CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
JANUARY 3, 2007

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

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

MEMBERS ABSENT

OTHERS PRESENT

Kim Steadman
Lesley Davis
Debbie Archuleta
Mia Lozano Helland
Jim Hash
John Wesley
Rich McAllister
Ryan Matthews
Rob Dmohowski
Krissa Lucas
Doug Himmelberger
Chip Nix
John Bulka
Maria Spirandi
John Banas
Leo Marin
Roy Arrieta
Moni Dosanji
Cindy Carpenter
Jeff Swan
Daniel Nobel
Robert Pizorno
Tod Miller
Sake Reinbersma
Justin Hay
Ryan Petersen
Curtis Clarklaz
Michael Hill
Les Partch
Roger Goldstein
Fred Woods
Nicole Posten
Dan Brock
Charles Mannino
Alisa Peterson Dangelo
Ellis & Marilynn Falk
Joe Murray
Emily Diver
Ed Dunishie
Sean Lake
Don Rogers
Phyllis Rogers
Brad Bryant
Liz Gaston
Chris Vickers
Seth Friedman
Dan Saleet
Robert McClelland
Stephen Krager
D. J. Stapley
Wes Balmer
Gonzo Grasis
Paul Almond
Jeff Looker
Others

1. Work Session:

CASE: Neon for existing PLS Financial Services Building
SWC Country Club and Southern

REQUEST: Approval of neon for an existing building

DISCUSSION: Curt Rich and J. D. Berryman represented the case. They believed the neon would be a design feature because it follows the tiles. They believed it was integrated because it follows the angles of the building. It would embellish only at night because there were no words or corporate logos. They believed it was compatible with the neighboring businesses because many other businesses had neon. The contrasting light bands mimic the contrasting tile bands. They believed the neon on the façade would draw attention away from the brightness of the interior of the building.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- The inside of the store is bright already
- How does the neon wrap the building? If it's just tacked on that's not integrated

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Why do we need to draw even more attention to a building that is already very bright?
- A lot of the photo examples are prior to current regulations
- The neon should not be "tacked on" to the building, it should be recessed, or be back lighting
- On the photo of the China restaurant the neon was part of the architecture, the neon illustrated the building and was originally designed into the architecture
- On the photo of the Quik Trip they actually use an illuminated panel, not exposed neon
- On the Del Taco photo it was signage
- They would have to do a façade change
- The building is very lit up at night already

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Is it really necessary?
- Couldn't they do something interesting with color components on the façade?
- It's right on the corner and it's a very prominent building

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- What is the need for the neon? Are they having trouble getting business?

- They want it because the Ordinance says they can have it?
- The neon does not make this building any better

- There would be other ways to enhance the building
- The building seems very top heavy already and the neon enhances that

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- There needs to be balance in the area, just because some other buildings have neon does not mean this one has to have it too
- This building has enough signage, it gets good business during the day and at night it is already lit up
- The red does nothing to complement the building

CASE: Mt. Vista Marketplace
Signal Butte & Southern

REQUEST: Approval of a retail center, a Super Target, and an apartment complex

DISCUSSION: Cindy Carpenter, Justin Hay, and Sake Reinbersma represented the case and presented a rendered site plan. Cindy Carpenter explained the hotel and office components are not being reviewed at this time. Staffmember Lesley Davis explained that the bank, the restaurant pads and the gas station would all be reviewed separately.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Thought they should have a special work session to review the project
- Try to get all the drawings in the scale
- They could break out some of the details on separate sheets
- Was concerned with so much pad space taking up the site, the large buildings in front make it difficult to lease the buildings in the rear
- Nice looking center, its going in the right direction, a little concerned with the multi-family
- The multi-family probably should look different

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Because this project backs up to the freeway they need to be careful about having 4-sided architecture
- Likes there theme

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- There seem to be a lot of browns and beiges, could the out-parcels have additional colors?
- Thought the windows were not as important as they used to be, a lot of centers are destination driven and a certain mix of retailers will follow the major; he thought it could work

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Seems flat
- Cornices appear to be the same
- Could the entries have arches, gables, barrel rows, something?
- Likes coping/cornice look but could it be broken up?

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Agreed with Boardmember Burgheimer regarding having too many pads blocking other parcels

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Very concerned with safety of pedestrians between the multi-family and the retail across Hampton Avenue
- Suggested round-a-bouts or at least a pedestrian light.

CASE: Sanctuary on Higley
SEC Enid & Higley

REQUEST: Approval of a multi-family residential project

DISCUSSION: Fred Woods represented the case and stated all the units would have gates and bollards at the private yards, and painted steel half walls. He stated they were committed to go with that.

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Liked the fact that they face onto the park

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Could the 6' wall have some interest? Maybe stone or insets.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The minty green color does not look good with the other accent colors, maybe a warm green
- Maybe there are too many color variations

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Maybe use a pale olive green

CASE: California Pizza Kitchen
1850 S Val Vista

REQUEST: Approval of a restaurant at Dana Park

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- The south elevation looks flat
- Will colors complement the other pad restaurants?

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Add color so it wraps around
- The parking is awkward at the delivery area
- Maybe the delivery trucks could parallel park
- Where are refuse enclosures?
- If there is to be an outdoor dining area show it on the plan

CASE: Danny's Car Wash
202 & Dobson

REQUEST: Approval of an office light manufacturing project

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Need to be careful with the cornice mass
- Look at it 3 dimensionally
- Concern with what the interior looks like when doors are up
- Other Danny's sites have a problem with traffic circulation
- Concern for safety of pedestrians
- Make sure the dark colors are sealed well so the spray off from detergents don't create a long term maintenance problem
- Provide color photos of inside color

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Flaw between 'C' store and car wash and flow of traffic
- Painted steel columns don't work visually, beef them up
- Do they have to have 6 bays

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Concerned about safety of pedestrians and the stacking area between the vacuum canopy and the car wash
- Make the fascia wider to provide more shade
- Need something more solid at the end, the proportion of the canopy seems awkward

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Cornice not needed
- Carry white block around the base of the carwash entrance

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Appreciate the way it ties in to Riverview

CASE: Pecos Commerce Center
SWC Pecos & 80th Street

REQUEST: Approval of an office light manufacturing project

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Explain color placement
- Looks like a big box
- Needs relief
- Concerned with racing stripes
- Could they break up the windows, too much repetition

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Could they get some movement in the buildings
- Would like more landscaping in the front
- Need to see actual colors on the elevations

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Look at Broadway and Dobson as an example
- Need to set a higher standard
- Need employee break areas

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Would like to see them take some of the landscaping between buildings and enhance the fronts
- Looks like a big box
- Too simple
- Draw attention to entrances
- Need different patterns

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Rethink the Swan Hill Olive, very hard to find
- Sweet Acacia does better at higher elevations
- Find a substitution for the petite pink oleanders

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Very industrial
- This will set the tone for future development
- Need to set the tone higher

CASE: Choice Bank
Baseline & Vineyard

REQUEST: Approval of a 2-story bank

DISCUSSION:

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Trash enclosure needs to move

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Need drive-through windows to be bigger

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Proportional issues with tower component and stone
- Too many sizes to windows

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Need more parking

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Why t-store
- Work on proportion

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Windows are small
- Looks like a hotel
- Not proportioned
- Make block banding wider

CASE: Higley Professional Plaza
Higley south of Broadway

REQUEST: Approval of an office project

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Four sided architecture doesn't mean exactly the same on all four sides
- You don't have to add things just change them up so they are not so repetitive
- Need to have a little more variety, can still be consistent
- Maybe the window sizes change

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- All four sides are exactly the same
- Could be more visually interesting if there were subtle differences
- You could flip the colors
- Agree the window sizes could be change
- Buildings are monotonous

Chair Pete Berzins:

- If there are exam rooms you have windows that would have to be covered up
- Make the architecture on the outside reflect the interior floor plan
- Browns don't work well with gray mortar

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Could you vary the block a little?
- The pop-out elements could be varied on different buildings
- There is a lot of brown

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- You have good bones to start with and good materials
- Nice buildings, but could be nicer with a little variation

CASE: Altier Credit Union
Power & Warner

REQUEST: Approval of a financial institution

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- The equal location is awkward
- Could they bring the mullion down
- There needs to be more room around the canopies
- On the west elevation at the coping split could they jog a foot, or even 6" to complete the shape to give an element

