

Design Review Board

Minutes

**Tuesday, December 10, 2019
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:

Chair Randy Carter
Vice Chair Scott Thomas
Boardmember Sean Banda
Boardmember Nicole Posten-Thompson
Boardmember Jeanette Knudsen
Boardmember Tanner Green

Board Members Absent:

Boardmember J. Seth Placko

Staff Present:

Nana Appiah, PhD., AICP, Planning Director
Lesley Davis, Senior Planner
Tom Ellsworth, Principal Planner
Heather Omta, Planning Assistant
Kellie Rorex, Planner I
Cassidy Welch, Planner II

Others Present:

Veronica Gonzalez, Project Manager
Rachel Prelog, Senior Planner
Eric Tune, Brookfield

Chair Randy Carter welcomed everyone to the Work Session at 4:30 p.m. Boardmember Green arrived at 5:00p.m.

A. Call to order

B. Discuss and Provide Direction Regarding Design Review cases:

This is a preliminary review of Design Review Board cases. The applicant and public may speak about the case, and the Board may provide comments and suggestions to assist the Applicant with the proposal, but the Board will not approve or deny a case under Preliminary Review.

Item B.1.

DRB19-00870 **Within the 2400 through 2600 blocks of North Greenfield Road.**
Location: **Located south of McDowell Road on the east side of Greenfield Road.**
Request: **Requesting the review of 6 hangar buildings.**
Applicant: **ADM Group Inc.**
Staff Planner: **Cassidy Welch**
Council District: **5**

Cassidy Welch, Planner II, presented case for six hangar buildings at Falcon Field Airport. She explained which buildings would be most visible to the public to help orient the Board. She explained that the new buildings were to be utilized for office space and hangar space.

Applicant, Jeffrey Fleming, 2100 W 15th St., Tempe, represented the case. He stated that his client wanted a “techy” and modern look. He said they worked with Falcon Field and the client to create the design.

❖ Chair Carter

- Are there air conditioning units on the roof?
 - ◆ Applicant replied: Condensing units will be inside behind louvers.
- Parapet looks too uniform.
- Metal panel is very flat.
- The building should not look prefabricated.
- No issue with the front of the building however wants to see more plane changes in the sides of the building.
- Asked for clarification on staff concerns?
 - ◆ Staff Planner, Cassidy Welch replied: West side of the building may have drainage issues.
- Need architectural detailing on west side.
- Landscape plan is showing Chilean Mesquite Trees which break, split, and fall over; consider another species of Mesquite Tree.

❖ Boardmember Knudsen

- Asked if Mallory Street is accessible by the public?
 - ◆ Applicant replied: Yes, the public can drive down Mallory Street.

❖ Vice Chair Thomas

- Likes the design and the modern look.
- Is this a phased project?
 - ◆ Applicant responded: It was designed at the same time and will be constructed as a production line, however, not phased.
- Is the color integrated into the panel?
 - ◆ Applicant replied: Yes.

- Is the glazing tinted?
 - ◆ Applicant confirmed: Yes, grey tinting.

❖ Boardmember Banda

- Lighting plan is not detailed, asked for clarification?
 - ◆ Applicant replied: Main lighting in entry & in the curved structures at the entrance to the development. Entry lighting throughout.
- Metal panel examples are not modern tech. Usually Galvalume is used which provides a much sharper look. The textured metal deviates from the modern look.
- He would like to have seen a night shot rendering to review the nighttime lighting.
- Instead of all split-faced block, consider honed CMU to create a more modern texture.
- Would like more plane changes on the long runs of the building facing Greenfield Rd.
- Appreciates the curve of the building.
- Recommends nothing over 3500 Kelvin for lighting.

❖ Boardmember Posten-Thompson

- No angulation on Building A until it gets to the entrance.
- Building A & F have very flat planes.
- Large buildings to be all blue and grey, consider color revisions.
- Integrate lighting into the elements of the building, especially on the corners.

❖ Boardmember Green

- Recommends landscape palette in yellows rather than reds and pinks.

Item B.2.

DRB19-00877 **Within the 11200 block of East Pecos Road (north side).**
Location: **Located east of the northeast corner of South Mountain Road and East Pecos Road.**
Request: **Requesting the review of a new industrial development.**
Applicant: **Merchant Design Group**
Staff Planner: **Kellie Rorex**
Council District: **6**

Kellie Rorex, Planner I, presented case of a new industrial development in southeast Mesa at Pecos and Mountain Roads.

Applicant, Andrew Merchant, 588 N Jackson Street, Gilbert, represented the case. Mr. Merchant stated that the building is to manufacture splash pads. It is an industrial building, but they tried to provide continuity on all four sides. They used corrugated metal panels, which will be painted off-white. They are using a vertical ribbed panel.

