

**CITY OF MESA**  
**MINUTES OF THE**  
**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

**MARCH 1, 2006**

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Community Room of the Utility Building, 640 North Mesa Drive, at 3:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Pete Berzins - Chair  
Dave Richins- Vice Chair  
Tom Bottomley  
Robert Burgheimer  
Tim Nielsen

MEMBERS ABSENT

Vince DiBella (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

Kim Steadman	Jeff Welker
Lesley Davis	Bob Fronske
Debbie Archuleta	Jae Cho
Mia Lozano Helland	Dan Saleet
John Wesley	Mark Borgman
April Ward	Thurman Wagner
Krissa Hargis	Vince Dalke
Jennifer Griffke	Richard Coustion
Michael Bell	Mark Irby
Ryan Matthews	Scott Marshall
Len Swartz	Dan Brock
John Smales	Keith Romine
Craig Boswell	Chuck Finzer
Randy Carter	Dorothy Shupe
Phillip Ta	Michael Jorgensen
Stephen Richards	Korey Wilkes
Mark Bowker	Shawn Clow
Dwayne Griffin	Rick Schroeder
Doug Himmelberger	Jeff Miller
Bob Saemisch	Others

1. Work Session:

**CASE:** Office DFFM Yukon  
3635 E Inverness

**REQUEST:** Approval of two office buildings

**DISCUSSION:**

- Return parapet at entry pop out
- Top pf parapet needs more mass, looks façade-ish, box it out w/extra framing
- Wrap the coping
- Does the parapet screen the rooftop mechanical units?

**CASE:** Wal-Mart Neighborhood Market  
NEC Southern & Gilbert

**REQUEST:** Approval of a grocery store with a drive-thru pharmacy

**DISCUSSION:** Withdrawn by applicant

**CASE:** Gateway Commons  
5114 E Southern

**REQUEST:** Approval of two office buildings

**DISCUSSION:**

- The main arch, at the corner entry should be flatter, like the one at Signature Salon
- The columns and other non-roof metal elements should be darker metal – not red
- Balance vertical/horizontal on long elevations
- Provide vertical elements
- Colors are plain

**CASE:** McDonald's  
2130 W Southern

**REQUEST:** Approval of a fast food restaurant with a drive-thru

**DISCUSSION:**

- What happens behind window? It will affect the design
- Looks good
- Colors could be zippier
- The shine of the roof will pop
- The Board discussed adding some punch to the building with color, but agreed the metal roof and white trim accomplished that
- Relocate the pedestrian path toward the west, to avoid conflicts near the main drive aisle

**CASE:** Hawes Office Condos  
8401 E Baseline

**REQUEST:** Approval of an office project

**DISCUSSION:**

- How are they going to mix up the colors
- Color changes
- Change massing accent pieces
- Look at staggering buildings
- Three or four color options

**CASE:** Del Taco  
1842 S Signal Butte

**REQUEST:** Approval of a fast food restaurant with drive-thru

**DISCUSSION:**

- Revised color board
- No neon
- Waves are corporate/signage

**CASE:** Aquila Superstition  
96 Street & Southern

**REQUEST:** Approval of an office project and residential

**DISCUSSION:**

- Only one association?
- Very monumental
- Residential next to 4-story
- Only one color?
- Patients will drive through the residential project to get to the offices
- Very concerned with such a massive building so close to residential
- The hospital is only 3-stories
- All drawings to be at the same scale for the follow-up submittal

**CASE:** University & Meridian  
NWC University & Meridian

**REQUEST:** Approval of a retail building

**DISCUSSION:**

- Matches existing
- That may not be a good thing
- Consider revising the towers

**CASE:** Office bldg. Brown & Falcon  
Brown west of Ellsworth

**REQUEST:** Approval of two office buildings

**DISCUSSION:**

- Looks like a very large house
- Pre-cast concrete pieces would look nice
- Look at additional color

**CASE:** Sam's Club Gas Facility  
SEC McKellips & 46 Street

**REQUEST:** Approval of a gas facility with a car wash

**DISCUSSION:**

- Planters – irrigated
- Really need to dress it up
- No yellow bollards
- A box car wash
- Movement in the middle
- Break up wall – bump out
- Wainscot
- More color on canopy
- Bring in panels of color
- Wall of kiosk – now EIFS
- Integrate pumps
- Connection points
- Crowded sign area (pop-out)
- Make it look more like Sam's
- Is it necessary to look into the function of the car wash?

