

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
NOVEMBER 5, 2008

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Lower Level of the Council Chambers 57 East First Street, at 3:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Tim Nielsen – Chair
Greg Lambright
Vince DiBella left at 5:35
Tom Bottomley
Craig Boswell arrived 5:33
Delight Clark

MEMBERS ABSENT

Wendy LeSueur – Vice Chair

OTHERS PRESENT

Lesley Davis
Debbie Archuleta
Mia Lozano Helland
John Wesley
Angelica Guevara
Amy Shackelford
Cindy Lisonbee
Veronica Gonzalez
Rob Dmohowski
Tim Lillo
Richard Clutter
Stephanie Rowe
Arnand Lengean
Paul Saurey
John Code
Scott Mickleit

Chad Colby
Michael Jorgensen
Dan Brock
Don Andrews
Sean Lake
Malek Elkhoury
Tim Gallup
Tim MacDonald
Eric Thomson
Steve Cook
Arnold Wolk
Jim Larson
Scott Sjolseth
Others

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

1. Work Session:

CASE: Village Square
4210 E Main

REQUEST: Review of 2,245 sq. ft. restaurant building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Preferred the revised plan
- Wants change in plane where color changes
- Light fixture seems large for the building

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Stucco screeds need to be shown on the follow-up submittal

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Mesa Transitional Rehab
5358 E Baseline

REQUEST: Review of a 48,100 sq. ft. transitional rehabilitation nursing home

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Could cement board joint be used as a reveal in the tan aluminum
- Stone should be used at accent points
- The stone should be 2/3
- Explain how parapets return
- Provide a roof plan with the follow-up submittal

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Air louvers
- Provide a reveal at change of color

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Concerned with shade for windows
- Concerned with joints for the cement board
- Could they break-up the long horizontal line of the wainscot and use the stone in other places
- Put the stone where the people are

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Assisted Living
1051 N Stapley

REQUEST: Review of a 12,800 sq. ft. assisted living facility

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Concern with venting attic
- Suggest dormers
- Concerned with screening of mechanical units

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Landscape plan should be enhanced
- Landscape pallet shown at bottom of plan doesn't match the top of the plan

Boardmember Greg Lambright:

- The roof could be metal

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Atwood Industrial
7461, 7447, 7433, 7419 S Atwood and 7418, 7432, 7446, 7460 S 89 Place

REQUEST: Review of eight industrial buildings totaling 32,766 sq. ft.

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Greg Lambright:

- Downspouts need to be more decorative
- Work on the proportions of the accent band
- Shade for south elevation

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Appreciates the changes in material, but concerned with the flatness
- Should break the plan ½"
- Likes the overall concept of building and the colors

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Light fixtures will be very important
- Show the light fixtures on the follow-up submittal

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- If they keep the downspouts they need to be decorative

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Red Mt. Tire & Auto
2041 N Recker

REQUEST: Review of a 9,850 sq. ft. auto repair/carwash facility

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Concerned with the bay doors facing the street
- Concern with color choices
- The colors will not be accepted by the community
- Cannot approve the Yuma Gold as a building color
- Shade structures are interesting and could be blue
- The main building color needs to change
- The colors don't work together
- Maybe the wheat color, with rusty red and small amounts of blue like the car wash could work
- The forms need to be enhanced and broken up
- Too boxy

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- A lot of mixed messages with colors, shapes, forms, architecture
- You have a southwest shape in metal, vibrant colors that suggest a modern approach, but the architecture doesn't match it
- Mechanical units have to be screened

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Processed yellow is very difficult
- There is too much color
- Could do accents in bright color
- These colors and forms collide
- Forms need to be enhanced
- Restudy the use of color
- Shade structures are well done
- Need a revised color board with the follow up submittal

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Greg Lambright:

- Tinsel structures can be great, if they are done well
- Colors will fade quickly
- Use natural material
- Colored block, rusticated metal and natural shades
- Need to look at store front colors and glass colors
- Different materials could improve the design

Boardmember Delight Clark:

- The Board needs to know how the shade structures are attached
- Concerned with the durability of the fabric material
- A well designed building with muted colors will draw attention, it doesn't have to be bright colors

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Checker's/Rally's
2828 S Country Club

REQUEST: Review of a 785 sq. ft. drive-thru restaurant

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Metal is very shiny, could it be satin finish?
- Could replace the stone veneer with trendstone veneer, it would go better with the stainless

Boardmember Greg Lambright:

