

Design Review Board



Tuesday, April 14, 2020
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 via virtual connection

Chair Randy Carter
Vice Chair Scott Thomas
Boardmember Tanner Green
Boardmember Nicole Posten-Thompson
Boardmember J. Seth Placko
Boardmember Jeanette Knudsen

Board Members Absent:

Boardmember Sean Banda

Staff Present:

Nana Appiah, PhD., AICP, Planning Director
Lesley Davis, Senior Planner
Tom Ellsworth, Principal Planner
Rebecca Gorton, Planning Assistant

Staff Present via virtual connection:

Evan Balmer, AICP, Planner II
Wahid Alam, AICP, Planner II
Kellie Rorex, Planner I
Charlotte Bridges, Planner I

Chair Randy Carter welcomed everyone to the Work Session at 4:30 p.m.

- A. Call to Order
- B. Consider the Minutes from the 3/10/2020 meeting
Boardmember Posten-Thompson motioned to approve the minutes, Boardmember Knudsen seconded.
- Vote: 5-0
AYES – Carter, Thomas, Thompson, Gunderson, Knudsen
NAYS – None
ABSENT – Banda, Green

Note: Boardmember Green joined the virtual meeting at 4:40 p.m.

C. 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 C.1. DRB19-00962 Within the 1400 to 1600 blocks of South Signal Butte Road (west side); within the 10500 to 10700 blocks of East Southern Avenue (south side); within the 10300 to 10800 blocks of East Hampton Avenue (south side).

Council District 6. Located west of Signal Butte Road and south of Southern Avenue. (81.4± acres). Requesting the review of the Mountain Vista Master Plan Design Guidelines. Reese Anderson Applicant; Signal Butte BFC LLC, Owner.

Staff Planner: Evan Balmer

Staff Planner Evan Balmer presented the case. Mr. Balmer described the site.

The applicant, Reese Anderson, Pew and Lake, PLC, stated he is representing Bellafor Communities and stated he had nothing to add. He would be happy to answer any questions.

Vice Chair Thomas

- No specific comments.
- Excited to see something happen on the property.

Boardmember Thompson

- Has a few questions.
- The matrix – Why no R's or N's
 - *Mr. Balmer said there are not required, but they are required to choose from the list. The C's represent R's in that they have to choose from the list presented*
 - *Mr. Anderson acknowledged that the R's and N's should have been removed from the list.*
- The matrix should note that.
- The walls don't read as modern as the other elements of the project.

Boardmember Knudsen

- Agrees with Boardmember Thompson's comments.
- No additional comments.

Boardmember Placko

- Asked if the streets were Public or Private.
 - *Mr. Balmer explained the street system. Some are private.*
- Agrees with the theme wall comment from Boardmember Thompson.
- Make sure walls meet pool code.

Boardmember Green

- Styles mentioned on Slide 4 – are those meant to be intermixed and could we end up with a lot of one type?
 - *Mr. Balmer explained that they could be intermixed, but material palette would be same for all. Said there is no set percentage for the building types Agrees on the fence.*

Chair Carter

1. Confirmed there are only 2 items.
2. Slide 15 – walls need to be revised to meet the design styles.
3. Slide 8 – need reference to the N and R or remove.

Item C.2. DRB20-00003 Within the 4500 block of East Main Street (south side).

Council District 2. Located east of Greenfield Road on the south side of Main Street. (0.5± acres). Requesting the review of an automobile/vehicle service and repair facility. David Mason, Applicant; T & R Specialists LLC, Owner.

Staff Planner: Wahid Alam

Staff Planner Wahid Alam presented the project.

Architect David Mason was on the phone – audio only. No additional comments.

Vice Chair Thomas

- Perhaps stone would work in a different color.
- The gray doesn't blend with anything else.
- Agrees that deeper awnings with a metal style that cantilevers more than 18" to help with the summer heat.
- Otherwise likes the building.

