

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

JUNE 2, 2004

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Lower Level of the Council Chambers 57 East First Street, at 3:45 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Carie Allen - Chair
Pete Berzins - Vice Chair
Randy Carter
Jillian Hagen
Vince DiBella

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman	Paul Devers
Lesley Davis	Vince Dalke
Debbie Archuleta	William Cleaveland
Charlie Scully	Jerry Shakey
Scott Langford	Mike Reidy
	Craig Cote
	Others

MEMBERS ABSENT

Robert Burgheimer (excused)
Tim Nielsen (excused)

1. Call to Order:

Chair Carie Allen called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the May 5, 2004 Meeting:

On a motion by Vince DiBella seconded by Pete Berzins the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

3. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 2, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-26 **Light Rail**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC Sycamore and Main Street
REQUEST: Approval of the preliminary bus transfer facility and Park-and-Ride Lot designs.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: City of Mesa
APPLICANT: Jeff Martin, Assistant Development Services Manager, City of Mesa
ARCHITECT: Ken Caswell, Architectural Manager, Valley Metro

REQUEST: Table the case.

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

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR04-26 be tabled:

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: To allow the applicants time to work out development issues.

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 2, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-79 **Sign Package for Greenfield Professional Village**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1621 North Greenfield
REQUEST: Approval of a sign package for 11 office buildings totaling
54,333 sq. ft. and 3 office warehouse buildings totaling
22,036 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: UTAZ Development
APPLICANT: UTAZ Development

REQUEST: Approval of a sign package for eleven office buildings and three office warehouse buildings.

SUMMARY: Craig Cote represented the case. Mr. Cote stated they were using the cornice detail and cultured stone to tie the signs to the buildings.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed that the applicants could use halo lights to illuminate their signs but they were not required to. He also confirmed tenant ID's typically can't have more than 2 signs.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen was concerned that national trademark logos could be larger than the signs shown; she did not feel they would fit. She also confirmed the reveal between the stone and the bottom of the sign would be black aluminum.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt the signs were plain. He suggested using the stone on one side of the sign panels instead of at the base where it would be hidden by the landscaping. He wanted something decorative to match the building, and provide more definition.

Boardmember Pete Berzins confirmed they anticipate having 24 tenants in the project. He thought the stone was a nice feature, but agreed it would be lost at the base. He agreed it worked with the buildings but thought it should be visible. He confirmed that national logos would be allowed on the monument sign; however, they would have to fit within the 9" panels. He also confirmed that the tenants would have the front and matching back panel.

Chair Carie Allen agreed the stone should be placed where it would be seen. She thought the cornice on the monument sign should be dressed up.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR03-79 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
 - Revise the freestanding sign elevations to enhance the sign architecturally to relate more to the building architecture for the project. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.
 - Continue the stone up the sides but not all the way to the cornice on the

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 2, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

monument signs. It is not necessary to use the stone at the base, but it may be used.

- The logos are to be a maximum of 24", only on front elevation unless approved by Design Review staff. There must be a clear area around the sign.
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. This project was not reviewed for compliance with Chapter 19 (Sign Regulations) of the City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance. This relates to the number and sizes of the signage. The Design Review Board is only approving the aesthetic quality of the signs and how they relate to the overall project. All signage is required to be in conformance with Chapter 19 unless the Board of Adjustment approves a Comprehensive Sign Package that allows variations to the Code. A separate sign permit from the Building Safety Division is required for all signs.
 5. Provide one 8-1/2 X 11 set of revised site plans, and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The sign package as proposed with conditions complies with the Design Guidelines.

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 2, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-31 **63 Street Professional Office Condo Center**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 217 S. 63rd Street
REQUEST: Approval of a 12,545 sq. ft. office
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Michael Hamberlin
APPLICANT: Steven Nevala
ARCHITECT: Sherman Cawley

REQUEST: Approval of a 12,545 sq. ft. office building

SUMMARY: Paul Devers represented the case. Mr. Devers explained the changes that had been made since the previous meeting. He explained that he had softened the corners and provided an architectural theme by using vertical framed openings with windows “punched” in. He had added corrugated metal canopies at key areas and eliminated the arched radius. The aluminum was toned down and the colors were warmed up. The block textures were revised and they were now proposing stain instead of paint to provide a subtle variation of colors. They were proposing contemporary light fixtures to match the blue sage awning color.