- Will there be landscaping on the green screen?
- Stone and stainless don't go together
- Use Trendstone or no wainscot
- Revise wainscot, if one is used, to bottom of windows

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Stone seems to be fighting the stainless
- Don't use diamond pattern on the stainless

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Falcon Pacific Aviation
4562 E Mallory Units 101 - 121

REQUEST: Review of an 85,430 sq. ft. hangar project

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Why are they using stucco?
- Metal works if it is well thought through

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Could the translucent panels be grouped so they are not so staccato
- Could they use trendstone instead of split face

Boardmember Greg Lambright:

- Prefer to see a well done metal building
- Could use a gabien base and some gabien walls at the retention area
- Make the retention area usable
-

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Gabien would be nice for the retention area

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Hawker Beechcraft
5615 S Sossaman

REQUEST: Review of a 73,981 sq. ft. office/hangar project

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- Make sure Solid Waste Division approves location of trash enclosure

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Likes the landscaping
- Exciting project

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Likes the form of the overhang
- Really likes the way the office incorporates into the hangars

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Sonic Drive-In
1229 N Power

REQUEST: Review of a remodel and change in exterior illumination

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Greg Lambright:

- Could it be ground faced masonry with a metal roof?
- Too much going on, should be simplified
- New shade structure doesn't go with the buildings
- Too many roof types
- Darker color fights with the green
- Doesn't think the new canopy style goes with the existing building
- The new elements don't tie in with the rest of the building
- It's a mish-mash of different things
- Wants the red from the neon, could it be painted
- Need to get rid of one or two of the roof types
- It would be nice if the roofs all tied in together
- There are very strong elements on the existing buildings and the new shade canopy is a very strong element, but they don't work together
- Doesn't like the new arched canopies with the existing architecture
- No arched canopies, they don't tie in with the any architecture of any of the buildings

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Sleek versus rustic
- Warm colors don't work with sleek fast food theme
- Concerned with stone, could it be ground faced, or trendstone?
- Could the tile be metal?
- The teal roof clashes with the green on the Baseline store, the columns should be teal or a building color
- The buttons will work fine
- Could they use a darker color at the fascia
- Agreed the existing canopies should have the new fascia but not the arched canopies
- The arched canopies fight the existing architecture, the buildings will look like a retrofit, not a remodel
- The warmer elements fight the brushed aluminum

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- Appreciated that the attachment system would be concealed, did not want it latched on
- Too many different things going on
- Liked the different levels of canopies
- Concerned with the drive-thru canopy
- OK with staff review of the other stores if they are spread out throughout the City

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Thought staff could review the other sites with Board direction

Boardmember Delight Clark:

- Concerned with the fabric canopy structure
- Did not want the fabric to yellow in the sun

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

A. Call to Order:

Chair Tim Nielsen called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m.

B. Approval of the Minutes of the October 1, 2008 Meeting:

On a motion by Vince DiBella seconded by Delight Clark the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

C. Take Action on all Consent Agenda items:

D. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR08-74 Banner Heart Hospital 3rd Floor Addition

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 6750 East Baywood Ave
REQUEST: Approval of a 26,187 sq. ft. addition to existing hospital
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Banner Health Systems
APPLICANT: Deva Powell, HKS Inc
ARCHITECT: John Niziolek, HKS Inc
STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of a 26,187 sq. ft. addition to existing hospital

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda do to a conflict.

Chair Tim Nielsen declared a conflict and turned the meeting over to Vince DiBella.

MOTION: It was moved by Greg Lambright and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR08-74 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations:
2. Windows facing towards the adjacent residential neighborhood will have blinds pre-set to a specific angle to protect the privacy of the adjacent neighborhood.
3. Provide plant materials in landscape area at north property line where trash enclosure will be removed.
4. Compliance with all conditions of approval and requirements of Z05-103.
5. Compliance with all conditions of approval and requirements of Z08-67
6. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
7. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
8. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket *and painted green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
9. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0 – 1 (Boardmember Nielsen abstained)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-75 Express Car Wash

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2750 East University Drive
REQUEST: Approval of a 3,660 sq. ft. car wash
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: Count Realm, LLC
APPLICANT: Pew & Lake
ARCHITECT: Andrews Design Group
STAFF PLANNER: Joe Welliver

REQUEST: Approval of a 3,660 sq. ft. car wash

SUMMARY: Don Andrews and Sean Lake represented the case. Mr. Andrews explained the changes made since the work session.