Boardmember Thompson

- Agrees with the other boardmembers.
- Raise height of entrance to be tallest element of the building.
- Heights of wainscots are not consistent.
- East element is strange and not doing much for the side.
- Trash enclosure material doesn't match and needs to be cohesive with the building.
- Shade elements should extend back to the wall to make them more interesting.

Boardmember Knudsen

- All good comments and recommendations.
- Materials and colors – without seeing items in hand, it is difficult.
- Light color is reading as a cool gray and not a warm grey.
- Simulated stone needs to be revised.

Boardmember Placko

- "Smoothie" Cascalote is hard to find and not proposed near pedestrian route – go with standard Cascalote.
- Cascalotes with flowers would have more impact in the front, along Main Street near the entrance and Fruitless Olives should be toward the back (south of the building).

Boardmember Green (1st)

- Agrees with staff on materials and colors and how cohesive they are.
- Trash enclosures are not matching.
- More cohesiveness in the materials and colors.

Chair Carter

- Curious about why such a deep landscape buffer on the south side.
- *Mr. Alam explained that there is a grade change on the site, so the large area is to accommodate that.*

Summary –

1. Asked boardmember Placko for reiteration of Olive Tree comment (Use standard Cascalote in the front and Olive trees in the back).
2. Break up east elevation with variation of parapet height and plane change.
3. Raise front elevation to be tallest element.
4. Stone is not integrating into the materials.
5. Longer shade elements over service doors with ties.
6. Trash enclosure materials and color need to be compatible with building design.
7. Colors – warm and cool color scheme not working together – go with warm color scheme.

Item C.3. DRB20-00082 Within the 4400 block of East Broadway Road (south side) and within the 400 block of South Greenfield Road (east side).

Council District 2. Located on the southeast corner of Broadway Road and Greenfield Road. (1± acres). Requesting the review of a restaurant with a double lane drive-thru. Sketch Architecture Company, Applicant; Pine Haven Investments LLC, Owner.

Staff Planner: Kellie Rorex

Chair Carter recused himself from this case and Vice Chair Thomas took over leading the panel.

Staff Planner Kellie Rorex presented the project.

Boardmember Thompson

- Doesn't like the location of the building and thinks it should be on the corner.
- Trash location should not dictate the site.
- Underwhelmed by the building design.
- Applicant noted drive through is in same location as when it was a bank
 - *Mr. Burgheimer explained that this is not a bone stock Burger King*
- Feels the building could be more similar to Brown and Mesa Drive to include more articulation.
- Higher design and rethink building placement.
- Asked staff to bring up recent approved elevations for Burger King. One is at Mesa Drive and Brown (SWC) and Signal Butte and Guadalupe.
- Noted the one at Mesa Drive and Brown Road has more articulation in elements and has a nice patio.
 - *Mr. Burgheimer recommended the Board look at Power and University Dr.*

Boardmember Knudsen

- Nothing else to add.
- Agrees the area needs more infusion of good design.

Boardmember Green

- Agrees on the site plan and agrees that the existing trash location is an issue.
- No major concerns on building.
- Asked how they are dealing with existing walls on the streetscape with split face. Also, wondering if the walls will tie in with the building?
 - *Mr. Burgheimer noted that the site walls will all match the building – that is their intent.*

Boardmember Placko

- Followed up on Boardmember Green's comment.
- Palo Breas not good with power lines so may have to change.
- Crepe Myrtle will burn out on west side of building by 1st summer – replace with a different plant type.
- North and west side exterior of the building, relying on Octopus Agave and Compact

Sage – add differentiation into exterior landscape to add more stability to year-round landscape.

- Northwest corner at curve outside of the screen wall, using smaller species in the front, transitioning toward larger species in the back.
- New Zealand Flat at the entrance will not last one month in the summer and should also be replaced.

Vice Chair Thomas

- Agrees the building is very plain.