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The proportions look a little funny
- Maybe classical proportions 1/3 – 2/3 not 50/50
- It looks like the window is being forced around, could there be a variation of width or height
- The entry is too downplayed
- Building is too tall, would look nicer if it was shorter
- Could they move mechanical to lower park of the building

Chair Pete Berzins:

- It looks like a castle
- The proportion issue is very important
- You need to try to reduce the height

CASE: Purrfect Auto
10559 E Main

REQUEST: Approval of an auto repair facility

DISCUSSION: Jeff Looker represented the case

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Could they use one light in the center instead of two over the door
- Could use a few more lights

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Agreed with Rob regarding placement of the light
- Would prefer to see a galvalume

CASE: Southern & Crismon Retail
Sec Southern & Crismon

REQUEST: Approval of a retail center

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Suggested a wainscot or reveal on the rear or could use a tonal shade at the lower level

2. Call to Order:

Chair Pete Berzins called the meeting to order

Update of the Zoning Ordinance

Gordon Sheffield spoke to the Board and stated there are seven citizen advisory boards involved in this process. Besides this Board, there is the Planning and Zoning Board, the Downtown Development Committee, the Board of Adjustment, the Housing Advisory Board, the Economic Development Advisory Board, and the Historic Preservation Committee. He stated the main goal for this project is to align the Zoning Ordinance with the goals and objectives of the Mesa General Plan which was passed in 2002 by the Council and ratified by the voters. The idea was also to modify the review processes, update the land use districts, especially mixed uses, transit oriented development, etc. The idea was also to update the design guidelines and the development standards; specifically with the use of neighborhood and sub-area plans. Mesa is a very large City and we have a one size fits all Code. The idea is to recognize there are differences within the community and we should have development standards that recognize those differences. To reflect the changing nature of Mesa, to more stable growth, and address by-passed properties. Recognize the diversified of development interests, as well as continued compliance with State and Federal laws. They introduced the project to Council in June, they had stakeholder interviews in September, developed an issues list on a staff basis in October, concluded a report based on what the stakeholders said, introduced the consultant to the planning board and did a City tour in October, developed a web site which is www.cityofmesa.org/planning/zoningordinancerewrite where they will post any information they have including any reports they receive, in addition to that if anyone has comments they can go to that page and there is a form where you can basically answer a couple of questions and that goes to staff and they can get it to the consultant. They made a presentation to a sub-committee of the City Council called the General Development Committee last month. They had a community workshop and had over 60 people present. There will be an issues and options paper that should come out in late February or early March. There will be a joint meeting with the Planning and Zoning Board and Downtown Development Committee that will be held the end of March and it will be a community workshop. For the stakeholder interviews they invited 54 people who use the Code a lot. Different Boards, different developers, different neighborhood interests, there were 44 in attendance. They asked them two basic questions; what aspects of the Code should be changed, and what aspects should stay the same. They wanted the review process streamlined; update the purposes and standards; recognize urban, suburban, and transitional areas; increase design quality; increase the flexibility of the Zoning Code by adding urban standards as opposed to suburban orientation of the Code; update the historic preservation chapter; update enforcement provisions; reorganize and reformat to make the Code easier to use; and revise specific standards, specifically special uses, commercial uses, and RV and manufactured homes. The community workshop which was the second point . They sent out 1100 applications which included everyone who had been an applicant to the Design Review Board, Planning and Zoning Board, or Board of Adjustment for the last year which was 550 applicants. They also sent it to every registered neighborhood contact, that was over 500 applicants. They also sent it to the

members of the seven Board mentioned earlier. Out of that 60 people attended. Two basic questions; what are the problems with the existing Code and what are the priorities for the new Code? They got 13 categories: implement the General Plan; facilitate project reviews; user friendly Ordinance; encourage in-fill; facilitate mother-in-law units; ensure high quality design; make it easier to replace manufactured homes; the design guidelines should reflect neighborhood character; provide incentives for green building; several people talked about problem uses, such as payday loans and check cashing uses, pawn shops, tattoo parlors, day labor, and group homes.

The first part of the project has been inventory and analysis phase. What they have been doing is taking inventory of what we have and asking those who use it how it needs to change. The second phase will be an issues and options phase. Now what options do we have to address the issues. The current Code is based on a Supreme Court case from the 1920's. A lot of the Mesa Zoning Code follows that case. In the 1980's a performance based Code came out which is based on the land uses around you. The Mesa Ordinance has some elements of that. In addition to that there is a "form bases" code now. Rather than putting use first they put the architecture first and then figuring out what uses come after that. In the Mesa Code the use comes first and then design is addressed. The emphasis of this project is to create a hy-brid code. The idea is to equal out some of the emphasis between these types of things to make the Code more predictability. Predictability would allow neighborhoods to predict what will happen, and at the same time the developer can predict what is necessary to put a project through. They will try to be orderly, they will try to make it easier to find things, use understandable language, be brief and to the point, visual, lots of charts and pictures. They will also be positive and emphasize what you can do rather than what you can't do. The acronyms they are trying to incorporate are: simplicity, predictability, accountability, consistency, and efficiency. The project schedule they are trying to meet is in less than 18 months; so far they are 1/3 of the way. They will be asking the Board for a second meeting during the month to meet with Planning and Zoning.

3. <u>Approval of the Minutes of the December 6, 2006 Meeting:</u>

On a motion by Dave Richins seconded by Vince DiBella the Board unanimously approved the minutes with the revision stating that Wendy LeSueur was present.

4. <u>Design Review Cases</u>:

DRAFTMINUTES OF THE JANUARY 3, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-01 Toyota at Riverview
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC of Dobson & 202
REQUEST: Approval of Toyota at Riverview
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Miller Family Real Estate
APPLICANT: Trenton Jones
ARCHITECT: Jeffrey Fisher

REQUEST: Approval of a new car dealership

SUMMARY: Trent Jones and Jeff Fisher represented the case. Mr. Jones stated the designs had not changed drastically from the December work session. The awnings corresponded with the Riverview project on the east side of Dobson. The looked at the Mesa Stone wainscoting and attempted to expand the Mesa Stone but were unable to find any place where it worked cohesively.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated he did not think this went far enough to be a cohesive center. He thought they were still prototype buildings and had not been designed for the area. He thought the freeway landmark sign was supposed to dictate the architecture and that was not a good idea. He thought the public had been sold an idea that this would be a unified place and it was not. These were prototype buildings with a few token changes.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur agreed more could be done to tie in better. She thought they could still use the elements that were important to Toyota and Honda and use materials that mirror what was in the area.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought this was very high tech, sleek architecture which you can see in many other areas of the Valley. The Board thought that Riverview would be a unique site. He thought Riverview was very festive. This is separated by Dobson Road so you might be able to say one side of Dobson is one way and the other side is this way, but what is the unifying link. He thought the Board had suggested other things the applicant could have done. The suggested using other materials from Riverview other than just the Mesa Stone. He understood they were trying to portray a corporate image, so he suggested the unifying link could be the landscaping. He knew there were areas that were retail display that needed a different type of landscaping, but he did not want the project to be harsh. Staffmember Lesley Davis confirmed they were meeting the landscape requirements of the Code, and they were using the same palette from across the street. They were also following the Design Guidelines for Riverview regarding landscaping, hardscape and pedestrian connections. He confirmed the six foot site walls would screen trash enclosures and around the auto body shop. The display zones would not be screened. He confirmed the materials of the screen walls would be pulled from the main Riverview project. The difference would be the color of the block.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley was concerned with the follow-up submittal. He thought the prototype was not appropriate for this site. Even though the project across Dobson was

an eclectic mix, each portion seemed to take a portion from the overall design theme. He did not think this project did that. There needed to be customer friendly entrances and areas around the building, not to mention that fact that there would be a sea of white and gray building with a minimal splash of color. He thought it fell short of the warm architectural feel both in color, material and texture that was to exist at Riverview.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed the light fixtures, the site furniture, and the landscaping were the same as Riverview. He stated he was in favor of zones at Riverview and this had come up from where it had been, it was modern. He didn't know where they could go from here. He stated that people in his neighborhood were very pleased with the dealerships that were proposed. He was trying to keep a balance between design and economic development.

Chair Pete Berzins stated he was not willing to let economic development or who the tenant is drive his decisions. He stated he was on the Board because he was supposed to try to ensure that for the City of Mesa we have certain standards and certain things were met. He had to look at what he thought was architecturally sound for that purpose. He stated that one of the things Mr. Sheffield said was mentioned at the stakeholders meeting was increased design quality. He thought the Board was making a mistake if they allowed applicants to keep coming back with the same project until the Board finally threw up their hands and said OK. Regarding the buildings he thought the issue was where they are being located. He was concerned with three buildings looking so much alike. He did not think what they were presenting fit Riverview. He didn't see much effort by the applicants to make revisions.