**CASE:** Williams Gateway Self-Storage  
SEC Pecos & 88<sup>th</sup> Street

**REQUEST:** Approval of a self-storage facility

**DISCUSSION:**

- The Board had concerns with the design of the 10' wall

**CASE:** Chili's  
SEC Dobson & 202

**REQUEST:** Approval of a restaurant

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mint Green stands out
- Nice mission white mesa stone
- Galvanized metal a little foreign
- Colors go nicely
- Awning w/ glass above is a funny detail
- Glass detail above awning interesting
- Design of platter disc w/ band ok
- Eclectic looking mix
- Change plane of EFIS application by 1" to correspond w/ change in cornice

**CASE:** John Wright Building  
231 N Alma School

**REQUEST:** Approval of an office

**DISCUSSION:**

- Window treatment should be a continuation of the original building
- Consider windows and grilles on second floor
- The wide flat arches should be redesigned
- Needs something on the upper section of the west elevation
- Could there be windows on the west?
- Site wall could tie the two buildings together
- Arches are too flat

**CASE:** Restaurant Depot  
NEC Baseline & Extension

**REQUEST:** Approval of a restaurant supply building

**DISCUSSION:**

- Use deeper color for block
- The blue band around the whole building is too much
- Keep the blue band at the entry but revise it elsewhere
- Don't just delete the band; it is necessary
- Develop the downspouts to contribute to the design of the building
- The revised entry design works well
- Use a different material as an accent instead of painted block

2. Call to Order:

Chair Pete Berzins called the meeting to order at 5:24 p.m.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the January 20, and February 1, 2006 Meetings:

On a motion by Dave Richins seconded by Tim Nielsen the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

4. Discussion of the upcoming election:

Staffmember Kim Steadman explained that Boardmembers may not use their position on the board to campaign for or against upcoming ballot measures.

5. Design Review Cases:

## MINUTES OF THE 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR05-101**      **Gin Properties**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**      206 & 214 N Power  
**REQUEST:**                      Approval of a 4,056 sq. ft. office building  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**      District 5  
**OWNER:**                          Gene Gin  
**APPLICANT:**                  Shawn Clow  
**ARCHITECT:**                      Gerald Deines

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 4,056 sq. ft. office building

**SUMMARY:** Shawn Clow represented the case. He explained the owner had decided to go with a modern look. The foam stucco elements would be larger and the colors were bolder.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer liked what they had done. He thought the building would be different, and unique. He stated he liked the innovation of the building and appreciated all the hard work the applicant had done working with the Board.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen appreciated the applicant's effort. He confirmed the glass system would be butt glazed, inside an aluminum perimeter frame.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley appreciated the edginess of the building. He thought the canopy connections were well done. He liked the new colors. He thought the color and design were cool, but inviting. He appreciated the butt glazed window system.

Boardmember Dave Richins stated he was looking forward to this building being built, and would be sure to visit it.

Chair Pete Berzins liked the building and how the monument sign complemented the building.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Dave Richins that DR05-101 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. Compliance with the conditions of approval for Z05-21 – Ordinance No. 4370.
  - b. Compliance with the conditions of approval for BA05-25 a Development Incentive Permit.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)

## MINUTES OF THE 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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. 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 to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. 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

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The building is bold and innovative and should be an asset to the area.

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR06-05 QuikTrip**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 14715 S Power

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 5,104 sq. ft. convenience store  
and a 9,879 sq. ft. gas canopy

**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 6

**OWNER:** QuikTrip Corporation

**APPLICANT:** Craig Boswell

**ARCHITECT:** JMS

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 5,104 sq. ft. convenience store and a 9,879 sq. ft. gas canopy

**SUMMARY:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually.

**MOTION:** It was moved by and seconded by that DR06-05 be approved with the following conditions:

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** Appropriate, site-specific design makes this an asset to the area.

