

## Design Review Board

---



### *Minutes*

July 12, 2016  
Council Chambers – Lower Level  
57 East 1<sup>st</sup> 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 1<sup>st</sup> Street at 4:30 p.m.

**Board Members Present:**

Brian Sandstrom – Chair  
Sean Banda – Vice Chair  
Tracy Roedel  
Randy Carter  
Eric Paul  
Nicole Thompson

**Board Members Absent:**

Taylor Candland

**Staff Present:**

John Wesley  
Andrew Spurgin  
Tom Ellsworth  
Kim Steadman  
Lisa Davis  
Lesley Davis  
Rebecca Gorton

**Others Present:**

Jim Olsen  
Richard Zegers  
Lew Lenz  
Kristen Bateman  
James Lazarewicz  
Tom Buttino  
Debbie Schulz  
Michael Bailey  
Doug Oscarson

Chair 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  
July 13, 2016**

**Item A.1. DR16-011 Expansion of A.T. Still**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 5850 – 5959 E. Still Circle  
**REQUEST:** Review of an academic building and parking garage  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** 2  
**OWNER:** Kirksville College of Osteopathic Medicine IN  
**APPLICANT:** Toby Rogers, Butler Design Group  
**ARCHITECT:** Jeffrey Cutberth  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Andrew Spurgin, AICP

**Continued from the June 14, 2016 meeting**

**Discussion:** Andrew Spurgin, AICP presented the Board with an overview of the project. Mr. Spurgin stated the applicant is proposing a new 122,000 sq. ft. classroom with a tri-level parking garage. Toby Rogers, Butler Design Group, stated that the building is designed to duplicate the materials used on the existing building and described the materials being used. Mr. Rogers stated the intent of the design is to create a sense of campus.

**Boardmember Thompson**

- Inquired about shade relief on the west elevation on the windows. Applicant responded that there is a foot and one half brow and large canopy on the windows for shade.
- Stated preference is to use metals on garage
- Felt the length would be better if the windows were smaller and had different dimensions
- Suggested changing the sandstone to make changes to windows, use smaller punched openings
- Suggested lengthening the sandstone on west elevation of academic building

**Chair Sandstrom**

- Inquired about the intent of the breezeway on the upper levels. Applicant responded it will be used for future growth space for new classrooms.
- Likes the sandstone
- Feels the overall design is plain
- Suggested raising the sandstone
- Confirmed all sides glazing
- Stated garage materials are not unique and suggested different meshes, 3-forms or water jet panel

**Boardmember Paul**

- Stated there is movement in the end of the garage
- Questioned the canopy and stated there is no relationship to the building
- Suggested stepping up the brown EIFS on west side ground level of academic building

## **Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes July 13, 2016**

### **Boardmember Carter**

- Stated that he is troubled with the severity of the planes on the building
- Agrees that he likes the sandstone
- Feels that the foot and one half eyebrows on the west elevation is useless as shade
- Stated that the severity of the white eaves and looking at original building, and comparing the elevations to ASU Polytech building, feels there is a lot more that could be done with this building to help differentiate the planes
- Stated does not see movement on the building
- Stated the parking garage is too linear
- Suggested a wave form on garage instead of repeat pattern, tilt out
- Suggested placing fins from the breezeway and add to the garage

### **Vice Chair Banda**

- Suggested looking at ASU Polytech for the academic building with the differentiated planes
- Stated that the garage needs variation
- Stated it lacks cornice to tie it down
- Suggested looking at ASU poly materials and planes which look less like a garage
- Likes exterior stairs on ASU garage #7

The Board requested that the product be back to the Board for review with the changes discussed.

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes  
July 13, 2016**

**Item A.2. DR16-018 Arizona General Hospital Emergency Room**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 1310 E. McKellips  
**REQUEST:** Review of a stand-alone emergency room  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** 1  
**OWNER:** Garrett Development Corporation  
**APPLICANT:** Bill Arsenault, Mays Company  
**ARCHITECT:** Rodney L. Booze  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Kaelee Wilson

**Discussion:** Senior Planner Tom Ellsworth presented the Board with an overview of the project.

Resident Jim Olson, 2049 N. Doran, stated that he is in support of the project and looks forward to a structure on the empty lot which will help keep trash out of the area. Mr. Olson is concerned with the type of landscaping and requested that Palo Verde and Eucalyptus trees not be planted as they are messy. He has also requested that the existing wall to the north be replaced to match the style further to the west.