Boardmember Richins then stated that citizens did the right to expect better design at Riverview because tax money was subsidizing the projects. They could expect a higher level of quality, but where should it go?

Boardmember Burgheimer thought the Board had been consistent in asking for better design. He did not think the projects matched the Freeway Landmark Monument Signs at all and the signs were supposed represent what would happen at the sites. He thought the buildings were nice but this project was supposed to be a higher standard. He thought the Board needed to hold firm and not cave because they are auto dealers. He did not think they should exactly match or that they could not be modern, but they should not be prototypes that exist in other locations throughout the Valley and don't fit Riverview.

Mr. Fisher then spoke and stated they had tried to listen to the Board and addressed it by introducing materials and features that are not in the corporate palette, that tied to buildings across the street. The were using the same landscaping and site furniture as the project across Dobson. He stated they were limited as developers to corporate image. The manufacturers were unwilling to bend. There were certain elements that were quite sacred to their image. The reason they look the same is that the different manufactures hire the same architects to create their images. You will see it throughout the nation. 1,200 dealerships are being forced to use this prototype.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur stated that on the previously discussed case, the Tesco was going into a center with existing architecture and they had pulled elements in, but yet

they had kept it modern and much more interesting, to reflect their corporate image. Couldn't this applicant do something similar and be more aggressive with the design and still keep the modern look, while still capturing the flavor of the area.

Mr. Fisher thought they had done that. He stated it was a tight rope, looking for quality of materials of consistency and design. He didn't think it should look like Bass Pro Shop.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated some of this started long before these projects were probably started. He understood it was very tough for them, but there was an expectation for this entire development early on.

Mr. Jones stated that regarding materiality and what the grocery store was able to do was keep the same geometry of the building and change the materiality. With the dealerships the materiality is one of their key elements. The aluminum panels on the majority of the facades is a key element and they are specific on the coloring of that. They will not budge on the silver toned acm, and he cannot figure out how a silver toned acm will correspond with the materials across the street.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur questioned why they couldn't do more with the body massing of the structure where they reflect some of the colors or textures of Riverview and still then mesh together the panels on the front so they have the main components that identify their clients. Even those panels could mesh with the others. They did some of the wainscoting, which was a nice gesture, but they have all the cars and landscaping so most people won't see that unless they are close to the buildings. It seemed there could be a larger block at the main mass and then they could put on the front the identifying features that were important to the owners.

Boardmember Richins was concerned the elements would clash.

The Board then suggested using something other than the white super stone, ground face block, which really you see very little of at Riverview. What is seen driving by Riverview is red. It was suggested they use red massing at a level where it is visible. They didn't think cornicing would work. The canopy detail at Riverview and some of the other pedestrian canopy details could be put on here. The way the canopies are detailed could be used. The canopies the applicants were proposing were used on small pad buildings rather than using the canopy details from the larger project. They wanted to see building elements that worked with the project across the street not just site furniture.

Boardmember Bottomley stated that one of the comments early on regarding the Cinemark was that it wasn't enough to have nice landscaping around the building. There needed to be acceptable architecture. It was good to have the same landscape theme but it was not enough to ring the buildings with compatible landscaping. They were not saying start over they were saying when you squint at the this and what is across the street will you see touches and tie ins that make it look like the same family. Mr. Fisher stated first the Board said the commonality won't be seen because of the landscaping but then they say the landscaping didn't matter. Boardmember Bottomley stated the landscaping is important but it is only one aspect of tying it together. More than just the landscaping needs to match.

Staffmember Kim Steadman stated first time the Board saw this they gave very strong direction to make changes. Staff expected more changes and they came back with pilasters and horizontal banding. Staff thought the Board expected more than that, but at last months work session they did ask for more, but they were not as strong as they are this month. He was concerned they had given the applicants the impression they wanted a few changes but they were mostly OK. Staff went with the comments from the December work session. If they took them building by building could they write conditions of approval.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley stated he understood what it was like to work with corporate clients. He understood the front of the buildings were sacred, but they were asking for changes to the rest of the buildings. They could use more rustic material, not as rustic as Bass Pro, but something like studio or loft architecture where they use rustic and modern materials together. If done right in the right proportions they can be very attractive.

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested they might try scoring, or a change of plane with the alucobond, that would tie into the cornicing, so the detail of the scoring ties in. Could there be a wider reveal joint? He did not think Scottsdale dealerships look like Awatukee dealerships because they hold firm.

Boardmember Bottomley stated he had an appreciation for all varieties of buildings and sleek contemporary buildings might be fine in another location, but not at Riverview. There was too much contrast. They did not want it to be identical, they want more color, more cohesiveness.

Boardmember Nielsen stated that the concept of Riverview was laid out very early on and this doesn't fit that. Riverview is a destination, and this could be a great element within that. He didn't think it would take a lot to get there.

Boardmember Bottomley stated that "big box" corporations try to bully their way into communities and it was wrong to allow that. He stated they were not necessarily trying to do unrealistic things. There is masonry on this building so maybe introduce a different type of masonry, a different color of masonry, not eliminate the masonry and make it all metal. He thought it was possible to get it where it needs to be. It was a battle of the wills, they are not saying start over, just consider a marriage of the two.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR07-01 be continued to a January 10, 2007:

Discussion: Boardmember Dave Richins stated he thought the applicant would rather have a denial so they can go to Council. Boardmember Tom Bottomley did not think that was fair because on the one hand the public is saying they want higher design standards and on the other that says corporate tax dollars. He did not want to be the Board that gets by-passed. Boardmember Richins thought at the December work session the Board was OK with what they presented.

DRAFTMINUTES OF THE JANUARY 3, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Staffmember Kim Steadman stated the site plan review for this case goes to Council January 22, so if they could have a special meeting before that they would not be holding them up. If they deny them they could not get to Council until sometime in February, so that would be holding them up. He confirmed with the applicant that the owners would not allow the background cubes to look like old industrial as background with new modern in front.

Boardmember Bottomley confirmed that corporate was very reluctant to bend at all.

Staffmember Kim Steadman confirmed Mr. Fisher did not think adding warmer colors would work. He did not think the integrity of the building would be enhanced. He said they were trying to find colors that complement the corporate image. They could not change the aluminum. They could not change the illuminated entryway. The Board stated they were not asking for changes on the front. They could still have the clean slick look of the front but revise the other portions of the building. Overall when you look at Riverview you see red tones not white. Mr. Jones stated red is almost the antithesis of the corporate image, they like sleek, modern, the brick is reminiscent of old industrial zones. Mr. Fisher stated that the bent pipe awnings opposed to the fabric awnings the open awnings were a more modern contemporary motif, so they could bring those over, but they are white. Boardmember Burgheimer suggested they look at the whole center and not micromanage such small details, but look at it as a whole. Look at whether it feels like it belongs. He understood they were taking some small pieces but the average consumer would not be able to see such small elements and see it is part of it. The choices of materials don't look that way. Mr. Fisher stated they were not trying to play hard ball, they wanted to be part of the community. Many communities want these dealerships, but they like this site and the convergence of the freeways. Maybe they need to let the Board know what is sacred and what can and can't be changed. Boardmember Burgheimer suggested maybe the Board could show them elevations of other projects at Riverview and they could do a black and white with buff paper. The Board wants to help them, they are not trying to be an obstacle.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

DRAFTMINUTES OF THE JANUARY 3, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-02 Nissan at Riverview
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC of Dobson & 202
REQUEST: Approval of Riverview Nissan
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Miller Family Real Estate
APPLICANT: Trenton Jones
ARCHITECT: Jeffrey Fisher

REQUEST: Approval of a new car dealership

SUMMARY: Trent Jones and Jeff Fisher represented the case. Mr. Jones stated the designs had not changed drastically from the December work session. The awnings corresponded with the Riverview project on the east side of Dobson. The looked at the Mesa Stone wainscoting and attempted to expand the Mesa Stone but were unable to find any place where it worked cohesively.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated he did not think this went far enough to be a cohesive center. He thought they were still prototype buildings and had not been designed for the area. He thought the freeway landmark sign was supposed to dictate the architecture and that was not a good idea. He thought the public had been sold an idea that this would be a unified place and it was not. These were prototype buildings with a few token changes.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur agreed more could be done to tie in better. She thought they could still use the elements that were important to Toyota and Honda and use materials that mirror what was in the area.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought this was very high tech, sleek architecture which you can see in many other areas of the Valley. The Board thought that Riverview would be a unique site. He thought Riverview was very festive. This is separated by Dobson Road so you might be able to say one side of Dobson is one way and the other side is this way, but what is the unifying link. He thought the Board had suggested other things the applicant could have done. The suggested using other materials from Riverview other than just the Mesa Stone. He understood they were trying to portray a corporate image, so he suggested the unifying link could be the landscaping. He knew there were areas that were retail display that needed a different type of landscaping, but he did not want the project to be harsh. Staffmember Lesley Davis confirmed they were meeting the landscape requirements of the Code, and they were using the same palette from across the street. They were also following the Design Guidelines for Riverview regarding landscaping, hardscape and pedestrian connections. He confirmed the six foot site walls would screen trash enclosures and around the auto body shop. The display zones would not be screened. He confirmed the materials of the screen walls would be pulled from the main Riverview project. The difference would be the color of the block.

