

MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

**CITY OF MESA**

**MINUTES OF THE  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

**JULY 6, 2006**

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  
Wendy LeSueur

MEMBERS ABSENT

OTHERS PRESENT

Kim Steadman	Reese Anderson
Lesley Davis	Marv Turley
Debbie Archuleta	Ted Watson
Mia Lozano Helland	Mike Hall
John Wesley	Ralph Coldiron
Ross Renner	Scott Gehrke
Kevin Baliner	Fred Woods
Jerry Fannin	Jay Stallings
R. Marc Davis	Bill Wells
Kevin Kerpan	Bob Hunt
Heather Beattie	Rick Fennel
Kevin Kerbo	Jeff Welker
Tony Cooper	Kim Page
Michael Roth	Rick Sterr
Gregg Sherwood	Others
Bill Betzoit	
Jesse Macias	
Doug Himmelberger	
Adea Miller	
Randy Carater	

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

### 1. Work Session:

**CASE:** Banner Baywood Children's Choice  
East of SEC 63 & Broadway

**REQUEST:** Approval of a day care facility

### **DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Vince DiBella

- Very concerned with site layout
- People will pull-up in front of building and drop off their children rather than parking

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer

- Redesign the mechanical well
- The site is too narrow
- Want to see the playground equipment with follow-up submittal

Boardmember Tom Bottomley

- Very concerned with site plan

Chair Pete Berzins

- Still want to see a 24' drive aisle
- Still need to move the trash enclosure
- The site is too narrow
- Sidewalk needs to be screened/buffered from the drive aisle

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

**CASE:** Commercial Center  
NEC Baseline & Greenfield

**REQUEST:** Approval of a shopping center

### **DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Liked the red brown storefronts as depicted
- Liked the hierarchy

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- The rears of the cornices need to be finished

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Liked Major B and the shops
- Liked the awnings

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Agreed with previous comments
- Liked the center architecture

Chair Pete Berzins:

- The lights should match throughout the project
- Lights should be all the same color – he preferred the bronze

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

**CASE:** Hobby Lobby  
NEC Baseline & Greenfield

**REQUEST:** Approval of a hobby store

**DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Integrate the stone from the center into the Hobby Lobby
- Liked the awnings on Major B

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- The parapets should match the center

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- The cornice on the rear of the entry parapet needs to be detailed

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- It feels like a warehouse
- The front looks like the utility side of a building
- Proportions of the entry are awkward
- Not inviting
- The parapet seems weak
- Needs more articulation
- Incorporate the stone from the center
- Liked the red/brown color for the store fronts
- Needs an accent color
- Major B has a hierarchy
- The north elevation needs to be articulated; it will be very visible
- Step the heights of the arch elements

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Agreed with previous comments
- Elements look tacked on
- Maybe a reveal and everything is in-set
- Needs an articulated feel for entry, not just tacked on
- Use the nicer materials on the entry not off to the side

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

**CASE:** Village Inn  
NEC Baseline & Greenfield

**REQUEST:** Approval of a sit-down restaurant

**DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Looks like a drive-thru

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Needs some massing for the cornice details – out of scale

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Liked the awning detail

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Overdone
- Busy
- Clean up the roofline, less can be more
- Cornices need to be refined
- Where are the trash enclosures located?
- How will Solid Waste service them?

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

**CASE:** M & I Bank  
NEC Baseline & Greenfield

**REQUEST:** Approval of a bank

**DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- They need to blend with the center which they seem to be doing

Chair Pete Berzins:

- The stone needs to match the center

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Liked the cornice detail

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

**CASE:** Wendy's  
NWC Juanita & East Valley Auto Drive

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

**DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Concern with the tile at the drive-thru staying clean

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Concern with the plant material at the drive aisle not scratching cars

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Liked the design of the drive thru windows
- Provide safe and adequate pedestrian walkways to adjacent internal development

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

**CASE:** Applebee's  
2055 S Alma School

**REQUEST:** Approval of the raze and rebuild of a sit-down restaurant

### **DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Looks set like
- The north and south elevations are long and flat

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- The parapets need to return and have more mass
- Don't just cut off the coping
- Pop out an element on the north and south elevations

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Tie the parapet into the windows so it is the same size and pop-out the element 18"

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Liked the reduced awnings

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

**CASE:** McDonald's  
202 & Dobson

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

### **DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Liked the contemporary elevations
- Liked the way it tied into the center
- Maybe more red at the entry or a different material to high light the entrance
- Maybe the entry could be bigger
- Liked the colors

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Maybe the entry should be higher