❖ Chair Carter

- The entrance is good; however, the rest of the building is straight, flat, no angulation.
- Where is the air conditioner?
 - ◆ Applicant responded: Units will screen by masonry
- Need more detail on the screen wall, standard CMU does not suffice. Needs to have more character in screen wall.

❖ Boardmember Posten-Thompson

- Soffit seems short, makes it look squatty.
- Consider moving the up the soffit up with some glass.
- Wants to see a design for the screen wall
- Will the site have a monument sign?
 - Applicant replied: No, not at this time.
 - ◆ If a monument sign comes later, match it to the building sign.
- Does not care for the Ash grey color tone and suggests the using the charcoal grey to look more modern.

❖ Boardmember Banda

- Wants to see a sample of the metal.
 - ◆ Applicant responded: He provided cut sheets, however, did not have a sample.
- Recommends verifying the white color is not a brilliant white, may to too bright.
- Likes the RainDeck sign.
- What color is the granite?
 - ◆ Applicant responded: More in the earth tone range – pinkish red
- Boardmember Banda recommends using goldish to grey tone for the granite rather than any red tone rock.

❖ Boardmember Knudsen

- Do you have exterior color samples?
 - ◆ Applicant response: No but provided cut sheets of colors.
- Requests that no pink granite be used in the landscape.

C. Consider the Minutes from the November 12, 2019 meeting 5:20p.m.

Boardmember Posten-Thompson moves to approve the November 12, 2019 minutes, Vice Chair Thomas seconds the motion.

Vote: 5-0

Upon tabulation of the vote, it showed:

Ayes: Banda, Knudsen, Thomas, Posten-Thompson, Green

Nays: None

Absent: Placko
Recused: Carter

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

Item D.1.

DRB19-00897 **Within the 9200 and 9300 blocks of East Point Twenty-Two Boulevard (north side) and 4800 and 4909 blocks of South Ellsworth Road (east side)**
Location: **Located just east of the NEC Ellsworth Road and Point Twenty-Two Boulevard.**
Request: **Requesting the review of a proposed City of Mesa fire station number 221.**
Applicant: **City of Mesa**
Staff Planner: **Wahid Alam**
Council District: **6**

Lesley Davis, Senior Planner, presented the case for Wahid Alam. She described the proposal for a new City of Mesa Fire Station within the Eastmark Community. She explained that there is not a lot of development currently constructed around the site, but there are approved residential subdivisions to the north and to the east of the Fire Station site.

Chair Carter asked if this project has been through Eastmark's Design Review Committee process. Lesley Davis replied that it did and received an approval. She noted that Eric Tune, who is a Brookfield representative, was in attendance and he confirmed the approval.

Don Weazer, HDA Architects, 459 N Gilbert Road, represented the case. Project Architect for the City of Mesa, Mike McBrady was also in attendance.

Mike McBrady stated that this is the first fire station in the Eastmark community. He said it is also the first City building to go through the Design process with Eastmark, setting a precedence for other City buildings to come.

Bruce Scott, HDA Architects, 459 N Gilbert Road was also representing the case. He said that HDA wanted to utilize the elements and materials found in Eastmark. For example, ribbed metal material, 3 types of masonry, shading elements, main entry shade structure. He said that the Mission White is the predominate stone color. He also noted that the project has a community room and they are using 3000 Kelvin for lighting fixtures.

❖ Chair Carter

- Asked what is the angled dark feature on the front of the building? It looks too subtle that it could look like an unlevel horizontal line.
 - Bruce Scott: Yes, it's intentional. It is metal ribbed siding.

- Randy commented looks like it could be a mistake, need more slope in the angulation.
- Asked if there a reason for no landscaping on the backside?
 - Mike McBrady replied: To maintain site security the site will have limited internal landscaping to restrict access or need for contractor access to maintain the landscape. The City agreed to match the Eastmark landscaping on the front side of the building. Specifically have no-view fence and gates so that people will not be able to see the back side of the site.
- The back of the site is visible from Tract E .
 - Lesley Davis commented: there is a landscape tract between the wall and Tract E.
- Requests Brookfield provide sufficient screening since the City is not providing landscape in the rear of the site.
- There are only four trees in the retention basin. It doesn't feel like it meets Eastmark' s Landscape Plan.
 - Mike McBrady replied: Eastmark is landscaping the right of way and that landscape is not included on this plan.
- Advises the architectural team to consider the following when revising their plans:
 1. Lack of landscaping.
 2. The awnings integration.
 3. Design of Perimeter Walls.
 4. Parapet heights.
 5. Adding landscape around ped path.
 6. Consider Inverted roof planes or butterfly roof.