DRAFTMINUTES OF THE JANUARY 3, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Tom Bottomley was concerned with the follow-up submittal. He thought the prototype was not appropriate for this site. Even though the project across Dobson was an eclectic mix, each portion seemed to take a portion from the overall design theme. He did not think this project did that. There needed to be customer friendly entrances and areas around the building, not to mention that fact that there would be a sea of white and gray building with a minimal splash of color. He thought it fell short of the warm architectural feel both in color, material and texture that was to exist at Riverview.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed the light fixtures, the site furniture, and the landscaping were the same as Riverview. He stated he was in favor of zones at Riverview and this had come up from where it had been, it was modern. He didn't know where they could go from here. He stated that people in his neighborhood were very pleased with the dealerships that were proposed. He was trying to keep a balance between design and economic development.

Chair Pete Berzins stated he was not willing to let economic development or who the tenant is drive his decisions. He stated he was on the Board because he was supposed to try to ensure that for the City of Mesa we have certain standards and certain things were met. He had to look at what he thought was architecturally sound for that purpose. He stated that one of the things Mr. Sheffield said was mentioned at the stakeholders meeting was increased design quality. He thought the Board was making a mistake if they allowed applicants to keep coming back with the same project until the Board finally threw up their hands and said OK. Regarding the buildings he thought the issue was where they are being located. He was concerned with three buildings looking so much alike. He did not think what they were presenting fit Riverview. He didn't see much effort by the applicants to make revisions.

Boardmember Richins then stated that citizens did the right to expect better design at Riverview because tax money was subsidizing the projects. They could expect a higher level of quality, but where should it go?

Boardmember Burgheimer thought the Board had been consistent in asking for better design. He did not think the projects matched the Freeway Landmark Monument Signs at all and the signs were supposed represent what would happen at the sites. He thought the buildings were nice but this project was supposed to be a higher standard. He thought the Board needed to hold firm and not cave because they are auto dealers. He did not think they should exactly match or that they could not be modern, but they should not be prototypes that exist in other locations throughout the Valley and don't fit Riverview.

Mr. Fisher then spoke and stated they had tried to listen to the Board and addressed it by introducing materials and features that are not in the corporate palette, that tied to buildings across the street. The were using the same landscaping and site furniture as the project across Dobson. He stated they were limited as developers to corporate image. The manufacturers were unwilling to bend. There were certain elements that were quite sacred to their image. The reason they look the same is that the different manufactures hire the same architects to create their images. You will see it throughout the nation. 1,200 dealerships are being forced to use this prototype.

DRAFTMINUTES OF THE JANUARY 3, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur stated that on the previously discussed case, the Tesco was going into a center with existing architecture and they had pulled elements in, but yet they had kept it modern and much more interesting, to reflect their corporate image. Couldn't this applicant do something similar and be more aggressive with the design and still keep the modern look, while still capturing the flavor of the area.

Mr. Fisher thought they had done that. He stated it was a tight rope, looking for quality of materials of consistency and design. He didn't think it should look like Bass Pro Shop.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated some of this started long before these projects were probably started. He understood it was very tough for them, but there was an expectation for this entire development early on.

Mr. Jones stated that regarding materiality and what the grocery store was able to do was keep the same geometry of the building and change the materiality. With the dealerships the materiality is one of their key elements. The aluminum panels on the majority of the facades is a key element and they are specific on the coloring of that. They will not budge on the silver toned acm, and he cannot figure out how a silver toned acm will correspond with the materials across the street.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur questioned why they couldn't do more with the body massing of the structure where they reflect some of the colors or textures of Riverview and still then mesh together the panels on the front so they have the main components that identify their clients. Even those panels could mesh with the others. They did some of the wainscoting, which was a nice gesture, but they have all the cars and landscaping so most people won't see that unless they are close to the buildings. It seemed there could be a larger block at the main mass and then they could put on the front the identifying features that were important to the owners.

Boardmember Richins was concerned the elements would clash.

The Board then suggested using something other than the white super stone, ground face block, which really you see very little of at Riverview. What is seen driving by Riverview is red. It was suggested they use red massing at a level where it is visible. They didn't think cornicing would work. The canopy detail at Riverview and some of the other pedestrian canopy details could be put on here. The way the canopies are detailed could be used. The canopies the applicants were proposing were used on small pad buildings rather than using the canopy details from the larger project. They wanted to see building elements that worked with the project across the street not just site furniture.

Boardmember Bottomley stated that one of the comments early on regarding the Cinemark was that it wasn't enough to have nice landscaping around the building. There needed to be acceptable architecture. It was good to have the same landscape theme but it was not enough to ring the buildings with compatible landscaping. They were not saying start over they were saying when you squint at the this and what is across the street will you see touches and tie ins that make it look like the same family. Mr. Fisher stated first the Board said the commonality won't be seen because of the landscaping but then they say the landscaping didn't matter. Boardmember Bottomley stated the landscaping is important

but it is only one aspect of tying it together. More than just the landscaping needs to match.

Staffmember Kim Steadman stated first time the Board saw this they gave very strong direction to make changes. Staff expected more changes and they came back with pilasters and horizontal banding. Staff thought the Board expected more than that, but at last months work session they did ask for more, but they were not as strong as they are this month. He was concerned they had given the applicants the impression they wanted a few changes but they were mostly OK. Staff went with the comments from the December work session. If they took them building by building could they write conditions of approval.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley stated he understood what it was like to work with corporate clients. He understood the front of the buildings were sacred, but they were asking for changes to the rest of the buildings. They could use more rustic material, not as rustic as Bass Pro, but something like studio or loft architecture where they use rustic and modern materials together. If done right in the right proportions they can be very attractive.

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested they might try scoring, or a change of plane with the alucobond, that would tie into the cornicing, so the detail of the scoring ties in. Could there be a wider reveal joint? He did not think Scottsdale dealerships look like Awatukee dealerships because they hold firm.

Boardmember Bottomley stated he had an appreciation for all varieties of buildings and sleek contemporary buildings might be fine in another location, but not at Riverview. There was too much contrast. They did not want it to be identical, they want more color, more cohesiveness.

Boardmember Nielsen stated that the concept of Riverview was laid out very early on and this doesn't fit that. Riverview is a destination, and this could be a great element within that. He didn't think it would take a lot to get there.

Boardmember Bottomley stated that "big box" corporations try to bully their way into communities and it was wrong to allow that. He stated they were not necessarily trying to do unrealistic things. There is masonry on this building so maybe introduce a different type of masonry, a different color of masonry, not eliminate the masonry and make it all metal. He thought it was possible to get it where it needs to be. It was a battle of the wills, they are not saying start over, just consider a marriage of the two.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR07-01 be continued to a January 10, 2007:

Discussion: Boardmember Dave Richins stated he thought the applicant would rather have a denial so they can go to Council. Boardmember Tom Bottomley did not think that was fair because on the one hand the public is saying they want higher design standards and on the other that says corporate tax dollars. He did not want to be the Board that gets by-passed. Boardmember Richins thought at the December work session the Board was OK

with what they presented.

Staffmember Kim Steadman stated the site plan review for this case goes to Council January 22, so if they could have a special meeting before that they would not be holding them up. If they deny them they could not get to Council until sometime in February, so that would be holding them up. He confirmed with the applicant that the owners would not allow the background cubes to look like old industrial as background with new modern in front.