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- The entry could have more contrast

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

**CASE:** Cracker Barrel  
202 & Dobson

**REQUEST:** Approval of a sit-down restaurant

### **DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Finish the back sides of the parapets
- It looks like a set
- Pick up elements from the Bass Pro
- The stone looks applied

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Doesn't go with the center
- No clapboard siding
- Hardipanel will not age well in this climate
- Pick up details of how the timbers tie into the eaves on the Bass Pro

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- It shouldn't stand out all by itself
- It will be out of place in this center
- The Santa Fe corbel doesn't work
- Maybe less hardipanel and then use stone like the Bass pro or even EIFS
- Need additional color
- Does not like the gray

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Tie into the Bass Pro since it won't tie into the Riverview project
- It has to tie into one or the other
- Break up the roof line and pop it out

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

**CASE:** Chick Fil-A  
202 & Dobson

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

### **DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- The tower needs to engage the building
- Should the reveals be harlequin?

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Lots of blank panels
- A lot of vertical elements
- East elevation needs more articulation
- Reveal joints not score line
- Liked the placement of the light fixtures

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Maybe raise the tile and bring down the score lines on the north and south elevations

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Too much yellow
- Maybe a darker color on the rear
- Alter the colors on the drive-thru elevation

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Was concerned that there be adequate lighting

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

**CASE:** Brown & Recker Self-Storage 2 story revision  
NWC Brown & Recker

**REQUEST:** Approval of a second floor addition to a previously approved self-storage facility

### **DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Doesn't see the need for the tower element. It is just signage.
- Eliminate the tower and do something else

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- If the building is going to be seen it needs more articulation
- The bottom of the pieces at the corners need to rest on something
- The tower is a sign
- Need to articulate the second floor with something
- Score lines at a bare minimum
- Reveal panels to break up the wall

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- County they have pilasters that look like fingers that hold up the second floor?

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Needs more articulation

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

**CASE:** Deseret Family Medicine  
1425 S Greenfield

**REQUEST:** Approval of an expansion of an existing medical office

**DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Liked the buildings
- They need to be compatible colors

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The proportion is off
- Colors should be the same
- Repaint the first building to match the new one

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Seems a little squat
- Could the roof element be raised a couple of feet?

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

**CASE:** Signal Butte Self-Storage  
Signal Butte & Guadalupe

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

**DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Pop out the wainscot on the office/residence

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Could they have ground mounted A/C?
- Provide nicer light fixtures
- The paint below the fascia is too deep

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

**CASE:** Riverview Retail J  
202 & Dobson

**REQUEST:** Approval of a retail building

**DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Loading docks are now gone on 8<sup>th</sup>
- The corner element on swc should come up higher and break the roof line

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- 20' of landscaping along 8<sup>th</sup>
- More detailing on the east side with planters or pots and benches

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Interesting entrance
- Could curved element be deeper?

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

### 2. Call to Order:

Chair Pete Berzins called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

### 3. Approval of the Minutes of the June 6, 2006 and June 13, 2006 Meetings:

On a motion by Vince DiBella seconded by Rob Burgheimer the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

### 4. Election of Officers:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer nominated Pete Berzins as Chair and Dave Richins as Vice Chair. Tom Bottomley seconded the nominations which passed on a unanimous vote.

### 5. Design Review Cases:

## MINUTES OF THE 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR06-57 Park N Ride**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** Power Road at US 60  
**REQUEST:** Approval of a park & ride lot  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 6  
**OWNER:** Arizona Department of Transportation  
**APPLICANT:** Ross Renner City of Mesa  
**ARCHITECT:** Jacobs

**REQUEST:** Approval of a park and ride lot

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

**MOTION:** It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR06-57 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

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The project is reasonably well-designed and provides an important amenity to the City.

MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR06-58 Superstition Gateway pad D**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 1923 S Signal Butte  
**REQUEST:** Approval of a 4,821 sq. ft. shops building  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 6  
**OWNER:** CTW Retail Partners  
**APPLICANT:** Dante Cruz Ramirez  
**ARCHITECT:** Kurt Reed Associates

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 4,821 sq. ft. shops 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 Rob Burgheimer that DR06-58 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, 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

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The project meets the design standards

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR06-59 Homestead Sun Valley**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** SEC Sunvalley & Boise  
**REQUEST:** Approval of a 30 unit townhome project  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 5  
**OWNER:** RGB Partners  
**APPLICANT:** Fred Woods  
**ARCHITECT:** Fred Woods

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 30 unit townhome project

**SUMMARY:** Jeff Welker and Fred Woods represented the case. Staffmember Krissa Lucas explained that the stonework and the private gates had been removed, and the screen wall had been revised. Mr. Welker stated the changes were financial. Prices for townhomes had dropped so they cut off the fluff to reduce pricing. He stated they kept the bollards on the wall for the Sunvalley site.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed they were not modifying the interior, and the double car garages were remaining. He thought the changes would amount to very small amounts per unit.