Vice Chair Thomas recapped comments:

1. Location of drive through should be looked at.
2. Screen walls should be incorporated into the overall design.
3. Trees on west street side are not good under powerlines.
4. Crepe Myrtles will get too much sun and die off so should be replaced.
5. Add differentiation into the exterior landscape to add more stability to a year-round landscape.
6. Utilize Giant Hesper aloe by curve of wall at the street corner.

Item C.4. DRB20-00096 Within the 5200 block of E Southern Avenue (south Side).

Council District 2. Located east of Higley Rd on the south side of Southern Avenue. (1± acres). Requesting the review of a medical office building. Steven Nevala, Applicant; DCT Properties Mesa LLC, Owner.

Staff Planner: Kellie Rorex

The applicant, Steve Nevala, Finn Architects explained that this is a pediatric dentist office, he explained murals are part of the theme with the pediatric dentist. He noted that there is articulation on the east and west sides of the building. He noted they can increase the size of the reveals on the building.

Boardmember Thompson

- Is the alternative compliance for the longer flat walls?
 - *Kellie explained that the alternative compliance was for using less than the three required materials per an elevation as well as having one material exceed 50% of a single elevation.*
- Noted it is difficult to tell where stucco reveals are. If deeper and wider they will show better.
- Need articulation on the east and west.
- Need to look at the building without murals in case they ever get painted out in future. What does the building look like without?
- Suggested that window films could be looked at as an alternative to the mural.

Vice Chair Thomas

- Questions amount of stucco agrees with increasing the size of the reveals
- How will mural hold up over time?
- Some more height on front elevation at corner – add articulation.
 - *Applicant said they can work with staff.*

Boardmember Knudsen

- Asked about murals on the sides. Are they painted and will they fade? How will they last through time?
 - *The applicant noted that this client will be having them painted on the building. He explained they have used them on their building in Washington. They would take care to keep them looking nice.*

Boardmember Placko

- The two tones on the building are too close together. They need more contrast.
- Murals only go up half the building and the rest of the building is bland.
- Murals could be more dynamic and cover more of the building.
- Noted that they are using Smoothie Cascalote the way it is supposed to be used unlike the Burger King case.

Boardmember Green

- Paint is a consideration on the mural. Be aware that it will fade.
- Couldn't tell how far out the awning comes out at entrance and does it match other elevations.
 - *Applicant noted 4-feet, which is consistent with the other elevation canopies.*
- Looked up Apple Valley Dental – and sees an octopus on the building.
- Applicant confirmed there is not an octopus on this building and that it would stay a walrus.

Chair Carter

- Regarding the Alternative Compliance request, he does not find that the proposed alternative is aesthetically better than the Design Guidelines.
- Slide 10 – look at stone, corrugated metal awnings within the shopping center. There are a lot of other things happening that could be incorporated into this building design.
- Parapets are too flat. Need some variation on the flat planes (east and west particularly).
- Mural will fade over time and will likely go away one day.
- They should look at adding some other materials.
- Doesn't need alternative compliance.
- Bland stucco box and needs enhancing.
 - *Mr. Nevala noted that the mural is very important to the project*
 - *Scott Clark, the Development Director for Apple Valley Braces stated that the murals are highly themed to help kids be comfortable with the dentist*

Summary:

- Color on mural that is fade resistant.
- Needs some revisions to colors and building design.

Item C.5. DRB20-00105 Within the 0 to 200 blocks of North Val Vista Drive (west side).

Council District 2. Located north of Main Street on the west side of Val Vista Drive. (4± acres). Requesting the review of a self-storage facility. Nathan Palmer, Applicant; Intelliguard Group LLC, Owner.

Staff Planner: Evan Balmer

Staff Planner Evan Balmer presented the case.

The applicant, Nathan Palmer, represented the case. He explained that the southern boundary wall will be CMU with roll-cap. There is open wrought iron on the front where there is wall. They tried to keep a modern industrial theme. They also added vertical elements on front and additional landscape area at entrance for a patio feature.