Boardmember Bottomley confirmed that corporate was very reluctant to bend at all.

Staffmember Kim Steadman confirmed Mr. Fisher did not think adding warmer colors would work. He did not think the integrity of the building would be enhanced. He said they were trying to find colors that complement the corporate image. They could not change the aluminum. They could not change the illuminated entryway. The Board stated they were not asking for changes on the front. They could still have the clean slick look of the front but revise the other portions of the building. Overall when you look at Riverview you see red tones not white. Mr. Jones stated red is almost the antithesis of the corporate image, they like sleek, modern, the brick is reminiscent of old industrial zones. Mr. Fisher stated that the bent pipe awnings opposed to the fabric awnings the open awnings were a more modern contemporary motif, so they could bring those over, but they are white. Boardmember Burgheimer suggested they look at the whole center and not micromanage such small details, but look at it as a whole. Look at whether it feels like it belongs. He understood they were taking some small pieces but the average consumer would not be able to see such small elements and see it is part of it. The choices of materials don't look that way. Mr. Fisher stated they were not trying to play hard ball, they wanted to be part of the community. Many communities want these dealerships, but they like this site and the convergence of the freeways. Maybe they need to let the Board know what is sacred and what can and can't be changed. Boardmember Burgheimer suggested maybe the Board could show them elevations of other projects at Riverview and they could do a black and white with buff paper. The Board wants to help them, they are not trying to be an obstacle.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

DRAFTMINUTES OF THE JANUARY 3, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-03 Dealership 3
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC of Dobson & 202
REQUEST: Approval of Dealer 3 at Riverview
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Miller Family Real Estate
APPLICANT: Trenton Jones
ARCHITECT: Jeffrey Fisher

REQUEST: Approval of a new car dealership

SUMMARY: Trent Jones and Jeff Fisher represented the case. Mr. Jones stated the designs had not changed drastically from the December work session. The awnings corresponded with the Riverview project on the east side of Dobson. The looked at the Mesa Stone wainscoting and attempted to expand the Mesa Stone but were unable to find any place where it worked cohesively.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated he did not think this went far enough to be a cohesive center. He thought they were still prototype buildings and had not been designed for the area. He thought the freeway landmark sign was supposed to dictate the architecture and that was not a good idea. He thought the public had been sold an idea that this would be a unified place and it was not. These were prototype buildings with a few token changes.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur agreed more could be done to tie in better. She thought they could still use the elements that were important to Toyota and Honda and use materials that mirror what was in the area.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought this was very high tech, sleek architecture which you can see in many other areas of the Valley. The Board thought that Riverview would be a unique site. He thought Riverview was very festive. This is separated by Dobson Road so you might be able to say one side of Dobson is one way and the other side is this way, but what is the unifying link. He thought the Board had suggested other things the applicant could have done. The suggested using other materials from Riverview other than just the Mesa Stone. He understood they were trying to portray a corporate image, so he suggested the unifying link could be the landscaping. He knew there were areas that were retail display that needed a different type of landscaping, but he did not want the project to be harsh. Staffmember Lesley Davis confirmed they were meeting the landscape requirements of the Code, and they were using the same palette from across the street. They were also following the Design Guidelines for Riverview regarding landscaping, hardscape and pedestrian connections. He confirmed the six foot site walls would screen trash enclosures and around the auto body shop. The display zones would not be screened. He confirmed the materials of the screen walls would be pulled from the main Riverview project. The difference would be the color of the block.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley was concerned with the follow-up submittal. He thought the

prototype was not appropriate for this site. Even though the project across Dobson was an eclectic mix, each portion seemed to take a portion from the overall design theme. He did not think this project did that. There needed to be customer friendly entrances and areas around the building, not to mention that fact that there would be a sea of white and gray building with a minimal splash of color. He thought it fell short of the warm architectural feel both in color, material and texture that was to exist at Riverview.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed the light fixtures, the site furniture, and the landscaping were the same as Riverview. He stated he was in favor of zones at Riverview and this had come up from where it had been, it was modern. He didn't know where they could go from here. He stated that people in his neighborhood were very pleased with the dealerships that were proposed. He was trying to keep a balance between design and economic development.

Chair Pete Berzins stated he was not willing to let economic development or who the tenant is drive his decisions. He stated he was on the Board because he was supposed to try to ensure that for the City of Mesa we have certain standards and certain things were met. He had to look at what he thought was architecturally sound for that purpose. He stated that one of the things Mr. Sheffield said was mentioned at the stakeholders meeting was increased design quality. He thought the Board was making a mistake if they allowed applicants to keep coming back with the same project until the Board finally threw up their hands and said OK. Regarding the buildings he thought the issue was where they are being located. He was concerned with three buildings looking so much alike. He did not think what they were presenting fit Riverview. He didn't see much effort by the applicants to make revisions.

Boardmember Richins then stated that citizens did the right to expect better design at Riverview because tax money was subsidizing the projects. They could expect a higher level of quality, but where should it go?

Boardmember Burgheimer thought the Board had been consistent in asking for better design. He did not think the projects matched the Freeway Landmark Monument Signs at all and the signs were supposed represent what would happen at the sites. He thought the buildings were nice but this project was supposed to be a higher standard. He thought the Board needed to hold firm and not cave because they are auto dealers. He did not think they should exactly match or that they could not be modern, but they should not be prototypes that exist in other locations throughout the Valley and don't fit Riverview.

Mr. Fisher then spoke and stated they had tried to listen to the Board and addressed it by introducing materials and features that are not in the corporate palette, that tied to buildings across the street. The were using the same landscaping and site furniture as the project across Dobson. He stated they were limited as developers to corporate image. The manufacturers were unwilling to bend. There were certain elements that were quite sacred to their image. The reason they look the same is that the different manufactures hire the same architects to create their images. You will see it throughout the nation. 1,200 dealerships are being forced to use this prototype.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur stated that on the previously discussed case, the Tesco

was going into a center with existing architecture and they had pulled elements in, but yet they had kept it modern and much more interesting, to reflect their corporate image. Couldn't this applicant do something similar and be more aggressive with the design and still keep the modern look, while still capturing the flavor of the area.

Mr. Fisher thought they had done that. He stated it was a tight rope, looking for quality of materials of consistency and design. He didn't think it should look like Bass Pro Shop.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated some of this started long before these projects were probably started. He understood it was very tough for them, but there was an expectation for this entire development early on.

Mr. Jones stated that regarding materiality and what the grocery store was able to do was keep the same geometry of the building and change the materiality. With the dealerships the materiality is one of their key elements. The aluminum panels on the majority of the facades is a key element and they are specific on the coloring of that. They will not budge on the silver toned acm, and he cannot figure out how a silver toned acm will correspond with the materials across the street.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur questioned why they couldn't do more with the body massing of the structure where they reflect some of the colors or textures of Riverview and still then mesh together the panels on the front so they have the main components that identify their clients. Even those panels could mesh with the others. They did some of the wainscoting, which was a nice gesture, but they have all the cars and landscaping so most people won't see that unless they are close to the buildings. It seemed there could be a larger block at the main mass and then they could put on the front the identifying features that were important to the owners.

Boardmember Richins was concerned the elements would clash.

The Board then suggested using something other than the white super stone, ground face block, which really you see very little of at Riverview. What is seen driving by Riverview is red. It was suggested they use red massing at a level where it is visible. They didn't think cornicing would work. The canopy detail at Riverview and some of the other pedestrian canopy details could be put on here. The way the canopies are detailed could be used. The canopies the applicants were proposing were used on small pad buildings rather than using the canopy details from the larger project. They wanted to see building elements that worked with the project across the street not just site furniture.

Boardmember Bottomley stated that one of the comments early on regarding the Cinemark was that it wasn't enough to have nice landscaping around the building. There needed to be acceptable architecture. It was good to have the same landscape theme but it was not enough to ring the buildings with compatible landscaping. They were not saying start over they were saying when you squint at the this and what is across the street will you see touches and tie ins that make it look like the same family. Mr. Fisher stated first the Board said the commonality won't be seen because of the landscaping but then they say the landscaping didn't matter. Boardmember Bottomley stated the landscaping is important but it is only one aspect of tying it together. More than just the landscaping needs to

match.