Boardmember Vince DiBella thought they should use some of the elements, but in more visible locations. He did not think the Board would have approved the second submittal without changes.

Boardmember Dave Richins was concerned with cheapening the site at Center more than the site at Sunvalley. He thought the project could have brought up the neighborhood. He did not like the idea of cheapening to the level of what existed in the area.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the issue was whether the current proposal was above a level they could approve. He thought the project was missing texture. He thought some stone was needed.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur was disappointed the material was being removed. She thought it needed punch and interest.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought the color was too bland. He wanted to see more variety to give the units more identity. He suggested the stone be used at the entry and patio areas. He thought the garages were at a horizontal line. He wanted the pop-outs above the garages to come up in the some areas, and possibly the sill lines of the windows vary, to break up that line. He wanted accents at a pedestrian level, not just at the second floor level.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the site walls on the rear could be colored masonry, which could add texture and not have any additional cost. They would save the cost of stuccoing over the masonry wall. He suggested pre-cast elements to add interest.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed that the stucco would be smooth finish.

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Chair Pete Berzins agreed with previous comments. He stated that as the market changes you need to differentiate yourself from the others. He thought the separate gate was a good selling factor. He agreed more color was needed. He thought there were a lot of garage doors all in a row. He didn't think they had to have stone, however; they did need to break up the long view of garage doors. He suggested different windows in the garage doors. He thought the roof line was too straight. He suggested raising the dormers to break the roofline. He also thought the fence was a problem and that they needed to bring the enhancements out where they would be seen. He was concerned that there were 20 units in a row with only one break.

Boardmember Dave Richins wanted the bollards put back on the Center Street project. He thought changing the garage colors was a good idea.

Mr. Welker stated they were willing to put the bollards back on the Center Street project; add additional color; and changing the area above the garage doors to minimize the straight line.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Dave Richins that DR06-59 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 a revised color/material board that includes the CMU wall color and ramada color.
  - b. Revise view wall and private patio walls and gates to provide caps on the bollards. Provide bollards every 16' on center.
  - c. Revise the exterior light fixtures to express a residential theme. Staff to review and approve.
  - d. Provide a clear and complete landscape plan that provides specific plant locations and sizes. This landscape plan must be in conformance with the minimum landscape requirements established in Chapter 15 of the City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance.
  - e. Fully recess the SES in an appropriate location and paint to match the building. Staff to review and approve.
  - f. Revise vicinity map on plans to identify the correct location.
  - g. **Provide additional texture element and additional color changes.**
  - h. **Revise the tops of the garage elements.**
  - i. **Provide exterior view fence with masonry piers with bollards, 16' on center.**
  - j. **Provide two styles of garage doors and light kits.**
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. Compliance with all conditions of approval for zoning case, Z06-032.

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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 6 – 0 – 1 (Boardmember Tim Nielsen abstained)

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:**

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR06-60**      **Homestead on Center**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**      SEC Center & McKellips  
**REQUEST:**                      Approval of a 51-unit townhome project  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**      District 1  
**OWNER:**                          RSB Partners  
**APPLICANT:**                  Fred Woods  
**ARCHITECT:**                  Fred Woods

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 51 unit townhome project

**SUMMARY:** Jeff Welker and Fred Woods represented the case. Staffmember Krissa Lucas explained that the stonework and the private gates had been removed, and the screen wall had been revised. Mr. Welker stated the changes were financial. Prices for townhomes had dropped so they cut off the fluff to reduce pricing. He stated they kept the bollards on the wall for the Sunvalley site.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed they were not modifying the interior, and the double car garages were remaining. He thought the changes would amount to very small amounts per unit.

Boardmember Vince DiBella thought they should use some of the elements, but in more visible locations. He did not think the Board would have approved the second submittal without changes.