Boardmember Randy Carter liked the color shown on the elevations better than the color board, which he thought, seemed green in tone. He confirmed the placement of each of the colors. He wanted the wainscot to be a solid color. He felt the building needed another color, as well as more of the awnings, especially along the east side. He did not think the rust color worked well with the other colors.

Boardmember Pete Berzins thought there had been tremendous changes. He agreed that the break in the wainscot detracted from the building. Mr. Devers stated he was willing to change the color. Boardmember Berzins confirmed there would be some signage on the building, and that no decision had yet been made on whether there would be a monument sign. Boardmember Berzins liked the size of the bands and did not want a third band added.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed that with the original submittal they were proposing running band and large block. He agreed with the wainscot banding at the base. He preferred the colors on the renderings to those on the color board. He wanted to see more play with the parapets.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen thought the band across the base needed to be one color; and that there should be additional awnings. She thought the building seemed flat and felt like a storefront façade. She was concerned the thin band at the top was not tying the masses together and thought the bands should be thicker.

Chair Carie Allen thought there had been a dramatic improvement. She thought there should be a few more awnings but not too many. She wanted the wainscot to be all one color. She also preferred the colors on the renderings. She thought the banding was fine as presented.

MOTION: It was moved by Jillian Hagen and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR04-31 be approved with the following conditions:

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 2, 2004 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 with the following modifications:
 - Revise the color/material board to accurately depict the placement of the colors on the building.
 - Revise the elevations so that the wainscot is all one color.
 - Provide additional awnings to balance the theme.
 - Revise the stain color so that the beige colors more closely match the rendering.
 - The sign package to be reviewed by Design Review staff in the future.
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. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
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 elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is reasonably well designed.

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 2, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-35 **Baseline Office Center**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC Baseline and East Valley Auto Dr.
REQUEST: Develop 64,070 sq.ft., two-story office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Michael Reidy
APPLICANT: Michael Reidy
ARCHITECT: Sherman Cawley

REQUEST: Approval of a 64,070 sq. ft. two store office building

SUMMARY: Mike Reidy represented the case. Mr. Reidy stated they had redesigned the site and brought the parking closer to the entrance. The retention basin had been changed and there would now be underground retention. He stated the building would be pre-cast concrete with reveals and 2" to 3" off sets. He explained that the top of the building tapers back. He stated there would be a lot of glazing on the street side with over-sized mullions. He stated there would be a large public seating area with a water feature, which should accommodate 60 people. He did not want to add awnings or shade structures to the outside of the building because he felt they did not match the style of the building.

Boardmember Pete Berzins thought there was a tremendous improvement to the site design. He understood it would be a large building; he did not feel this building would lend itself to a lot of elements. He wanted to review details of the courtyard.

Boardmember Vince DiBella felt the project was proportionally over parked. He felt that the 300' long east elevation was too plain and repetitive. He suggested eliminating one row of parking and then shifting a portion of the building. Another option would be to recess the windows or provide a balcony for relief. He thought the applicant could do something interesting with the railings. He thought the concrete was a rich material, but the building was too simple. The applicant could vary the vertical plane to cast shadows. He confirmed the blue glass would not be insulated and thought it should be solar bronze glass. Mr. Reidy stated he preferred solar/bronze glass.

Mr. Reidy stated that the parking is calculated for medical and educational needs. He questioned how much is too much. He stated he has been negotiating with an educational tenant for the entire second floor. He explained that there are horizontal pieces of concrete 2" thicker than the spandrel panels; the glass would be recessed; and there would be reveal lines in the precast panels, which would be 3" wide and ½ to 2 – 4 inches deep.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen thought the building looked too industrial. She thought it seemed harsh and cold. She stated the landscape plan was inconsistent because the streetscape was very formal but the interior was not and the interior did not relate to the building. She stated the Texas Mountain Laurel would be too small next to a two-story building. She felt the design of the stream did not fit in the formal courtyard. She stated that palm trees do not provide shade. She thought the landscaping should be contemporary like the building. She thought the elevations were linear, symmetrical, and industrial rather than friendly.

