

Design Review Board



Minutes

April 12, 2016
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
Taylor Candland
Randy Carter

Board Members Absent:

Nicole Thompson
Eric Paul
Tracy Roedel

Staff Present:

John Wesley
Andrew Spurgin
Tom Ellsworth
Wahid Alam
Rebecca Gorton

Others Present:

Richard Dyer

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
April 12, 2016**

Item A.1. DR16-010 New Dollar General

LOCATION/ADDRESS: North of Southern Road and east of Hawes Road
REQUEST: Review of a proposed retail store
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 5
OWNER: Crescent Run Management
APPLICANT: Simon CRE Alpha IV, LLC
ARCHITECT: John Rumsey
STAFF PLANNER: Wahid Alam, AICP

Discussion:

Staff member Wahid Alam presented the case to the Board.

The applicant, Dan Biswas, stated that the project features updates to the standard prototype for Dollar Generals. Mr. Biswas presented to the Board the original design that was previously proposed.

Board members asked for a view of location and surrounding land uses.

Chair Sandstrom

- Stated that the project was a standard box type
- Stated that the design needs added relief from the plane
- Stated that planes are expansive compared to box
- Suggested continuing color along top
- Suggested the addition of reglets to sides
- Suggested some type of green screen along the blank walls
- Stated that it is going in the right direction but needs a dress up

Boardmember Taylor

- Stated that the project looked good overall

Boardmember Carter

- Suggested applicant add wainscoting to elevations
- Stated that building needs more vibrant colors
- Stated that the site plan has issues with amount of space left unoccupied

Vice Chair Banda

- Requested the addition of a pony wall
- Suggested not using box lighting
- Suggested switching sign to standard raceway
- Suggested removing lighting away from wall packs

Overall positive response from all Boardmembers. Staff will work with applicant to finalize design.

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes
April 12, 2016**

Item A.2. DR16-011 Expansion of A.T. Still

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

Continue to May 10, 2016 Meeting per applicant request

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes
April 12, 2016**

B. Call to Order

Chair Sandstrom called the meeting to order at 4:55 pm.

C. Consider the Minutes from the March 8, 2016 meeting

On a motion by Vice Chair Banda, seconded by Boardmember Taylor, the Board unanimously approved the March 8, 2016 minutes.

(Vote: 4-0, Excused: Board members Thompson, Paul, Roedel)

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

None

E. Other Business

Item E.1. Presentation of Defining Quality Development draft.

John Wesley, Planning Director, presented a draft of the Quality Development Guidelines for Board feedback.

Chair Sandstrom

- Felt that some of the verbiage seems arbitrary
- Suggested that Mesa look at how the Town of Gilbert and City of Chandler have defined quality.
- Suggested the need for cross checking with either graphics or definitions
- Would like to see the addition of examples of approved building materials
- Does not like applicant using the corporate prototype reason for design, wants to see what fits for Mesa

Boardmember Carter

- Inquired if there was a team that worked on the development
- Felt it is too politically correct
- Suggested reviewing Eastmark development guidelines
- Asked what the role of the Board is and what is Council's interest

Vice Chair Banda

- Suggested graphics be included
- Agreed with Boardmember Carter to review Eastmark guidelines
- Suggested including signage and lighting in the guidelines

Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes April 12, 2016

Item E.2. Discussion of screening small cell antennas

Gordon Sheffield, Zoning Administrator, presented background on screening of rooftops to the Board. Mr. Sheffield stated staff has seen an increase in applications for micro-cells and is seeking comments from the Board regarding screening. Screening would not be required when there are only one antennae, however, screening will be required when there are multiple antennae.

Vice Chair Banda stated that he works with antennae in his office and they are being placed on street lights. He agrees that when screening multiple antennae, the screening can sometimes be worse than spreading them apart. He suggested having them placed further back away from the street view.

Boardmember Candland stated that he also works with cell tower applications and believes that screening can sometimes create a bigger visual problem than the micro-cells alone. He stated that the City of Scottsdale allows them on light poles and believes that the amount placed on each building should be limited so screening would not be required.

Chair Sandstrom stated there are a number of departments that have microwaves and other antennae's which are all over. Mr. Sandstrom agreed with Boardmember Candland's statement that if they were to review the layout and spaced out equally for balance, it would not need to be screened.

Mr. Sheffield stated that the majority of the micro-cells are small installations with only one and typically these are placed on a small building close to the street. The code is clear about screening equipment. Placing only one pole would not make much difference, but when more are added the look is awful.

Chair Sandstrom stated that when they are screened, we are calling more attention to it. He stated that it would not be noticeable if it is designed correctly. Mr. Sandstrom asked if there was a way to review the design prior to approval. Mr. Sheffield responded that each one requires a staff review and suggested that when the first multiple antennae comes in, staff could request a review through the Board as a test. He would like to keep the process from going to full blown hearings.

F. Adjournment

On a motion by Boardmember Carter and seconded by Vice Chair Banda, the Meeting was adjourned at 5:38 pm.