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR06-10 Wireless Toyz**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 344 S. Power Rd.  
**REQUEST:** Approval of a 6,720 retail building  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 5  
**OWNER:** Wireless Toyz  
**APPLICANT:** Mark Bowker  
**ARCHITECT:** Kristjan Sigurdsson

**REQUEST:** Continuance to the April 5, 2006 meeting

**SUMMARY:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-10 be continued to the April 5, 2006 meeting.

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** To allow the applicant additional time to work with the shopping center.

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR06-14 Wal-Mart Fueling Station**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** SWC Greenfield & US 60

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 200 sq. ft. kiosk with a gas canopy

**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 6

**OWNER:** Wal-Mart Stores

**APPLICANT:** Tyler Wright

**ARCHITECT:** Harrison French & Assoc.

**REQUEST:** Withdrawal

**SUMMARY:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-14 be withdrawn

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The applicant withdrew the application

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR06-15 Wal-Mart Fueling Station**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 8335 E Guadalupe + Hawes (SWC)  
**REQUEST:** Approval of a gas canopy and fuel kiosk  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District  
**OWNER:** Wal-Mart Stores Inc.  
**APPLICANT:** Tyler Wright, Pew & Lake  
**ARCHITECT:** Harrison French

**REQUEST:** Withdrawal

**SUMMARY:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-15 be withdrawn

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The applicant withdrew the application

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR06-16 Wal-Mart Fueling Station**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** NEC Country Club & Baseline

**REQUEST:** Approval of a gas canopy and fuel kiosk

**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 4

**OWNER:** First National Bank

**APPLICANT:** Tyler Wright, Pew & Lake

**ARCHITECT:** Harrison French

**REQUEST:** Withdrawal

**SUMMARY:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually

**MOTION:** It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-16 be withdrawn

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The applicant withdrew the application

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR06-17 The Palms at Superstition Springs Retail**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** NWC of S. Power Road and E. Superstition Springs Blvd.  
**REQUEST:** Approval of a 2,407 s. f. building  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 6  
**OWNER:** Perry Mann Investments  
**APPLICANT:** Mark Bowker  
**ARCHITECT:** Kristjan Sigurdsson

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 2,407 sq. ft. building

**SUMMARY:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-17 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. Compliance with all conditions of approval of case Z05-94.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
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. 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 to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. 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

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The project was well designed and should be an asset to the area.

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR06-18    The Palms at Superstition Springs - Houlihans**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**     The Palms at Superstition Springs  
6560 E. Superstition Springs Blvd

**REQUEST:**                Approval of a restaurant building and associated site development.

**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**     District 6

**OWNER:**                  Allen G. Anz

**APPLICANT:**             Mark A. Bowker

**ARCHITECT:**             Kristjan Sigurdsson

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 5,956 sq. ft. restaurant

**SUMMARY:** This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley was concerned with the colors of the building as rendered. The applicant explained that the colors had been revised since the work session to better complement the future Bonefish restaurant and the future retail building (DR06-17). Boardmember Bottomley preferred the colors on the color board.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed the scuppers would have galvanized aluminum to work with the other metals on the building.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer liked the building. He agreed the color board was nicer than the rendering.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen appreciated the changes the applicant had made since the work session.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR06-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. Compliance with all conditions of approval of case Z05-94.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
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. 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 to match the primary building color.

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. 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

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The smart, modern design should be a nice complement to the surrounding area.

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR06-19 KFC/A & W**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** West of NWC Signal Butte & Baseline  
**REQUEST:** Approval of a 2,930 sq. ft. fast food restaurant  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 6  
**OWNER:** Yum Brands  
**APPLICANT:** Glen Ross, Architekton  
**ARCHITECT:** Doug Brown

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 2,930 sq. ft. fast food restaurant

**SUMMARY:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually

**MOTION:** It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-19 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. Provide adequate screening for the SES on the north elevation. Details to be worked out will staff.
  - b. **All** signage must be in conformance with the approved Comprehensive Sign Plan for Superstition Gateway or receive a modification to the Comprehensive Sign Plan from the Board of Adjustment.
  - c. Provide staff with manufacturer and color specifications for the storefronts as well as for the awning that wraps the southeast corner of the building. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff. Also provide Design Review Staff with a revised Color/Material Board.
  - d. Finish the backsides of all parapets to match the front wherever they extend above the lowest roof height.
  - e. Provide cut sheet for all proposed light fixtures, including parking lot lighting.
  - f. Provide foundation base landscape materials along the west elevation, consistent with §11-15-3(C) No. 5 and for the number of trees required around the building in compliance with §11-15-3(C) No. 2 of the City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
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. 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 to match the primary building color.