Chair Sandstrom inquired if Mr. Olson's concern is with the Palo Verde trees specifically and stated City has requirements for landscaping. Planning Director, John Wesley, replied that the requirements are for amounts of trees and not the type. Chair Sandstrom requested that the architect choose less messy trees. Mr. Sandstrom addressed the request that the wall be replaced by stating Mr. Olson may not have much success with the request to replace the walls as they belong to the neighbors and is on their property.

Applicant Bill Arsenault described an overview of their request for the stand-alone emergency room. Mr. Arsenault continued to describe the building style and stated the landscaping in the back is a desert landscape.

Vice Chair Banda

- Concerned with the diamond light sconces
- Likes the concrete panel looks good all the way to the base.

Chair Sandstrom

- Feels the diamond sconces and awnings do not play with the rest of the building
- Feels the tower and material is crisp and clean
- Stated the shed roof awning is a throwback and suggested an eyebrow or a wrap
- Inquired why the use of glass
- Suggested use of large format tile

Boardmember Thompson

- Stated the awnings over the windows seems out of place
- Suggested change the fixture shape
- Suggested not using wainscot and let stucco go all the way down

## **Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes July 13, 2016**

Boardmember Paul

- Stated he does not understand glass at the top

Boardmember Roedel

- Suggested not using wainscot

Boardmember Carter

- Stated the awnings do not fit and looks like they are just stuck on
- Suggested the use a straight eyebrow
- Stated the diamond backlight do not belong and suggested use of something with a stronger presence.
- Feels the consensus is that diamond lights need to go away and suggested use of different style to extenuate the building
- Suggested changing shape and color

Staff will work with applicant to finalize design.

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes**  
**July 13, 2016**

**Item A.3. DR16-019 Ice Kiosk**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 330 S. Gilbert  
**REQUEST:** Review of an ice house kiosk  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** 4  
**OWNER:** Nasser Zaghi  
**APPLICANT:** Bill Reiff  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Lisa Davis

**Discussion:** Staff member Lisa Davis presented the Board with an overview of the project and stated that staff has concerns with the metal panels. Ms. Davis displayed a sample of an ice kiosk building which had been approved by the Design Review years earlier but never built on Main and Greenfield. The approved design used different materials and colors.

Chair Sandstrom

- Suggested the design previously approved by Design Review on the Main Street location be used and step up colors
- Would like to see it back before approval

Boardmember Thompson

- Suggested using prefabricated panels
- Suggested fun colors be used to make it exciting and fun

Vice Chair Banda

- Suggested sign should be fun on the parapet and make it fun and whimsical

Boardmember Carter

- Suggested that the design not be tied to building and make it stand-alone and fun to look at

Staff will work with applicant to finalize design. Board requested that a summary be sent when complete.

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes  
July 13, 2016**

**Item A.4. DR16-020**

**Avilla Lehi**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 3400 – 3600 block of East Thomas Road  
**REQUEST:** Review of a multi-residence  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** 1  
**OWNER:** Rodney and Janelle Engel  
**APPLICANT:** Brennan Ray, Burch & Cracchiolo, PA  
**ARCHITECT:** Dave Soltysik, Terrascape Consulting  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Kim Steadman

**Discussion:** Staff member Kim Steadman presented the Board with an overview of the project. Mr. Steadman stated the project is built as single family residence which are strictly rentals. Staff concerns include the design of the pop-outs that could better cover the entries. Mr. Steadman stated staff had visited several of the completed sites and felt a lack of quality in the stucco. Mr. Steadman stated staff also has concerns of the layout of the site plan which will be addressed to the Planning and Zoning Board.

Resident James Lazareqicz, 3426 E. Riverdale Street, spoke in opposition to the proposed project. Mr. Lazareqicz stated his primary concern is the rear setbacks and which he will discuss at the Planning and Zoning meeting. However, he is concerned that the design shows a close proximity of the new units to his property and Mr. Lazareqicz would like to see a better buffer between the properties and the new development.

Resident Tom Petino, 3547 N. 34<sup>th</sup> Street, spoke in opposition to the proposed project. Mr. Petino stated he has a similar concern with the buffer and not sure of the quality of the materials used. His is also concerned about the negativity the project will bring to his property value, the design of square boxes and flat roofs and the fact they are rentals. Boardmember Carter asked his perception of the elevations and Mr. Petino responded that the square box style is a concern.

