandstrom called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

- C. Consider the Minutes from the August 11, 2015 meeting
On a motion by Boardmember Carter, seconded by Boardmember Banda, the Board unanimously approved the August 11, 2015 minutes. Vote-(approved 6-0) (Absent: Boardmember Candland)

- D. Discuss and take action on the following Design Review cases:

- E. City of Mesa General Design Direction Discussion

- F. Other Business

- G. Adjournment
The Work Session concluded at 6:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Gildenstern
Planning Assistant

mg