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. 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

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** A smart and rich design that will complement the commercial center.

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR06-20**      **Chase Bank**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**      NWC Baseline & Signal Butte  
**REQUEST:**                      Approval of a 4,250 sq. ft. bank  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**        District 6  
**OWNER:**                        Chase  
**APPLICANT:**                 Justin Gubler, Architekton  
**ARCHITECT:**                 Joe Salvatore

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 4,250 sq. ft. bank

**SUMMARY:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually

**MOTION:** It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-20 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. Provide light fixture cut sheets for the building mounted lighting as well as for the parking lot pole lights.
  - b. **All** signage must be in conformance with the approved Comprehensive Sign Plan for Superstition Gateway or receive a modification to the Comprehensive Sign Plan from the Board of Adjustment.
  - c. Turf is not permitted in the right-of-way per the Arizona State Department of Water Resources.
  - d. Provide color specification for decorative metal trellis for plant material.
  - e. Landscaping along the street frontages is required to comply with §11-15-3 (A). Please coordinate with the developer.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
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. 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 to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. 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.

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The design is well balanced, and works well with the surrounding center.

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR06-21    Mekong Plaza**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**    66 S Dobson  
**REQUEST:**                Approval of a remodel of a 102,000 sq. ft. retail building  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**    District 3  
**OWNER:**                 Mekong Property LLC  
**APPLICANT:**            Dwight Griffin  
**ARCHITECT:**             Randall Ewers

**REQUEST:** Approval of a remodel of a 102,000 sq. ft. retail building

**SUMMARY:** Dwayne Griffin, Philip Todd, and Jeremy Granger represented the case. Mr. Todd stated they were proposing to add 4 lion sculptures carved from stone to the front of the building. One on each side of the two entry towers.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed they had added metal features and changed the windows. The columns would be both round and square. Boardmember Nielsen appreciated the reinvestment in the center. He confirmed the split face cmu would be integral.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley appreciated the metal work and the details at the corners. He liked the tile and confirmed it would be more traditional stacked, glazed tile. He was concerned that if future signage were allowed to be multi-colors they would detract from the building. The owner stated they would try to keep the signs neutral colors.

Boardmember Dave Richins thought this project was a great example of how details make a difference.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer agreed with the previous comments. He liked the green, but thought the metal details might be better as a traditional black or gold. He agreed the building should have a comprehensive sign package with unified colors and fonts. He suggested using some Asian trees and/or flowers to reinforce the Asian influence, especially at the building. Maybe Chinese rocks instead of decomposed granite. He stated he didn't want to hold up their project, he just wanted to allow them the flexibility to vary their plant palette.

Chair Pete Berzins appreciated how well they were converting a "big box".

**MOTION:** It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-21 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, including the 40' towers, 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. Provide finish color of decorative light fixture.
  - b. Revise the "Exterior Finish Schedule" to include an item for the painted, pre-cast concrete columns.

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- c. Compliance with all conditions of approval of BA05-07, including the 1/6/06 Admin. SPM letter of approval.
  - d. Add decorative pavement to all pedestrian paths.
  - e. Note on plans that the west PL wall will be painted, and specify the color.
  - f. Note on plans that the south PL chain link fence will be replaced with a CMU wall. Specify color of wall.
  - g. Provide a rear wall (above roof level) to the pop-out at the south-side entry. Carry the cornice and finish colors around to this rear wall as well.
  - h. Demonstrate that rooftop mechanical units are fully screened by the new parapets of the north, east, and south walls.
  - i. Fully recess the SES in an appropriate location. Staff to review and approve.
  - j. All Phase I and Phase II site improvements must be installed prior to occupancy of Phase II.
  - k. **Allow the applicant the flexibility to use some Asian landscaping.**
  - l. **Allow oriental statues or rock as design elements.**
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
  3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
  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. 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 to match the primary building color.
  6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
  7. 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

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** This project is an example of how a plain box can be converted into a very nicely designed building.