Boardmember Knudsen

- Asked for the elevation of their facility at 457 S Higley to be brought up.
 - *Mr. Palmer walked the board through the elevations describing each side*
- No additional comments

Boardmember Placko

- Where is property line in relation to Oleanders?
 - *Mr. Palmer explained that they encroach 5-7 feet onto their property. Screen feature for the neighborhood. They agreed to keep them but will landscape adjacent to the hedge.*
- Concerned with block wall with hedge, but understands it is an iron fence.
 - Boardmember Thompson explained the landscape is outside the fence.
 - Mr. Palmer noted they will have an access gate to maintain landscape.
- Concerned there is a trapped space – think through and work with landscape architect.
 - *Mr. Palmer said they will have an access gate*
- Introduce a 3rd tree that compliments they yellow flowers of the Palo Brea.

Boardmember Green

- Agrees with concern about maintenance of Oleanders.
- If fence is too close to the oleander the root structure will push it out.
- Are there building elevations that include the shade structure elevations? Noted it is difficult to tell how they interact with the buildings. Concern that they are visible.
- Noted trees should screen the RV areas.

Vice Chair Thomas

- Enjoys the blues with the block color.
- No overall concerns

Boardmember Thompson

- No comments on building, they are nice. Only comments on the site.
- Echo what Boardmember Green said on the RV parking screening. Along Val Vista the masonry wall needs to be higher to screen that view and design needs to be looked at by Planning staff.
- Doesn't agree with wrought iron on west side adjacent to residential. Should have masonry at least 3-feet to block car lights.
- Which way do the awning tilt? If roof is visible use color from palette (blue).

Chair Carter

- Agrees with Vice Chair Thomas and likes the facility. Will be a nice addition to the property.

Summary

1. Screening from Val Vista Drive.
2. North and west side – where there are Oleanders in landscape area, there needs an outlet for safety.
3. Introduce a 3rd tree that compliments the yellow flowers of the Palo Brea.
4. If awning tilt so they are visible, use color from palette (blue).
5. Use different trees on northeast corner.

Item C.6. DRB20-00135 Within the 1800 block of East Baseline Road (north side).

Council District 3. Located west of Gilbert Road on the north side of Baseline Road. (0.2± acres). Requesting the review of an automobile/vehicle service and repair (minor) facility. Lori Gafner, Applicant; KEMF GB PAD LLC, Owner.

Staff Planner: Charlotte Bridges

Staff Planner Charlotte Bridges presented the case.

Lori Gafner, Applicant (Greenbergfarrow) and Kent Lupton, Valvoline Project Manager, attended however did not have more to add to the presentation.

Vice Chair Thomas

- Agrees the additional glass being added works.
- Ties in with the center.
- The mechanical unit may not be above parapet and appears that it is.
- No other issues.

Boardmember Thompson

- Asked if the little pop out on the north elevation is on the same plane? Does it stay on the same plane?
 - *Applicant stated all one plane – just taller*
- Likes use of materials and entry.
- Entry may be a little too tall.
- Rear elevation (east) is all one plane.

Boardmember Knudsen

- Asked for clarification on the revised south elevation.
- Asked about the view of the north elevation and where that is seen from.
 - *Ms. Bridges clarified and explained that the view was from within the shopping center.*
- No concerns.

Boardmember Green

- No major concerns.
- Confirmed there is no covered parking.
- Agrees with changes staff had requested on the south elevation.

Boardmember Placko

- No comments.

Chair Carter

- Facades on west and east are flat and there is no articulation in wall plane. Consider a faux pilaster or something to break that up.
- East side is a long parapet and should be broken up.

Summary:

1. Facades on west and east are flat and there is no articulation in wall plane. Consider a faux pilaster or something to break that up.
2. East side is a long parapet and should be broken up

Discuss and take action on the following Design Review case: None

D. Adjournment

Boardmember Posten-Thompson motioned for adjournment, Boardmember Knudsen seconded. Without objection, the meeting was adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Vote: 6-0

AYES – Carter, Thomas, Thompson, Gunderson, Knudsen, Green

NAYS – None

ABSENT – Banda

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.**