Boardmember Greg Lambright confirmed the pilasters would be split faced block. He thought the blue seemed dark. He stated the X seemed to be a sign, and wasn't doing anything for the building. He suggested the X face University.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed the awnings would be fastened behind the tube and would not be visible.

Chair Tim Nielsen stated the main traffic is on University and the south elevation is the least designed, and should be the best elevation. He stated they need to enhance the canopy on University. He suggested providing architecture on the canopy which the sign could be attached to. By attaching the sign to the canopy it would be closer to University and more visible. He stated the project needed to have 4-sided architecture.

In response to suggestions by Boardmember Tom Bottomley Sean Lake and Don Andrews stated they could pull the SES in, however, they could not move the windows very much because there was a bathroom next to them. He stated the roll-up doors could be widened on the entry side, however, they did not want them to be wider at the exit, because they wanted it to be clear which doors were the entry. He stated they could be shifted slightly so they appeared more centered. Mr. Andrews stated they wanted the X element to draw people to the entry.

MOTION: It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Greg Lambright that DR08-75 be continued to the December 3 meeting:

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-76 Walgreen's

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 10825 E. Baseline Rd.
REQUEST: Approval of a 14,550 sq. ft. drug store
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: CP Signal LLC
APPLICANT: Khoury Engineering
ARCHITECT: Timothy Gallup
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of a 14,550 sq. ft. drug store

SUMMARY: Chair Tim Nielsen declared a conflict and turned the meeting over to Vince DiBella.

Staffmember Lesley explained the applicant had agreed to the conditions of approval and to move the trash enclosure.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley agreed with staff that the tower needed to be 4-sided; the tile should match and thought the columns should be expressed more and be deeper. He liked the proportions of the center.

Boardmember Greg Lambright agreed with staff concerns.

MOTION: It was moved by Greg Lambright and seconded by Delight Clark that DR08-76 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Revise the pedestrian path from Signal Butte to the building so that it is a straight path adjacent to a landscape island on one side rather than between two parking stalls.
 - b. Revise foundation base landscape requirements per §11-15-3(C) of the Zoning Ordinance. This requirement has not been met on the east side of the building.
 - c. Work with staff to revise the color placement on the building to more similarly reflect the center.
 - d. Details and proportions of columns, cornices, awnings and wainscot to match the shopping center. Trash enclosure gates and light standards also must match what has been approved for the center.
 - e. Trash enclosure for the adjacent building to the east to be relocated to the northeast corner of the Walgreens site, eliminating the parking spaces in that location, and allowing the parking area east of Walgreens to be redesigned eliminating the dead end parking.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. A comprehensive sign plan has been approved for this development. (BA08-21). All signage must be in compliance with this approved document.
6. Light fixtures and textures for pedestrian crossings are to match what has been approved for the adjacent shopping center as part of case DR07-009.
7. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket *and painted green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
8. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
9. Provide two half-size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0 – 1 (Boardmember Nielsen abstained)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

- E. Discuss, receive comment and recommend to City Council the following Design Review Cases:

None

- F. Discuss, receive comment and take action on the following appeals of Administrative Design Review:

Staffmember Lesley Davis explained the application to the Board.

After reviewing the original case file and photos of what was built.

MOTION: It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Greg Lambright that the administrative approval request for DR07-48 and DR07-49 be approved with the following conditions:

The Dooley wall be allowed to remain subject to the wall along the street and turning the corner one panel being changed to split faced, and the remainder of the wall in visible area to be painted to match the building.

VOTE: 5 – 0

- G. Other business:

Discuss the Mesa Gateway Strategic Development Plan Design Guidelines Manual

Planning Director, John Wesley presented the Mesa Gateway Strategic Development Plan Design Guidelines Manual. He explained the document would help staff and future developers establish a vision for the airport in the future. He stated future developments would be reviewed compared to this document.

Chair Tim Nielsen confirmed staff will give developers a copy of this document to use as guidelines. He asked if there would be incentives for LEED developments or if LEED would be mandatory. Mr. Wesley stated there could be incentives; however, they would not be monetary. He questioned how transportation and urban development would work. He liked the vision and the flexibility. He questioned what weather they would go through the same processes as other development.

Boardmember Greg Lambright confirmed there would not be a separate Advisory Board for the area; the project would go through normal development processes.

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Boardmember Tom Bottomley confirmed the document was intended to point development in the right direction from the beginning. He liked the flexibility of the document and hoped it would inspire creative development.

Boardmember Craig Boswell stated he was looking for the day when there would be more photos of Mesa projects used as examples, instead of photos of other communities.

H. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 6:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da