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR06-22 Hampton Mesa**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** The 7400 block of East Hampton Avenue  
**REQUEST:** Approval of two industrial shell buildings totaling 86,167 sq. ft.  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 6  
**OWNER:** John Secco  
**APPLICANT:** Rick Schuh  
**ARCHITECT:** Cawley Architects

**REQUEST:** Approval of two industrial buildings totaling 86,167 sq. ft.

**SUMMARY:** Michael Jorgensen represented the case.

Boardmember Dave Richins did not like the color palette. He deferred to the architects on the Board to discuss how the buildings could be improved.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated the buildings still needed work. He did not feel the buildings were of the same quality level as the other buildings in the area. He suggested they look at using railings, or cornices, could they apply metal elements, or vary the massing of the windows? He thought the building needed more movement, maybe curtain wall pieces. Look at forms, flat arches. He thought the colors were too monochromatic. Could they use some steel elements?

Boardmember Tim Nielsen stated he understood there was a vacant lot to the south of the apartment complex; however, he still thought they should consider the apartments. Even the other industrial in this area was edgier. He stated the buildings should be inviting. This building was common 20 years ago. He thought the building needed richness. He suggested they look at the adjacent building, which used rounded elements and blue glass.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley agreed with the previous comments. He liked the entry element, but thought there was too much repetition. He wanted to see additional color.

Chair Pete Berzins did not think the buildings worked with the surrounding area. He stated the buildings could be fine in an industrial complex in other areas of the City, but not at this location. He thought there should be different colors or additional colors. He suggested they study the residential and pull some elements from that project.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR06-22 be continued to the April 5, 2006 meeting:

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested the applicant look at:

Cornices; Materials; Fenestrations; Massing; Architectural elements; Detailing; color palette; and what's around this site.

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** To allow the applicant time to redesign the

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

project.

**CASE #: DR06-23 Mt. Vista Medical Office Building II**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 1301 S Crismon  
**REQUEST:** Approval of an 103,300 sq. ft. medical office building  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 6  
**OWNER:** TBGRA Healthcare Properties  
**APPLICANT:** Butler Design  
**ARCHITECT:** Butler Design

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 103,000 sq. ft.

**SUMMARY:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-23 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. **Approval of the Site Plan by the City Council is required per condition 2, Ordinance 4363 (reference Z05-017). This Design Review Approval is contingent upon that approval.**
3. Any future signage must be approved by Design Review and must be in conformance with the Comprehensive Sign Plan for the Mountain Vista Medical Campus (reference Z05-017).
4. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
6. 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.
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 to match the primary building color.
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 at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division.

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The building is well designed using quality materials to complement the rest of the development.

### 6. Appeals of Administrative Design Review:

ADR06-11 Value Engineered revisions to Riverview – DR05-62

Bob Saemisch represented the application. He explained the bollards would be larger and cone shaped.

The proposed pavers can break down at the corners and become soiled and grayed out over time. The proposed concrete would be easier to maintain and hold up better over time. The pavers would still be used at pedestrian areas.

For the wainscot they had proposed Mesa Stone at the base and caps with a 2' band of EIFS connecting them together. On Phase II they changed to scored block instead of the EIFS. They wanted to do the same at the theatre district.

They wanted to use masonry soldier courses and headers instead of EIFS.

They wanted to use Sunbrella fabric awnings on the rears of the building because they could have more variety of color. The rears of the building face the streets.

They wanted to reduce two of the foam cornice overhangs to 2' depth.

They wanted to reduce the jog in the site walls from 6' every 100' to 2' every 100'.

Staffmember Kim Steadman explained that the normal requirement for the walls is a 2' every 50'.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer supported the change to the bollards and the stained concrete. He thought the concrete could hold up better. He also supported the wainscot and the soldier course, he supported the canvas awnings if they were Sunbrella, and the cornice change. Regarding the jogs in the site walls, he supported the change in the rear but not at the street.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen was OK with the changes. He did think the site walls should be 2' jogs every 50'.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley was OK with most of the changes. He was concerned the canvas awnings be properly maintained and replaced when needed. He thought the site wall jogs should be 2' to 3' every 50'.

Boardmember Dave Richins thought the stamped concrete looked richer. He thought the site walls should jog 2' every 50'.

