



## Design Review Board

---

### *Minutes*

December 8, 2015  
Mesa City Plaza-Room 170  
20 E. Main Street  
4:30 PM

A work session of the Design Review Board was held at the Mesa City Plaza – Room 170, 20 East Main Street at 4:30 p.m.

**Board Members Present:**

Brian Sandstrom – Chair  
Eric Paul  
Tracy Roedel  
Nicole Thompson

**Board Members Absent:**

Sean Banda-(Excused)  
Taylor Candland-(Excused)  
Randy Carter-(Excused)

**Staff Present:**

John Wesley  
Andrew Spurgin  
Tom Ellsworth  
Wahid Alam  
Kim Steadman  
Rebecca Gorton  
Mike Gildenshern

**Others Present:**

Toby Rogers  
Tony Cooper

Chairperson Sandstrom welcomed everyone to the Work Session at 4:44 p.m.

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

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

**Item A.1. DR15-036 Development of a new drive-thru restaurant**

**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 January 12, 2016 Meeting

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

**Item A.2. DR15-042 Signal Butte RV and Mini Storage**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** NWC Guadalupe and Signal Butte Roads  
**REQUEST:** Review of a proposed two story RV and mini-storage facility  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** 6  
**OWNER:** Mesa Centerpointe Plaza  
**APPLICANT:** Mesa Centerpointe Plaza  
**ARCHITECT:** Tony Cooper  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Wahid Alam, AICP

**Discussion:**

Wahid Alam, presented the case to the Board.

**Chairperson Sandstrom:**

- Confirmed that the parapets will be no taller than 24'
- Felt that materials will read better because they are CMU, providing a more pronounced texture
- Liked the elevations and landscaping for screening a more intense use
- Confirmed that the Board is only approving phase 1,(buildings located off of the street), in this meeting

**Boardmember Roedel:**

- Felt that the phase of the project located along the arterials must be more dressed up

**Boardmember Paul:**

- Confirmed that the pop-out protrudes roughly 9'
- Concerned that the precedent is set for the design of the on-street component of the project
- Felt that there may be too much texture
- Encouraged more play with the massing along the wall

**Boardmember Thompson**

- Confirmed that there will be landscaping installed along Signal Butte and Guadalupe Roads in the initial phase of development
- Felt that the trellis was too long, and that it should be staggered to create visual interest
- Suggested using another color/texture on the pop-out

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

**Item A.3. DR15-025 Rosemont Office Warehouses**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 1715, 1737, 1759 North Rosemont  
**REQUEST:** Review of a proposed office warehouse building  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** 5  
**OWNER:** Mark Reeb, Ranchland Holdings II LLC  
**APPLICANT:** Greg Hitchens Architecture  
**ARCHITECT:** Greg Hitchens  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Kim Steadman, RA

**Discussion:**

Staff member, Kim Steadman, presented the case to the Board.

Staff identified the following concerns with the proposed office warehouse building:

1. Would like to see more push and pull, change in plane, change in height

Chairperson Sandstrom:

- Confirmed wanted variation in parapet height
- Like variation in material, but project still appears as a box
- Proposed adding interesting small-scale changes to the building
- Suggested variation and reveals
- Proposed adding a course of CMU to create additional relief on the building

Boardmember Paul:

- Proposed relief on verticals, to create pop
- Suggested using 4" block to create shadows, and to break up spaces

Boardmember Roedel:

- Concerned about the box-like appearance of the building

Boardmember Thompson:

- Liked the shadow lines, liked the color, too felt that the building is still too flat
- Confirmed that the trees on site will be thorn-less Mesquite, Desert Museum Palo Verde
- Suggested popping out the grey columns on the building
- Confirmed that the perimeter wall around the building is at 7'4"

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

Boardmember Paul:

- Suggested raising height on side walls that run between the buildings.
- Proposed relief on verticals, to create pop
- Suggested using 4" block to create shadows, and to break up spaces

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

**Item A.4. DR15-044 Falcon Business Park**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 3110 North Greenfield  
**REQUEST:** Review of a proposed business park  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** 5  
**OWNER:** Hewson Desoto South LLC  
**APPLICANT:** Toby Rogers, Butler Design Group  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Kim Steadman, RA

**Discussion:**

Staff member, Kim Steadman, presented the case to the Board.