Staffmember Kim Steadman stated first time the Board saw this they gave very strong direction to make changes. Staff expected more changes and they came back with pilasters and horizontal banding. Staff thought the Board expected more than that, but at last months work session they did ask for more, but they were not as strong as they are this month. He was concerned they had given the applicants the impression they wanted a few changes but they were mostly OK. Staff went with the comments from the December work session. If they took them building by building could they write conditions of approval.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley stated he understood what it was like to work with corporate clients. He understood the front of the buildings were sacred, but they were asking for changes to the rest of the buildings. They could use more rustic material, not as rustic as Bass Pro, but something like studio or loft architecture where they use rustic and modern materials together. If done right in the right proportions they can be very attractive.

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested they might try scoring, or a change of plane with the alucobond, that would tie into the cornicing, so the detail of the scoring ties in. Could there be a wider reveal joint? He did not think Scottsdale dealerships look like Awatukee dealerships because they hold firm.

Boardmember Bottomley stated he had an appreciation for all varieties of buildings and sleek contemporary buildings might be fine in another location, but not at Riverview. There was too much contrast. They did not want it to be identical, they want more color, more cohesiveness.

Boardmember Nielsen stated that the concept of Riverview was laid out very early on and this doesn't fit that. Riverview is a destination, and this could be a great element within that. He didn't think it would take a lot to get there.

Boardmember Bottomley stated that "big box" corporations try to bully their way into communities and it was wrong to allow that. He stated they were not necessarily trying to do unrealistic things. There is masonry on this building so maybe introduce a different type of masonry, a different color of masonry, not eliminate the masonry and make it all metal. He thought it was possible to get it where it needs to be. It was a battle of the wills, they are not saying start over, just consider a marriage of the two.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR07-01 be continued to a January 10, 2007:

Discussion: Boardmember Dave Richins stated he thought the applicant would rather have a denial so they can go to Council. Boardmember Tom Bottomley did not think that was fair because on the one hand the public is saying they want higher design standards and on the other that says corporate tax dollars. He did not want to be the Board that gets by-passed. Boardmember Richins thought at the December work session the Board was OK with what they presented.

Staffmember Kim Steadman stated the site plan review for this case goes to Council January 22, so if they could have a special meeting before that they would not be holding them up. If they deny them they could not get to Council until sometime in February, so that would be holding them up. He confirmed with the applicant that the owners would not allow the background cubes to look like old industrial as background with new modern in front.

Boardmember Bottomley confirmed that corporate was very reluctant to bend at all.

Staffmember Kim Steadman confirmed Mr. Fisher did not think adding warmer colors would work. He did not think the integrity of the building would be enhanced. He said they were trying to find colors that complement the corporate image. They could not change the aluminum. They could not change the illuminated entryway. The Board stated they were not asking for changes on the front. They could still have the clean slick look of the front but revise the other portions of the building. Overall when you look at Riverview you see red tones not white. Mr. Jones stated red is almost the antithesis of the corporate image, they like sleek, modern, the brick is reminiscent of old industrial zones. Mr. Fisher stated that the bent pipe awnings opposed to the fabric awnings the open awnings were a more modern contemporary motif, so they could bring those over, but they are white. Boardmember Burgheimer suggested they look at the whole center and not micromanage such small details, but look at it as a whole. Look at whether it feels like it belongs. He understood they were taking some small pieces but the average consumer would not be able to see such small elements and see it is part of it. The choices of materials don't look that way. Mr. Fisher stated they were not trying to play hard ball, they wanted to be part of the community. Many communities want these dealerships, but they like this site and the convergence of the freeways. Maybe they need to let the Board know what is sacred and what can and can't be changed. Boardmember Burgheimer suggested maybe the Board could show them elevations of other projects at Riverview and they could do a black and white with buff paper. The Board wants to help them, they are not trying to be an obstacle.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

DRAFTMINUTES OF THE JANUARY 3, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-04 Auto Body repair at Riverview
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC of Dobson & 202
REQUEST: Approval of LHM Auto Body Shop at Riverview
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Miller Family Real Estate
APPLICANT: Trenton Jones
ARCHITECT: Jeffrey Fisher

REQUEST: Approval of a LHM Auto Body Shop at Riverview

SUMMARY: Trent Jones and Jeff Fisher represented the case. Mr. Jones stated the designs had not changed drastically from the December work session. The awnings corresponded with the Riverview project on the east side of Dobson. The looked at the Mesa Stone wainscoting and attempted to expand the Mesa Stone but were unable to find any place where it worked cohesively.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated he did not think this went far enough to be a cohesive center. He thought they were still prototype buildings and had not been designed for the area. He thought the freeway landmark sign was supposed to dictate the architecture and that was not a good idea. He thought the public had been sold an idea that this would be a unified place and it was not. These were prototype buildings with a few token changes.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur agreed more could be done to tie in better. She thought they could still use the elements that were important to Toyota and Honda and use materials that mirror what was in the area.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought this was very high tech, sleek architecture which you can see in many other areas of the Valley. The Board thought that Riverview would be a unique site. He thought Riverview was very festive. This is separated by Dobson Road so you might be able to say one side of Dobson is one way and the other side is this way, but what is the unifying link. He thought the Board had suggested other things the applicant could have done. The suggested using other materials from Riverview other than just the Mesa Stone. He understood they were trying to portray a corporate image, so he suggested the unifying link could be the landscaping. He knew there were areas that were retail display that needed a different type of landscaping, but he did not want the project to be harsh. Staffmember Lesley Davis confirmed they were meeting the landscape requirements of the Code, and they were using the same palette from across the street. They were also following the Design Guidelines for Riverview regarding landscaping, hardscape and pedestrian connections. He confirmed the six foot site walls would screen trash enclosures and around the auto body shop. The display zones would not be screened. He confirmed the materials of the screen walls would be pulled from the main Riverview project. The difference would be the color of the block.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley was concerned with the follow-up submittal. He thought the

prototype was not appropriate for this site. Even though the project across Dobson was an eclectic mix, each portion seemed to take a portion from the overall design theme. He did not think this project did that. There needed to be customer friendly entrances and areas around the building, not to mention that fact that there would be a sea of white and gray building with a minimal splash of color. He thought it fell short of the warm architectural feel both in color, material and texture that was to exist at Riverview.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed the light fixtures, the site furniture, and the landscaping were the same as Riverview. He stated he was in favor of zones at Riverview and this had come up from where it had been, it was modern. He didn't know where they could go from here. He stated that people in his neighborhood were very pleased with the dealerships that were proposed. He was trying to keep a balance between design and economic development.

Chair Pete Berzins stated he was not willing to let economic development or who the tenant is drive his decisions. He stated he was on the Board because he was supposed to try to ensure that for the City of Mesa we have certain standards and certain things were met. He had to look at what he thought was architecturally sound for that purpose. He stated that one of the things Mr. Sheffield said was mentioned at the stakeholders meeting was increased design quality. He thought the Board was making a mistake if they allowed applicants to keep coming back with the same project until the Board finally threw up their hands and said OK. Regarding the buildings he thought the issue was where they are being located. He was concerned with three buildings looking so much alike. He did not think what they were presenting fit Riverview. He didn't see much effort by the applicants to make revisions.

Boardmember Richins then stated that citizens did the right to expect better design at Riverview because tax money was subsidizing the projects. They could expect a higher level of quality, but where should it go?

Boardmember Burgheimer thought the Board had been consistent in asking for better design. He did not think the projects matched the Freeway Landmark Monument Signs at all and the signs were supposed represent what would happen at the sites. He thought the buildings were nice but this project was supposed to be a higher standard. He thought the Board needed to hold firm and not cave because they are auto dealers. He did not think they should exactly match or that they could not be modern, but they should not be prototypes that exist in other locations throughout the Valley and don't fit Riverview.

Mr. Fisher then spoke and stated they had tried to listen to the Board and addressed it by introducing materials and features that are not in the corporate palette, that tied to buildings across the street. The were using the same landscaping and site furniture as the project across Dobson. He stated they were limited as developers to corporate image. The manufacturers were unwilling to bend. There were certain elements that were quite sacred to their image. The reason they look the same is that the different manufactures hire the same architects to create their images. You will see it throughout the nation. 1,200 dealerships are being forced to use this prototype.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur stated that on the previously discussed case, the Tesco

was going into a center with existing architecture and they had pulled elements in, but yet they had kept it modern and much more interesting, to reflect their corporate image. Couldn't this applicant do something similar and be more aggressive with the design and still keep the modern look, while still capturing the flavor of the area.