Chair Pete Berzins didn't understand why they proposed pavers in traffic areas in the first place. Mr. Saemisch stated the problem with the pavers at Dana Park Village just recently become apparent. He did not agree with the change in metal awnings to canvas. He thought the site walls should jog 2' every 50'.

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**MOTION:** It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tim Nielsen that ADR06-11 be approved with the following conditions:

The site walls to jog 2' every 50'.

**VOTE:** Passed 4 – 1 (Chair Pete Berzins voting nay)

### ADR06-14 Addition of LED to Cinemark – DR05-62

The request was to add LED lighting to the Cinemark building. A revised design was presented to the Board, proposing color changes to blue on the parapet and yellow on the panels, and various colors on the 1605' section instead of all red. Also the addition of LED accents on 6 wings.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that ADR06-14 be approved as presented in revised drawings provided at the meeting.

As presented.

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0

### ADR06-09 Outback monument sign - DR02-50 1830 E McKellips

Staffmember Kim Steadman explained that the applicant had worked out an acceptable solution with staff.

## 7. Other Business:

Fiesta Towers  
Westwood & Grove

Bob Saemisch and Reese Anderson represented the project.

Mr. Saemisch explained that the rust color had been deleted, the roof top mechanicals had been screened, and color banding was accomplished by using two colors of glass.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed the current plan was to build the two shorter buildings first.

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was concerned with the amount of glass. Mr. Saemisch stated the Esplanade and Harden Ferry project have large amount of glass with deep balconies. Scale and reflectivity have been addressed and the neighbors don't object. Boardmember Burgheimer stated he did not object to the use of glass; however, he wondered how this building looked different from any buildings in other cities around the nation. He stated it was not designed for this neighborhood. Mr. Saemisch stated it would be it own theme. Boardmember Burgheimner stated the Esplanade and Hayden Ferry projects differed from side to side, not just identical on all sides.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley likes the project overall. He was concerned with the vertical fin walls on the hypotenuse of the building. He thought they looked cheap. He understood the design was cohesive, but could these walls be handled another way? The covered walkway on sheet A-10 was called out as wood, but on sheet L1.04 it was called out as steel or metal. He wanted it to be steel or metal. He was concerned with how windows would be washed. He confirmed that no more than two buildings would be the same height. He stated the finishing of the concrete including the under-side would have to be high quality.

Chair Pete Berzins was concerned with sun reflection for traffic and the neighboring residences and businesses.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought it looked like a piece of Chicago transplanted here. He was concerned with the use of painted storefronts. He confirmed the applicant was proposing slip form 1' thick concrete floors. Looking up at building you will see solid formed concrete, no metal deck. He wanted to see a richness to the project.

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

### Homestead at Center Center & McKellips

#### Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Treatment of end units, especially facing Center, needs to be strong

#### Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Very tunnel-like
- Maybe remove units 23 and 24 to provide a central amenity

#### Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Flatness
- Garages are dominant – break them up
- Garages and doors should be different
- Tunnel effect along garage rows
- Could the buildings be split up?
- Not so rigid, jog the buildings
- Elevations on either side of the street or landscape amenity shouldn't be a mirror image.
- Areas between garages could have softscape ground treatment
- Off-set alignment so units are not straight across from each other
- Variety of colors

#### Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Flat façades, more relief desirable
- Poor rhythm along rooftops
- Curved rooftop element should be removed
- Forms compete
- Too much white space
- End of gable needs to be complete
- Needs variety
- Faux end façades should be real, with real windows to those units

### Homestead at Sunvalley Sunvalley north of Main

- Garages are dominant, need to break them up
- Not enough space between Units 16 – 22 and 23 – 30
- Maybe redesign site to be an “L” shape

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Alta Mesa Villas  
5750 E Main

- Overall, the Boardmembers liked the project
- The varied garage door choices are good
- The varied window shapes are good
- Good relief along the façades
- Less blank wall should be on the end of the units; provide some detail, even if just some horizontal bands
- The project needs additional colors
- Look at the project at Southern and Clearview

Some comments similar to those for Homestead at Center:

- Avoid the tunnel effect along garage rows
- End units should not have faux façades, but should incorporate real windows and balconies to those floor plans
- Elevations on either side of the street or landscape amenity shouldn't be a mirror image.
- Areas between garages could have softscape ground treatment
- Off-set alignment so units are not straight across from each other

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta  
Planning Assistant

da