❖ Boardmember Green

- Asked for clarification on the ribbed metal. Boardmember Green noticed both horizontal and vertical ribbing.
 - Bruce Scott replied: He thinks the intention is horizontal ribbed metal.
- Building seems functional.
- Mechanical – What kind coolers?
 - Bruce Scott replied: large evaporative cooling unit for the bays.

❖ Boardmember Thomas

- Asked what the material is on the underside of the entry awing?
 - Bruce Scott replied: it is Kalwall aluminum.
- It looks very reflective.
- How large is the community room?
 - Mike McBrady replied: 560 s.f.
- Suggested using form board or concrete board material in place of stone as an alternative.
- Not supportive of the building's architectural look or awnings.

❖ Boardmember Posten-Thompson

- Underwhelmed by the whole building.

- It is a dated design on a brand-new building.
- Does not approve of the design.
- Pedestrian connection goes nowhere.
- East elevation is flat, no architecture elements.
- Poor precedence for future City buildings in Eastmark.
- Design does not meet the standard being required elsewhere in the City.
- Asked what is the cost per square feet for this project?
 - Mike McBrady responded with \$500 per square feet.
- Boardmember Posten-Thompson commented that she previous designed fire stations and \$220 per square foot was considered high at the time. \$500 per square foot is expensive in her opinion.

❖ Boardmember Banda

- Eastmark tends to use an extensive formalized landscape plan and a modern landscape plan, this plan is neither. Landscape placement seems random. The landscape plan submitted is not formalized or in the Eastmark palette. Eastmark does not use decomposed granite (DG) and this plan has DG all over the place.
- Minus material and DG are not the patterned landscape like the rest of Eastmark.
- Colors are underwhelming.
- Design of the building has a 1980's feel.
- Other projects (not in Eastmark) are held to higher standards than this one. Eastmark is premier community and the design should fit accordingly.

❖ Boardmember Knudsen

- Agrees that the building feels heavy.
- Understands that they need a lasting product.
- Awning over the entry way seems out of place.

Tom Ellsworth asked the Board to summarize their request and craft some conditions of approval.

Boardmember Banda motioned to deny the fire station in Eastmark as designed, Boardmember Posten-Thompson seconded the motion.

Vote: 3-3

Upon tabulation of the vote, it showed:

Ayes: Thomas, Posten-Thompson, Banda

Nays: Carter, Green, Knudsen

Absent: Placko

A second motion made by Boardmember Banda to approve was rescinded.

A third motion by Boardmember Banda to continue the case to address design concerns related to the following:

1. The amount of masonry. Lessen the amount of masonry used
2. Use other complimentary exterior materials like metal
3. Change the roof plane to add more variation, like a butterfly roof
4. Attach architectural enhancements to the building to integrate into the building
5. Address the contrast of colors, specifically the white and dark brown contrast
6. Improve the landscaping to be in line with Eastmark's Landscape Plan
7. The ped path be integrated into the fire station
8. Add modern elements to the architecture; and
9. And the board gets another opportunity to review the updated design.

The motion was seconded by Boardmember Posten-Thompson and additional design concerns were added to include:

10. The architecture be consistent with Eastmark's Architectural elements
11. Be mindful of precedence the building is setting
12. and cost of the project for what is being delivered
13. Stamped concrete ped path to match the community plan

Vote: 6-0

Upon tabulation of the vote, it showed:

Ayes: Thomas, Posten-Thompson, Banda, Carter, Green, Knudsen

Nays: Carter, Green, Knudsen

Absent: Placko

Lesley Davis notified the Board the case will be continued to the next meeting.

E. Discuss creating bylaws for the Board

Lesley Davis, Senior Planner opened a discussion with Board regarding establishing a set of bylaws. She explained the bylaws will establish a set of rules for the Design Review Board that would apply to how the board functions. She elaborated that all planning affiliated boards are reviewing bylaws. Lesley asked if the Board would like to create a committee of three people to research the bylaws or would the Board prefer staff to research bylaws?

Tom Ellsworth, Principal Planner explained that the intention of the bylaws is to provide order and structure to Design Review Board meetings.

Chair Carter responded that the Board would like staff to bring back examples. The Board requests an email of example bylaws to review ahead of time.

F. Adjournment

Without objection, meeting adjourned at 6:15p.m.

The City of Mesa is committed to making its public meetings accessible to persons with disabilities. For special accommodations, please contact the City Manager's Office at (480) 644- 3333 or AzRelay 7-1-1 at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting. **Si necesita asistencia o traducción en español, favor de llamar al menos 48 horas antes de la reunión al 480-644- 2767.**