Debbie Schulz, 3454 E. Riverdale Street, spoke in opposition to the proposed project. Ms. Schulz is concerned that each unit has a garage and the noise that will be made by the garage doors opening and closing. Ms. Schulz is also concerned there are not enough trash units provided which may bring the potential for excessive trash.

Michael Bailey, 3442 E. Riverdale Street stated his concern is of property values and the new homes being rentals.

Lewis Lenz, 3717 E. Pomegranate Street, spoke about his concern that the design is very dense and the reduction of setbacks. Chair Sandstrom replied that there are some requests of deviation of setbacks which comes under the Planning and Zoning Board.

Doug Oscarson, 3511 N. 34<sup>th</sup> Street, stated that he visited the other sites in the area and saw basic and large building that could be seen by surrounding neighborhoods over the walls. The elevations were plain with flat roofs and the buildings were very close to each other. He continued to describe the area full of over flowing trash cans that smelled.

## **Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes July 13, 2016**

### **Chair Sandstrom**

- Stated he does not feel it matches the surrounding neighborhood style
- Feels it is a Santa Fe throwback and does not make sense
- Feels they are glorified duplexes
- Stated the project reminds him of the Apache motel on Main Street
- Feels it does nothing to add to the character of the location and is nothing special
- Stated the vocabulary of existing homes should set the base line for this project
- Stated that neighbors have said that they do not want to look down on to square boxes and is interpreting that as the sloped rooftops, concrete roof tiles, or a combination of both
- Feels the buildings are clustered together
- Suggested that they lend itself to surrounding environment

### **Boardmember Carter**

- Feels the architecture is substandard to the adjacent neighborhood
- Feels that long term viability does not work
- Feels the concept is not conducive to a good neighbor sustainable project
- Feels the concept is interesting but it is too congested
- Stated the little pieces of brick are minimal
- Feels it is not ready to go forward
- Suggested landscaping should at least represent the surrounding citrus area
- Inquired about the concrete ditch on back where landscaping cannot be provided. Staff member Steadman clarified the ditch is underground and some citrus is provided at entry
- Suggested more movement in the parapet heights due to the one AC unit per dwelling
- Feels the units do not complement the neighborhood and surrounding neighborhood design should be integrated into this project
- Feels it has a sterile design and not compatible with Residential Design Standards

### **Boardmember Thompson**

- Stated the flat roofs are a maintenance nightmare
- Stated the design does not meet standards and is substandard
- Feels the buildings are being squished everywhere
- Feels the landscaping plan leaves a lot to be desired and only the middle area is nice
- Stated there needs to be more trash enclosures
- Requested to see the project after it goes to Planning and Zoning Board
- Suggested to play with parapet heights, perhaps put a cap on parapets
- Suggested using a long piece on certain buildings
- Stated she does not like how the windows are wrapped and it is a mashup of styles
- Stated the project needs to be stepped up
- Suggested nicer landscaping and not just Palo Verde trees
- Suggested using more characteristics of surrounding Lehi area



## **Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes July 13, 2016**

### **Boardmember Paul**

- Suggested pitch roofs which responds better to human scale
- Feels the straight parapet wall makes it appear out of proportion to neighbors and yard
- Stated the walls are too high
- Suggested the site plan needs to work with the architecture and cluster buildings so architecture works better

### **Vice Chair Banda**

- Feels the elevations do not seem to pick a theme or architecture
- Feels the elevations are a 70s style architecture
- Stated there are no returns on materials, just veneer
- Stated that the Santa Fe style does not have pop outs but would have recesses
- Feels that the Leasing Office should have a grander feel and is disappointing
- Feels the office does not reflect well on the complex
- Suggested more variety
- Suggested green court homes development form with a communal yard space.

The Board that requested that the product be back to the Board for review with the changes discussed.

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes  
July 13, 2016**

**Item A.5. DR16-021                      Saranac Offices**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**                      5253 S. Saranac

**REQUEST:**                                      Review of an office building  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**                      6  
**OWNER:**                                        Granite Investments, LLC  
**APPLICANT:**                                Design Professionals, LLC  
**ARCHITECT:**                                John C. Manross  
**STAFF PLANNER:**                        Lesley Davis

**Discussion:** Senior Planner Tom Ellsworth presented the Board with an overview of the project. Mr. Ellsworth stated that staff has a concern with the shading on the west elevation of the building. The applicant, Mr. Allen with Design Professionals, stated that architect was unavailable to attend to answer questions.