Staff identified the following concerns with the proposed business park:

1. Wanted to see more varying colors used on the project

Chairperson Sandstrom:

- Liked the modern aesthetic of the building
- Liked the use of metal on the project

Boardmember Paul:

- Suggested adding masonry material to the design

Boardmember Thompson:

- Confirmed that black block will be used on the building
- Suggested using brown, as there may be too much grey on the project
- Liked the incorporation of metal on the project
- Suggested using more contrasting colors
- Proposed using darker colors for the entry area to create some differentiation

Staff agreed to review the colors in the sunlight to see if they look as gray as they appear on the elevations, and then to work with the applicant to add more contrast to the colors.

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

**Item A.5. DR15-045 Aviva Apartments**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** NWC Baseline Road and State Route Loop 202  
**REQUEST:** Review of a proposed gated multi-family project  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** 6  
**OWNER:** Baseline Mesa LLC  
**APPLICANT:** Susan Demitt; Gammage and Burnham  
**ARCHITECT:** Vince Scurano  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Wahid Alam, AICP

**Discussion:**

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

Staff identified the following concerns with the proposed gated multi-family project:

1. Concerned with the change of colors without a change of planes
2. Issue with the use of stone appearing foreign to the design
3. Would like to see a more urbanized look, using less stucco, an incorporation of metals, and ribbed concrete
4. Concerned with the westward/eastward facing long elevations, as there are no canopies for shading

Chairperson Sandstrom:

- Felt that the stone is foreign on a rectilinear and modern project
- Suggested using transom trend width burnished masonry
- Suggested masonry veneer or ground-face masonry
- Proposed some type of cover on the third floor for shading
- Proposed recesses on the metal panel for visual interest, as well as a better tie in to the rest of the project

Boardmember Roedel:

- Didn't like the variety and random placement of stone on the project
- Liked the color scheme
- Proposed pedestrian connections and street furniture

Boardmember Thompson:

- Confirmed that the trees shown on site plan are the actual trees used on the project
- Suggested wall packs for lighting, and at the individual unit entries,
- Confirmed with the applicant that can lighting will be installed by entries
- Didn't like the stone

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

- Liked the color scheme
- Confirmed that the parapet caps are metal
- Would like to see pop-outs extend an inch or two on the parapet to create a shadow line,
- Proposed adding stone or brick to the project

Boardmember Paul:

- Liked the undulation of building
- Proposed more shadowing, and shade on windows
- Suggested that the traffic entry gate needs a series of vertical bars instead of horizontal

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

**Item A.6. DR15-046 Culver's Restaurant**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** SEC Crismon and Southern Roads  
**REQUEST:** Review of a proposed drive-thru restaurant  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** 6  
**OWNER:** Brian Farrell  
**APPLICANT:** Jim Larson; Larson Meinhold  
**ARCHITECT:** Jim Larson  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Wahid Alam, AICP

**Discussion:**

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

Staff identified the following concerns with the proposed drive-thru restaurant:

1. Felt that the architecture is too plain, too much stucco used
2. Felt that the project needs a larger landscape buffer between drive thru and seating area

Chairperson Sandstrom:

- Would like to see more of a difference in the architecture from other Culver's restaurants
- Would like to see a covered, arching drive thru, to match the adjacent hospital better
- Confirmed with applicant that green screens included on building are unique to this project
- Liked patio with wire mesh
- Would like to see the design sharpened up

Boardmember Roedel:

- Liked the blue color used
- Would like to see more unique architectural features, but appreciated the need for corporate branding

Boardmember Thompson:

- Felt that the drive-thru columns are too spindly
- Would like to a minimized overhanging of the taller parapet above the lower parapet
- Didn't like the wainscoting
- Would like to see the Culver's sign placed on the main pop-out
- Would like to see the capitals cleaned up
- Would like to see the pop-outs be more pronounced, to create shadows

Boardmember Paul:

- Would like to see a greater use of varying color

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

- B. Call to Order  
Chairperson Sandstrom called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.
- C. Consider the Minutes from the November 10, 2015 meeting  
On a motion by Boardmember Roedel, seconded by Boardmember Paul, the Board unanimously approved the November 10, 2015 minutes. Vote-(approved 4-0) (Absent: Boardmembers Banda, Candland, Carter)
- D. Discuss and take action on the following Design Review cases:  
  
None
- E. Other Business
- F. Other Business
- G. Adjournment  
The meeting was adjourned at 6:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Gildenstern  
Planning Assistant

mg