Boardmember Dave Richins was concerned with cheapening the site at Center more than the site at Sunvalley. He thought the project could have brought up the neighborhood. He did not like the idea of cheapening to the level of what existed in the area.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the issue was whether the current proposal was above a level they could approve. He thought the project was missing texture. He thought some stone was needed.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur was disappointed the material was being removed. She thought it needed punch and interest.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought the color was too bland. He wanted to see more variety to give the units more identity. He suggested the stone be used at the entry and patio areas. He thought the garages were at a horizontal line. He wanted the pop-outs above the garages to come up in the some areas, and possibly the sill lines of the windows vary, to break up that line. He wanted accents at a pedestrian level, not just at the second floor level.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the site walls on the rear could be colored masonry, which could add texture and not have any additional cost. They would save the cost of stuccoing over the masonry wall. He suggested pre-cast elements to add interest.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed that the stucco would be smooth finish.

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Chair Pete Berzins agreed with previous comments. He stated that as the market changes you need to differentiate yourself from the others. He thought the separate gate was a good selling factor. He agreed more color was needed. He thought there were a lot of garage doors all in a row. He didn't think they had to have stone, however; they did need to break up the long view of garage doors. He suggested different windows in the garage doors. He thought the roofline was too straight. He suggested raising the dormers to break the roofline. He also thought the fence was a problem and that they needed to bring the enhancements out where they would be seen. He was concerned that there were 20 units in a row with only one break.

Boardmember Dave Richins wanted the bollards put back on the Center Street project. He thought changing the garage colors was a good idea.

Mr. Welker stated they were willing to put the bollards back on the Center Street project; add additional color; and changing the area above the garage doors to minimize the straight line.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Dave Richins that DR06-60 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 a revised color/material board that includes the CMU wall color and ramada color.
  - b. Revise view wall and private patio walls and gates to have bollards, provide caps on the bollards.
  - c. Revise the exterior light fixtures to express a residential theme. Staff to review and approve.
  - d. Provide a clear and complete landscape plan that provides specific plant locations and sizes. This landscape plan must be in conformance with the minimum landscape requirements established in Chapter 15 of the City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance.
  - e. Fully recess the SES in an appropriate location and paint to match the building. Staff to review and approve.
  - f. Revise vicinity map on plans to identify the correct location.
  - g. **Provide additional texture element and color changes.**
  - h. **Develop the tops of the garage elements**
  - i. **Provide exterior view fence with masonry piers with bollards every 16' on center.**
  - j. **Provide two varieties of garage doors and light kits.**
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

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

ownership.

5. Compliance with all conditions of approval for zoning case, Z06-026.
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 6 – 0 – 1 (Boardmember Tim Nielsen abstained)

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:**

MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR06-61 Superstition Commerce Park**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** SWC Sossaman & Hampton  
**REQUEST:** Approval of seven buildings totaling 397,338 sq. ft.  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 6  
**OWNER:** Superstition Springs Investors Ltd. Partnership  
**APPLICANT:** T. Wall Properties Mgt.  
**ARCHITECT:** Dickinson Architects

**REQUEST:** Approval of seven buildings totaling 397,338 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 Rob Burgheimer that DR06-61 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. Final Landscape Plan Required. Provide numbers and sizes of plant material. Provide a one-to-one ratio of plant name to symbol.
  - b. Provide a sidewalk on both sides of the private drive.
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

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The project meets the design standards of the Zoning Ordinance.

MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR06-62 Mountain Road Industrial Park**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** SWC Mountain Road & Underwood Road  
**REQUEST:** Approval of 14 buildings totaling 58,287 S.F.  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 6  
**OWNER:** Metric Group LLC  
**APPLICANT:** Dorothy Shupe, Dream Catchers  
**ARCHITECT:** Randy Carter

**REQUEST:** Approval of fourteen buildings totaling 58,287 sq. ft.

**SUMMARY:** This case was on the removed from consent agenda because Boardmember Bottomley had a conflict.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-62 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
  - a. Revise the materials at the northwest corner of building 14 to correct the difference in materials that are currently depicted.
  - b. Compliance with the conditions of approval of Z06-46.
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 – 0 – 1 (Boardmember Bottomley abstained)

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The project is reasonably well designed.

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR06-63**    **Shops H Mesa Riverview**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**    Dobson & Loop 202  
**REQUEST:**    Approval of a shops building  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**    District 1  
**OWNER:**    DeRito/Kimco Riverview, LLC  
**APPLICANT:**    Saemisch DiBella Architects, Inc.  
**ARCHITECT:**    Saemisch DiBella Architects, Inc.