Chair Sandstrom

- Felt that the design reads pre-cast; applicant clarifies it is stucco
- Agrees with Boardmember Thompson that it underwhelms
- Felt that the date palms are very straight and vertical
- Suggested breaking up the mass with small architectural features
- Felt it is too thin up middle and suggested using more glass
- Felt the west side has good shade at the higher elevation due to the palms

Boardmember Thompson

- Felt that the colors are too repetitive
- Stated that there is nothing exciting about the design and is boring
- Suggested looking at the architecture at Horne and US60
- Felt that the entry compresses the building elevation.
- Stated that it is the same stacked stone we always see
- Felt that the center score block is out of place
- Felt that the verticality and repetitiveness is a problem
- Stated that the elevation needs better design and is very heavy
- Suggested the entire top part be glass
- Stated that the brown colors are disturbing
- Stated that the request for BIZ requires higher quality
- Inquired why there are so many palms
- Requested detail on lighting

## **Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes July 13, 2016**

### Vice Chair Banda

- Felt that there needs to be a cornice and parapet treatment
- Felt that the design is very plain
- Suggested a play on edges or outside pieces and flare out the outside
- Felt that the top element is out of place
- Suggested making the center piece bigger to match the aluminum panels
- Suggested that the window canopy shades span further across, use on multiple floors
- Suggested a lighter material, like silver and not brown
- Felt that only redeeming element is the center piece, otherwise it is just a box

### Boardmember Carter

- Suggested recessing windows might help
- Felt that the mullions need to have a presence as it cannot be seen
- Suggested more variation due to too many palm trees
- Suggested adding a cornice and bring center piece up higher
- Suggested removing the skinny piece of split face block on each side of entry
- Suggested taking wainscoting around and wrap the vertical elements

### Boardmember Paul

- Felt that the canopies are hollow and just a band
- Felt that the second floor canopies are going to hit the palm trees

The Board that requested that the product be back to the Board for review with the changes discussed.

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes  
July 13, 2016**

**Item A.6. DR16-022                      Red Mountain Business Park**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 3410 N. Higley  
**REQUEST:** Review of a warehouse  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** 5  
**OWNER:** Higley Land Investments, LLC  
**APPLICANT:** Corey Smith, DCSJ, LLC  
**ARCHITECT:** Don Christensen  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Tom Ellsworth

**Discussion:** Staff member Tom Ellsworth presented the Board with an overview of the project.

Chair Sandstrom

- Feels the column going through the roof is confusing
- Suggested borrowing elevations from the development at Horne and US60
- Suggested a band all the way across the building
- Suggested addition of reveals and a shadow line
- Suggested the extenuating and massing from Horne and US60
- Suggested removing rock altogether
- Suggested imitating the shadowing and detail

Boardmember Carter

- Stated the pitched roofs do not belong
- Feels that the form is not bad, it just needs work

Boardmember Thompson

- Feels the design is confusing
- Likes color palate
- Suggested using a more contrasting color of stone, this is muted
- Suggested more of a concrete or white stone with more of a contrast

Vice Chair Banda

- Feels that it looks like a 40's Swedish mushroom castle. 40s Sweden
- Feels the pitched roof takes away from the design
- Suggested precast concrete would give it more detail
- Suggested spicing up the color palate
- Suggested using simple rooflines
- Feels the columns going through the roof is awkward

The Board that requested that the product be back to the Board for review with the changes discussed.

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes  
July 13, 2016**

B. Call to Order

Chair Sandstrom called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm.

C. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair meeting

Chair Sandstrom thanked the Board and staff for the opportunity to Chair the Design Review Board for the past year. Mr. Sandstrom nominated Vice Chair Banda to become Chair and Boardmember Roedel as Vice Chair.

On a motion made by Boardmember Carter and seconded by Boardmember Paul, the Board unanimously approved the nominations.

(Vote: 6-0, Absent, Boardmember Candland)

D. Consider the Minutes from the June 14, 2016 meeting

On a motion by Boardmember Thompson and seconded by Boardmember Carter, the Board unanimously approved the June 14, 2016 minutes.

(Vote: 6-0, Absent, Boardmember Candland)

E. Other Business

**Item E.1.** Presentation of Defining Quality Development draft.  
Planning Director John Wesley presented an update of draft to the Board.

F. Adjournment

On a motion by Boardmember Carter and seconded by Boardmember Thompson, the Meeting was adjourned at 7:10 pm.

(Vote: 6-0, Absent, Boardmember Candland)