Boardmember Randy Carter stated the 300' long east elevation was too monotonous. He suggested the applicant look at the Mesa Corporate Center on Southern. He thought the

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 2, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

building needed differentiation between the concrete panel planes. He confirmed the 20' landscape setback along East Valley Auto Drive was the minimum required. He suggested bringing out the center bay of the east wall 4' to 5'. He agreed the landscaping did not seem to go with the building. He also suggested some color differentiation in the reveals or the aggregate. He confirmed the glass would be recessed 4". He stated the Mesa Corporate Center building recessed the first floor windows 2'. He felt this building needed work on the east elevation. Mr. Reidy stated that in order to do that he would need to add curtain walls and soffits. He stated the horizontal members are 20' wide. Boardmember Carter suggested enhancing the landscaping along East Valley Auto Drive to help accentuate the vertical elements.

Chair Carie Allen stated that very large offices seem to be flat with a lot of windows. She felt this project was very nice for what it was. She was concerned that trying to add things onto the building would not enhance the building because they would look stuck on. She appreciated the courtyard for the employees.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen stated the proposed monument sign did not match the building, especially the round corners at the top of the sign. She stated it needed to be revised to reflect the architecture of the building.

There was some discussion regarding whether the landscaping should be symmetrical like the building or whether it should vary to break up the building. There was also discussion regarding breaking up the east elevation with the use of additional trees. It was decided that although additional trees would be a nice enhancement, they would not be enough to break up the elevation. Changes to the actual building were necessary.

Boardmember Randy Carter agreed decorative railings would enhance the building.

MOTION: It was moved by Pete Berzins that DR04-35 be approved with staff conditions and the following condition: The glass be changed to 65% reflective bronze. The signage be revised and approved by Design Review staff. The applicant provide decorative railings.

This motion died for lack of a second.

MOTION: It was then moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR04-35 be continued to June 16, 2004 at 8:00 a.m. Two options were suggested: inset the ground floor windows 24" from the face of the concrete columns and/or articulate the building mass by creating an offset at a portion of the east building face.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: To allow the applicant time to revise the proposal to articulate the building by moving the mass or recessing the ground floor windows 2'; and to revise the landscape plan.

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 2, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-36 **Augusta Ranch Professional Village**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Guadalupe & Ellsworth
REQUEST: Approval of a 43,333 sq. ft. of office project
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Evergreen Ellsworth & Guadalupe LLC
APPLICANT: Craig Cote, UTAZ
ARCHITECT: Jeff Hunter, Architecture Plus

REQUEST: Approval of a 43,333 sq. ft. office project

SUMMARY: Craig Cote represented the case. Mr. Cote stated this was an infill site located behind a retail center. He stated this would probably be the last time they would build this project. He stated they would be willing to change, Building #5 to a hip roof; similar to Type B building.

Boardmember Vince DiBella stated this was a familiar project that seems to work.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen stated the rear elevations of the buildings appeared to be very flat. She thought the windows on the rear of Building E were too repetitive, and there needed to be a wainscot or something at the base. The change could be a different color. She felt the window next to the diagonal on the rear of Building 2 was too close to the edge.

Boardmember Randy Carter was not in favor of buildings 5 and 8; he wondered if there was another building type that would fit in that footprint. He felt there needed to be some theme to the project. He suggested replacing Building 5 and 8 with a different building type which were painted a different color. He did not feel building Type B fit with the rest of the buildings; however, he thought it could be revised so that it would.

Boardmember Pete Berzins agreed the rear elevations were too flat and plain. He stated the front elevations had movement and richness that did not appear on the rear elevations. He suggested revising the windows or extending the wainscot. He agreed Buildings 5 and 8 did not work, he suggested replacing them with Building 9. He felt the colors as displayed on the color boards were too green. He preferred the colors as depicted on the renderings. He suggested the roof materials could tie the project together. He confirmed this project would have cross access with the shopping center. Boardmember Berzins thought that the rear elevations could be revised using stucco pop-outs and color changes without spending a lot of money. He didn't feel they needed to use stone on the rears. He was concerned that there was very little landscaping at the rear elevations.

Chair Carie Allen agreed the rear elevations were too flat, and the buildings need to tie together better. She stated she could live with the different styles if there was something that tied them together.

Mr. Cote then explained that this project has a "Disneylandish theme". He stated that their buyers are very happy with the variety of buildings. He explained that there was a 5' offset on the rear of all the buildings except Type A. Mr. Cote stated that small 4,000 sq. ft. buildings meant it is hard to hide things like roof ladders, downspouts and mechanical equipment. He stated that he had determined Building F could replace Building C. He thought no one would ever see the rear elevations.