**REQUEST:** Approval of a shops building

**SUMMARY:** This case was removed from the consent agenda because Boardmember Vince DiBella had a conflict.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-63 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. All hardscape, screen walls, site furniture, bollards and light fixtures revised to match what was approved as part of the Riverview at Dobson Design Guidelines.
  - b. Revise the color board to provide all proposed color/material samples, and brand/manufacturer names.
  - c. Revise the elevation drawings to reflect the correct location(s) of canopies.
  - d. Revise the landscape plan to comply with Code requirements and the Riverview at Dobson Design Guidelines, and to eliminate landscaping in the adjacent drive-thru lane.
  - e. All exterior light fixtures must be installed per City of Mesa Outdoor Light Control as specified in Title 4 Chapter 6.
  - f. Design for monument signs to be reviewed and approved by Design Review Staff.
  - g. Revise the dumpsters for pick up from the service drive aisle behind the pad.
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

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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 – 0 – 1 (Boardmember Vince DiBella abstained)

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The project is compatible with the remainder of the center.

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR06-64**    **Banner Desert Tower**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**    1400 S Dobson  
**REQUEST:**    Approval of a new 7 story tower  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**    District 3  
**OWNER:**    Banner Health  
**APPLICANT:**    Jon Hammond, HDR  
**ARCHITECT:**    William Wells, HDR

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 7-story patient tower

**SUMMARY:** Bill Wells, Bob Hunt, and Jay Stallings represented the case.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed the remainder of the hospital would be painted in the future. He liked the proposal.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley confirmed their proposed time line to repaint should be approximately 3 – 5 years. He suggested phasing the repainting so the transition areas were done first; then they could work there way west. He thought the proposal was a very nice project. Very playful and interesting. He liked the scale at the pedestrian level. He did think the transition between old and new needed to be worked on.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought there needed to be a defined time line to repaint the old hospital. He agreed it could be a phased project. He liked the concept on the northwest portion. He was concerned with the transition at the emergency room entrance. He thought it fell off at that element. He thought it should continue around the corner, with use of color, landscaping, something. He wanted staff or the Board to review the signage. He wanted any future signage or gateway element at the corner of Southern & Dobson to be reviewed. He wondered if they could paint the east side and turn the corner to a logical stopping point. Mr. Stallings stated it was their intent to paint the entire building; however, it was not part of this project. He stated they could commit to painting the east of the hospital.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur thought it was a very nice project. The only concerns were completing the color change, and the pedestrian connection from the parking area to the emergency room entrance.

Chair Pete Berzins was excited with the direction they took. His only concern was the future painting of the existing building. He stated he would have expected them to budget for painting the rest of the building. He stated that if this were anyone else expanding an existing building the Board would require them to paint the original building so the entire project would match.

Staffmember Kim Steadman stated we are seeing a level of quality and materials that we don't normally see on other projects.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR06-64 be approved with the following conditions:

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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. **Banner will paint the east side and wrap the south with a colorization study to show the Board how the design and colors of the current project will be applied to the existing hospital to be submitted prior to completion of this project.**
3. **Landscaping, site lighting, signage, colorization, and pedestrian connections to be reviewed by the Design Review Board.**
4. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
6. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
7. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
8. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
9. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0 – 2 (Boardmembers Tim Nielsen and Dave Richins abstained)

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:**

MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR06-65 Classic Car Spa**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 2737 S Ellsworth  
**REQUEST:** Approval of a 10,655 sq. ft. car wash/automotive care  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 6  
**OWNER:** Classic Car Spa  
**APPLICANT:** Reese Anderson  
**ARCHITECT:** Seaver Franks

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 10,655 sq. ft. car wash/automotive care facility

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

**MOTION:** It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR06-65 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 specification for the stacked stone at the base of the building to match or be compatible with the adjacent buildings in the development.
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 conditions of approval from the Board of Adjustment for the Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit (BA06-027).
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

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The project is reasonably well designed

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

### Appeals of Administrative Design Review:

VLJ Aircraft, LLC  
5030 E Falcon Drive

Ted Watson and Mike Hall represented the case, and stated they had changed the building to be a hanger. They had removed the false windows and awnings, and changed the slope of the roof.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought the revised building was more elegant because it was simpler. Increasing the glass was a good idea. He thought the placement of the sign was much better.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed the siding would be white. He agreed simpler was better. He was disappointed with the use of white and gray.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur thought this plan was better than the second submittal.

Chair Pete Berzins thought the colors were simple and the building was simple.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Wendy LeSueur that the administrative approval for Value Jet be approved as submitted:

**VOTE:** Passed 4 – 0 – 1 (Boardmember Vince DiBella abstained)

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The project meets the design standards of the Zoning Ordinance.

MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta  
Planning Assistant

da