Mr. Fisher thought they had done that. He stated it was a tight rope, looking for quality of materials of consistency and design. He didn't think it should look like Bass Pro Shop.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated some of this started long before these projects were probably started. He understood it was very tough for them, but there was an expectation for this entire development early on.

Mr. Jones stated that regarding materiality and what the grocery store was able to do was keep the same geometry of the building and change the materiality. With the dealerships the materiality is one of their key elements. The aluminum panels on the majority of the facades is a key element and they are specific on the coloring of that. They will not budge on the silver toned acm, and he cannot figure out how a silver toned acm will correspond with the materials across the street.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur questioned why they couldn't do more with the body massing of the structure where they reflect some of the colors or textures of Riverview and still then mesh together the panels on the front so they have the main components that identify their clients. Even those panels could mesh with the others. They did some of the wainscoting, which was a nice gesture, but they have all the cars and landscaping so most people won't see that unless they are close to the buildings. It seemed there could be a larger block at the main mass and then they could put on the front the identifying features that were important to the owners.

Boardmember Richins was concerned the elements would clash.

The Board then suggested using something other than the white super stone, ground face block, which really you see very little of at Riverview. What is seen driving by Riverview is red. It was suggested they use red massing at a level where it is visible. They didn't think cornicing would work. The canopy detail at Riverview and some of the other pedestrian canopy details could be put on here. The way the canopies are detailed could be used. The canopies the applicants were proposing were used on small pad buildings rather than using the canopy details from the larger project. They wanted to see building elements that worked with the project across the street not just site furniture.

Boardmember Bottomley stated that one of the comments early on regarding the Cinemark was that it wasn't enough to have nice landscaping around the building. There needed to be acceptable architecture. It was good to have the same landscape theme but it was not enough to ring the buildings with compatible landscaping. They were not saying start over they were saying when you squint at the this and what is across the street will you see touches and tie ins that make it look like the same family. Mr. Fisher stated first the Board said the commonality won't be seen because of the landscaping but then they say the landscaping didn't matter. Boardmember Bottomley stated the landscaping is important but it is only one aspect of tying it together. More than just the landscaping needs to

match.

Staffmember Kim Steadman stated first time the Board saw this they gave very strong direction to make changes. Staff expected more changes and they came back with pilasters and horizontal banding. Staff thought the Board expected more than that, but at last months work session they did ask for more, but they were not as strong as they are this month. He was concerned they had given the applicants the impression they wanted a few changes but they were mostly OK. Staff went with the comments from the December work session. If they took them building by building could they write conditions of approval.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley stated he understood what it was like to work with corporate clients. He understood the front of the buildings were sacred, but they were asking for changes to the rest of the buildings. They could use more rustic material, not as rustic as Bass Pro, but something like studio or loft architecture where they use rustic and modern materials together. If done right in the right proportions they can be very attractive.

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested they might try scoring, or a change of plane with the alucobond, that would tie into the cornicing, so the detail of the scoring ties in. Could there be a wider reveal joint? He did not think Scottsdale dealerships look like Awatukee dealerships because they hold firm.

Boardmember Bottomley stated he had an appreciation for all varieties of buildings and sleek contemporary buildings might be fine in another location, but not at Riverview. There was too much contrast. They did not want it to be identical, they want more color, more cohesiveness.

Boardmember Nielsen stated that the concept of Riverview was laid out very early on and this doesn't fit that. Riverview is a destination, and this could be a great element within that. He didn't think it would take a lot to get there.

Boardmember Bottomley stated that "big box" corporations try to bully their way into communities and it was wrong to allow that. He stated they were not necessarily trying to do unrealistic things. There is masonry on this building so maybe introduce a different type of masonry, a different color of masonry, not eliminate the masonry and make it all metal. He thought it was possible to get it where it needs to be. It was a battle of the wills, they are not saying start over, just consider a marriage of the two.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR07-01 be continued to a January 10, 2007:

Discussion: Boardmember Dave Richins stated he thought the applicant would rather have a denial so they can go to Council. Boardmember Tom Bottomley did not think that was fair because on the one hand the public is saying they want higher design standards and on the other that says corporate tax dollars. He did not want to be the Board that gets by-passed. Boardmember Richins thought at the December work session the Board was OK with what they presented.

Staffmember Kim Steadman stated the site plan review for this case goes to Council January 22, so if they could have a special meeting before that they would not be holding them up. If they deny them they could not get to Council until sometime in February, so that would be holding them up. He confirmed with the applicant that the owners would not allow the background cubes to look like old industrial as background with new modern in front.

Boardmember Bottomley confirmed that corporate was very reluctant to bend at all.

Staffmember Kim Steadman confirmed Mr. Fisher did not think adding warmer colors would work. He did not think the integrity of the building would be enhanced. He said they were trying to find colors that complement the corporate image. They could not change the aluminum. They could not change the illuminated entryway. The Board stated they were not asking for changes on the front. They could still have the clean slick look of the front but revise the other portions of the building. Overall when you look at Riverview you see red tones not white. Mr. Jones stated red is almost the antithesis of the corporate image, they like sleek, modern, the brick is reminiscent of old industrial zones. Mr. Fisher stated that the bent pipe awnings opposed to the fabric awnings the open awnings were a more modern contemporary motif, so they could bring those over, but they are white. Boardmember Burgheimer suggested they look at the whole center and not micromanage such small details, but look at it as a whole. Look at whether it feels like it belongs. He understood they were taking some small pieces but the average consumer would not be able to see such small elements and see it is part of it. The choices of materials don't look that way. Mr. Fisher stated they were not trying to play hard ball, they wanted to be part of the community. Many communities want these dealerships, but they like this site and the convergence of the freeways. Maybe they need to let the Board know what is sacred and what can and can't be changed. Boardmember Burgheimer suggested maybe the Board could show them elevations of other projects at Riverview and they could do a black and white with buff paper. The Board wants to help them, they are not trying to be an obstacle.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 3, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-05 **McKellips & Stapley Retail**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC McKellips & Stapley
REQUEST: Approval of a 14,400 sq. ft. multi-tenant retail building, a 4,600 sq. ft. bank, and a 5,390 sq. ft. automotive tire store
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Venture Development
APPLICANT: Jeff Looker
ARCHITECT: Jeff Looker

REQUEST: Approval of a 14,400 sq. ft. multi-tenant retail building; a 4,600 sq. ft. band, and a 5,390 sq. ft. automotive tire store

SUMMARY: Jeff Looker represented the case. Staffmember Rich McAllister explained the revised site plan submitted at the meeting. The site plan had been revised to address pedestrian connections and some other issues on the site.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed the landscaping issues had been addressed, as well as the right turn egress. He was concerned there was not enough parking for the Big O Tire store. They added landscaping and a sidewalk behind the building. They reoriented the parking to address pedestrian connections. They removed parking in certain areas to reduce the decibel route from the street.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought the buildings were fine.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed the letter was from a property owner to the west. The letter referred to a Planning and Zoning issue.

Mr. Looker stated they were in the process of going through the Zoning Administrator for amendment of the Z99-41 case. He asked that condition 1 be revised to say be approved through the Zoning Administrator. Mr. McAllister stated the reason for the wording was that depending on what this Board approved the project might have to go back to Planning and Zoning Board rather than Administrative approval. As presented, the site plan would not need to go back to the Planning and Zoning Board.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed that the landscaping behind the building had been shown originally. He was concerned that the landscaping would not survive. He understood Boardmember Nielsen's concerns about parking for the Big O Tire store. He agreed with the neighbors concerns regarding the tire store keeping stacks of tires. He was also concerned that the building be well maintained since stucco buildings don't always hold up well for auto uses.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Wendy LeSueur that DR07-05 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Administrative review and approval of the site plan through the Planning Director, in regards to the approved site plan from zoning case Z99-41.