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 2, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Carter stated that with the exception of Buildings 1 and 2, the rears of the buildings would be visible from the drive aisles.

The Board then discussed revisions they would like to see on the individual buildings. For Building A they suggested a trellis, columns, pop-outs, a color change, thicker EIFS around the windows, and a color change so that below the hipped roof sections it could be a different color.

Mr. Cote stated he preferred using a wainscot for the middle section of the building rather than the ends. That way it would be easier to terminate. He could bring the wainscot higher than the sill.

Boardmember Pete Berzins confirmed there would not be signage on the rear elevations.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed the cornice would be the same as the photos of the Awatukee project.

Chair Carie Allen did not want a change in color on Building A.

The Board then started discussing changes for Building B, they wanted the front to more in harmony with the other buildings, especially Building Type E. They also wanted a color change below the thin band.

Mr. Cote then asked the Chair to continue the case. He stated he had confidence his architect could design something the Board would be happy with.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Pete Berzins that DR04-36 be continued to the July 7, 2004 Design Review Board meeting

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: To allow the applicant to redesign the project.

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 2, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-37 **Brown Practice**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2310 & 2320 E. Brown Rd. (NEC 23rd Street & Brown)
SUMMARY OF REQUEST: Two medical offices buildings to be developed in phases.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Dr. Jerry R. Shockey
APPLICANT: Vince Dalke
ARCHITECT: Vince Dalke, Archicon

REQUEST: Approval of two 7,597 sq. ft. medical offices

SUMMARY: Vince Dalke represented the case.

William Cleaveland an adjacent property owner spoke regarding the case. Mr. Cleaveland wanted a 6' masonry wall along the north property line of this project which would be along the southern side of the 16' alley. Mr. Cleaveland stated he was happy with an office project and liked the look of the building, he did not like the look of the alley. He thought the trees would provide a place for people to hide and the fence would not. He also wanted the wall to stop the noise from Brown Road.

Mr. Dalke stated they would be willing to provide a wrought iron fence. Mr. Cleaveland was willing to accept that.

Staffmember Charlie Scully explained that CPTED felt that visibility was the best way to provide protection and solid walls obstruct visibility. Mr. Scully also stated that this project had never been presented with a wall along the north property line therefore Engineering, Fire, Sanitation, had never reviewed it with a wall.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen thought the building was attractive. She preferred the rendering color to the color board which she felt was too yellow and too green.

Boardmember Randy Carter preferred the green on the rendering. He thought the applicant should substitute a different tree for the pine trees along the north property line. Boardmember Carter preferred no fence, he felt the wrought iron fence could be fine. Mr. Dalke stated the owner would like a masonry fence to hide the ugly alley, but they would do whatever CPTED wants.

Boardmember Pete Berzins agreed the green should match the rendering. He was in favor of some type of fence/wall.

Chair Carie Allen preferred the dark "forest" green on the rendering. She was in favor of some type of fence/wall.

Staffmember Scully explained that the Engineering, Fire, Sanitation, etc. divisions would have to review the plans and approve them.

MOTION: It was moved by Jillian Hagen and seconded by Randy Carter that DR04-37 be approved with the following conditions:

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 2, 2004 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, and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be approved by Design Review staff prior to submitting for construction documents:
 - Shift each building two and one-half (2 ½) feet closer to the shared interior property line so as to provide a twenty-five (25) foot building separation; and, add two and one-half (2 ½) feet to each outside foundation base shown as the west side of the Phase I building and the east side of the Phase II building.
 - Provide additional foundation base landscaping on the west side of the Phase I building and the east side of the Phase II building to include at least five (5) five-gallon shrubs and additional groundcover plants as shown on the color elevations.
 - Replace at least one-third (1/3) or eight (8) of the twenty-four (24) pine trees proposed along the north site perimeter with a different tree species so as to provide more variety.
 - Change the green color to match the rendering.
 - Prefer to see a wrought iron and masonry fence per all necessary departments.
 - Replace the pine trees along the north property line with a different species of tree. To be approved by Design Review staff.
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. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions should be a nice addition to the neighborhood.

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 2, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da