2. 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 (except as noted in Condition #1 above). Any minor modifications to the site plan and landscape plan 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.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
8. 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 7 – 0

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 3, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-06 **Greenfield Court Lot 2**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 4242 E Southern
REQUEST: Approval of an 8,000 sq. ft. office
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Greenfield Court LLC
APPLICANT: Paul Almond
ARCHITECT: Paul Almond

REQUEST: Approval of an 8,000 sq. ft. office

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 DR07-06 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. 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 7 – 0

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 3, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-07 **Mulberry Business Park Phase 3**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 242, 244, 246 S Mulberry
REQUEST: Approval of a three industrial buildings totaling 57,297 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: Pat Mahoney
APPLICANT: Stephen Krager
ARCHITECT: Euthenics Architecture

REQUEST: Approval of three industrial buildings totaling 57,297 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 DR07-07 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 revised elevations with coordination of colors and materials.**
    b. **Provide the required 15' landscape setback at the north property line, or gain approval of a SCIP.**
    c. **Provide the required 5' foundation base along exterior north walls of buildings 5 & 6, or gain the approval of a SCIP.**
    d. **Provide the required 5' foundation base with landscape materials equal to 10% of adjacent exterior wall on rear walls of buildings 4, 5, & 6, or gain the approval of a SCIP.**
    e. **Provide the required 5' foundation base along the entire length of the exterior walls adjacent to drive aisles of buildings 4 & 6, or gain the approval of a SCIP.**
    f. **Provide the required 15' foundation base for the entire length of the exterior walls with public entrances of buildings 4, 5, & 6, or gain the approval of a SCIP.**
    g. **Provide landscaping and shade for the employee break area.**
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 7 – 0

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 3, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-08 Manco Investments Office Buildings
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC McDowell & Val Vista
REQUEST: Approval of a 12,498 sq. ft. office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: ManCo Investments
APPLICANT: Dan Brock
ARCHITECT: Dan Brock

REQUEST: Approval of a 12,489 sq. ft. office 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 DR07-08 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 berms and supplemental vegetation in the gaps between the screen walls and parking area.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all conditions of approval for zoning case, Z06-96.
4. Signage shall be limited to one per street frontage, and free standing monument signs shall be non-illuminated, limited to 6 feet in height and 24 square feet in sign area, have a base of metal or masonry construction, incorporate design features associated with the buildings or structures and constitute an architectural component of the overall development.
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 prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 3, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-09 **Signal Butte & Baseline Retail**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Signal Butte & Baseline
REQUEST: Approval of two retail buildings totaling 35,000 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: DTCREH LLC
APPLICANT: Joe Murray
ARCHITECT: Tom Zandler

REQUEST: Approval of two retail buildings totaling 35,000 sq. ft.

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda due to a conflict of interest with one of the Boardmembers.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded Dave Richins by that DR07-09 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 landscape requirements as outlined in Chapter 15 of the City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance.
    b. Screening of SES to be reviewed and approved by Design Review Staff once SRP has approved the locations.
    c. Provide light fixture cut sheets for attached exterior light fixtures. Also provide details regarding the finish for the storefront and the color of the glass.
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.

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 3, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0 – 1 (Boardmember Nielsen abstained)

CASE #: DR07-10 Guadalupe & Crismon
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC Guadalupe & Crismon
REQUEST: Approval of a grocery store, a bank and a day care Facility totaling 42,734 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: CVS Realty
APPLICANT: Pew and Lake
ARCHITECT: Bollinger and Cardenas

REQUEST: Approval of a grocery store, a bank and a day care facility totaling 42,734 sq. ft.

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda. Sean Lake, Misial Gana, and Rick Redpath represented the case.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was concerned with the wedge element on the one building. He did not think it tied in with the rest of the center. He thought the applicants had been directed to choose either the wedge element or the cornice. Mr. Redpath stated he thought they had addressed the Board's comments by reducing the scale of the cornice. He stated the corner feature was the client's identity. Boardmember Burgheimer confirmed this building would be pad B. He still thought this building would be very different from the rest of the center. He liked the wedge and the east elevation but it did not seem well coordinated.

Boardmember Vince DiBella understood Boardmember Burgheimer's concerns, but did not want to penalize the rest of the center for not being as interesting as this building.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed the building with the wedge was for a specific user. They were using the Tesco corporate architecture and trying to tie it into the existing CVS architecture, materials and colors. The features Tesco really wanted to use were geometry, glazing, and green. He understood there were a number of different owners and maybe different on this one building would be OK.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley confirmed the coping color, form and scale would be the same. He liked the wedge and thought it could work with the repetition of the columns and recessed panel forms. He liked the fact that they were not identical.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed they were not proposing to place signage on the recessed panels.

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Wendy LeSueur that DR07-10 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. **6 ft CMU wall with wrought iron gate painted to match main wall color Dunn Edwards DE 6235 "Northgate Green", to screen the trash compactor on the northwest side of the building on PAD 'B'.**
b. **Provide Detailed Elevation for the and engineering for the propose 40' access drive entering off of Crismon Rd on the northeast side of the parcel**
c. **Provide Detail for the "Cart" storage area on the south side of PAD 'B' on both the site plan and the elevation.**

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 6 – 1 (Boardmember Rob Burgheimer voting nay)

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 3, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-11 Falcon View Lot 9
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC McKellips Rd. & Recker Rd.
REQUEST: Approval of a 4,290 S.F. retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: CTW Retail Partners
APPLICANT: Liz Gaston
ARCHITECT: Larson Associates

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,290 sq. ft. retail 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 DR07-11 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 foundation base along exterior walls with public entrances to a min. 33%.
    b. Provide foundation base along exterior walls without public entrances visible from public parking or right-of-way to a min. 25%.
    c. Provide trash enclosure elevations and gate details.
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 7 – 0

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 3, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 12 Mt. Vista Medical
LOCATION/ADDRESS: Hampton east of Crismon
REQUEST: Approval of two medical office buildings and two future light industrial buildings totaling - 123,847
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Crismon Superstition Development
APPLICANT: Wesley Balmer
ARCHITECT: Wesley Balmer

REQUEST: Approval of two medical office buildings and two future light industrial buildings totaling 123,847 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 DR07-12 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
6. 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 7 – 0

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 3, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Appeals:

Restaurant Depot
Extension and Baseline

Dan Saleet represented the case. Staffmember Kim Steadman explained the applicant was proposing adding canopies around the entrance. He stated staff supported the change but thought the Board needed to see it also. The original design had a small canopy, they were proposing a higher canopy with lower canopies on either side. Mr. Saleet explained they had added carports in the front in the center parking, but they also wanted to add parking along the front of the building in front of the foundation landscaping. The original canopy was raised 4 feet in height, then they put two carports on either side. The color scheme for the canopies would be white on top and for the poles with camel at the bases.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed the canopies would be steel with metal siding. He also confirmed that the building was a combination of split face and ground face block with blue tile. He was concerned that the canopies would block the view of what will be an attractive building. He confirmed the parking spaces would be for customers. He suggested the covered parking spaces could be away from the building. Mr. Saleet stated he would lose the most desirable parking spaces at the building, but they do have covered spaces out in the parking area.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley agreed the addition of the shade canopies cheapened the building. He thought they were covering up too much of the building. He appreciated the thought to provide shade for their customers. He suggested using canopy trees.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur suggested the applicant at the Basha's store at Hayden and Indian School. She said the canopy was more playful, it was a shade cloth, and had movement and architecture. She did not think they should be at the very front of the building.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed with Boardmember LeSueur that they could not get the same shade using trees.

Mr. Saleet asked if the Board would be in favor of using the canopies on the east side of the building. They would be mostly for employees who would be there all day. Boardmember Bottomley thought that would be a better location.

Boardmember Dave Richins was surprised they were willing to provide so much shade. He stated he would prefer it be done in a more green way, and a more designed way.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer agreed with previous comments. He thought covered parking was a good thing, but would prefer it be more designed than a basic parking structure. He wondered why they were so tall. He thought the sun would penetrate them in the morning and later in the afternoon. He was concerned that at 14' they might not actually provide the solar protection they were hoping for.

Boardmember LeSueur recommended they look at the SEC Hayden and Indian School site.

Boardmember Dave Richins suggested looking at the shade structures proposed for the light rail stations.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed they were proposing to have light under the canopies.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated he wanted to see a detail of the structure so the Board would know exactly what they were proposing. He still thought 14' was too tall. 9' to 12' at the highest would be more reasonable.

Staffmember Kim Steadman asked if the applicant were to come back with an interesting tinsel structure similar to the Basha's that adds something to the building, or if they come back with the same layout with detailing that show it will be a high quality canopy structure as opposed to a parking lot grade structure, or if they put them along the east side.

The Board agreed that would be acceptable.

Appeal of Panda Express at Riverview

Staffmember Kim Steadman explained the proposed changes.

The Board wanted the entry trellises on both sides of the entry to remain.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer preferred the original design.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur was OK with the arch over the drive-through window.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen liked the west elevation as originally proposed.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley wanted the anchor of the arch on the west wall.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 3, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING