

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MAY 3, 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
Vince DiBella

MEMBERS ABSENT

Tim Nielsen (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

Kim Steadman	Michael Fries
Lesley Davis	Ernie Garcia
Debbie Archuleta	Joe Micelli
Mia Lozano Helland	Philip Reina
John Wesley	Eddie Vidales
Wayne Rockwood	
Jerry Vest	
Bob Weigel	
John Brown	
Jared McQuarrie	
Terry Tull	
David Ross	
Brandon Pl	
Richard Dyer	
Lena Cartwell	
Dan Copeland	
Michael Jorgensen	
Martin Hazine	
David Calcaterra	
Mike Kraft	
Jeff Pipkin	
Bob Saemisch	
Larry Boardurow	
David Udall	

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

1. Work Session:

CASE: Office Condo shell building
7565 E Eaglecrest

REQUEST: Approval of an office project

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- The elevations are not well drawn; the rendering is better

Boardmember Pete Berzins:

- Concerned with roof vents at tower
- Concerned with the parking

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Mesa/University mixed use center
NWC University & Greenfield

REQUEST: Approval of a 2-story mini-storage facility and retail

DISCUSSION:

Staffmember Jennifer Gniffke explained the applicants had submitted revised elevations that did not include the recessed elements. The applicants stated the elements were too costly.

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- No wrought iron fence next to residential
- Trash cannot be along the street

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Appreciates the retail in front
- If they want the retail to look different from the mini-storage; it needs to look like the Osco

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Why is the storage CMU and the retail stucco?
- The buildings don't work together; why the disconnect?
- Don't like the stucco building
- If it is stucco it needs to have a wainscot or some other architectural features
- Don't want painted masonry
- Perhaps colored mullions
- Concern with the landscape buffer along residential

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Gateway Norte
4314, 4320, 4328, 4330 S Sagewood

REQUEST: Approval of four industrial buildings within Gateway Norte

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Look at possibly using a metal roof

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Landscape palette needs to work with the remainder of Gateway Norte
- Doesn't like the "Taco Bell" element

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Please submit elevations that show all four fronts and all four rear elevations
- Could they tie the buildings together with a trellis or a wall element to give a street scape; then pull the landscaping to the front
- Maybe a wall with a hole in it
- The yellow is too foreign
- Maybe the same colors but used a different way on each building
- The pink and the yellow don't work together

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Similar architecture to remainder of center; this is not as industrial
- The mission style is stretched too much

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Lucky Star Auto
430 W Guadalupe

REQUEST: Approval of an auto service building

DISCUSSION:

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Step up the parapet

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Vertical relief
- Variation of roof line
- Define the office
- Do something different with the doors; maybe windows

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Doesn't match the quality of what has been approved in the last few years for auto repair uses
- Not well integrated
- Look at the Sun Devil Auto on Power and McKellips
- Not an exciting project
- Maybe patterning of the block; or step the block in and out
- Maybe metal trellis on the front
- Look at materials and how well it will weather over time
- Could use downspouts as a design element

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Trash enclosure won't work
- 4" projection of piers not enough; looks like a flat box
- Different color on doors
- More play to the windows
- Look at using the rust color on the sides
- Glazing could come down

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Falcon Commons
SWC Ingram & Higley

REQUEST: Approval of three industrial office/warehouse buildings

DISCUSSION:

Chair Pete Berzins:

- There appear to be more colors on the color board than there are on the elevations

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- The Board has seen this building 3 or 4 times already. It needs to change.
- Variation of height
- This has become a prototype

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Not enough change of color
- Plain
- Needs a lot more going on
- Needs additional play
- More light and shadow
- Change color of bay doors to give them recess and form
- Just develop it a little more
- Maybe canopies
- More intense changes; but not too busy

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Signal Butte Market Place
SWC Signal Butte & Main

REQUEST: Approval of new retail buildings in an existing shopping center

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Concerned with signage placement

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Nice little buildings
- Colors are interesting
- Horizontal break on light-colored buildings can get streaky; the ledge could be a problem
- Concerned the signage will look squashed

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Liked the vertical and square forms of the glass

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Panda Express
Riverview

REQUEST: Approval of a restaurant with drive-thru window

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Provide elevations for the outdoor dining canopy with the second submittal

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Nice building
- May want a shade darker at the recessed areas

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- A little concerned with the roman arch, but agreed painting recessed area darker would help
- Doesn't like the cover over the drive thru window
- Liked the entry roof forms and the Mesa Stone accents

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Quick N Clean
S of SEC Power & University

REQUEST: Approval of a car wash

DISCUSSION:

Chair Pete Berinz:

- Need to see details of the canopies for the Design Review meeting
- Traffic flow is awkward
- Traffic is going every which way
- Trash doesn't work

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Clean building
- Canopies will be very important; must be shown on follow-up submittal

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- If canopies have arched form could they split it so it's a half arc and a half arc so they square off rather than an oblique

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Canopies should be curved
- A lot of roof top equipment; make sure it is screened
- Doesn't like the tower element; it looks tall and spindly
- Lower the tower element

The site may work well, but its workings all need to be presented more clearly.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Sunrise Pre-school
West side of Lindsay north of Main

REQUEST: Approval of a pre-school

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Confirmed it will replace the one at Adobe and Lindsay

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Good entry element, but tower needs more design and more materials

Chair Pete Berzins:

- East elevation below canopy looks like a boarded up window
- Provide relief
- Could there be some small windows at the top of the kitchen area to provide natural light?
- Is this a prototype?

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Very similar to other Sun Rise Preschools
- Could there be additional building materials on the front?
- Could remove the wainscot on the rear where the children play

Do something different with the faux windows, perhaps a 3-dimensional element

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Gateway Norte
East side of Power north of Warner

REQUEST: Approval of an industrial building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Stucco cornice doesn't look very rich
- Pre-cast look more upscale

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Need relief between the glass and the building; 8' is good
- Proportion of tile and signage seems odd
- Revise the areas with four colors and no tile; the white area is really bad

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Doesn't want spandrel glass

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Towers should be open so there is natural light during the day
- Very concerned with the yellow and pink colors working together; try not to use them next to each other

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- The cornice element below the tower seems foreign
- Likes the 360° glass
- The colors need to turn the corners to a change in plain

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

2. Call to Order:

Chair Pete Berzins called the meeting to order at 5:10 p.m.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the April 5, 2006 Meeting:

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

4. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-33 **Aquila Superstition – Residential (north of Hampton)**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 96 Street & Southern
REQUEST: Approval of a 4,940 sq. ft. residential
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Pacific Ventures
APPLICANT: Martin Hazine
ARCHITECT: George Tibsherany

REQUEST: Approval of 174 residential units (north of Hampton)

SUMMARY: Martin Hazine represented the case and stated the original submittal had been for 204 residential units; the revised submittal, based on their Planning and Zoning recommendation was for 174 residential units only north of Hampton.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley appreciated the commercial portion being separated. He thought the colors would be harmonious with the desert.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed the units would be 35'-11" in height.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer liked the colors and forms.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Dave Richins that DR06-33 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 DR staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Revise the site plan to delete the portion of the project south of Hampton.
 - b. Provide pavers or distinguished pavement on all drive aisle arroyo crossings.
 - c. Provide a minimum 5' foundation base adjacent to drive aisles.
 - d. Provide a minimum 10' foundation base adjacent to parking.
 - e. Provide an additional 2' of landscaping for all landscape areas that are encroached by a vehicle 2' overhang.
 - f. Maintain a minimum arroyo width of 23', which is only encroached by pedestrian pathways and amenities (underground retention, utilities, and surface drive aisle crossings may encroach the arroyo).
 - g. Retention basins to be 6:1 slopes maximum where adjacent to public right-of-ways or pedestrian walkways.
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 MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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 & roof access ladders are to be located within the bldg.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project, as conditioned, meets the design standards of the Zoning Ordinance, and provides well designed residential units.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-42 KBAD 22

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 5250 E Southern
REQUEST: Approval of a 16,132 sq. ft. office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: KBAD 22 Enterprises
APPLICANT: Marcus Murray
ARCHITECT: William Johns

REQUEST: Approval of a 16,132 sq. ft. office building

SUMMARY: No one was present to represent the case.

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR06-42 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 color of the metal awning to match the colored rendering, which portrays a "sage" green tone rather than the darker green presented on the color/material board. Provide a revised/color material board reflecting the change.
 - b. Provide a revised/color material board that identifies the color of the glass.
 - c. The gable roof element on the east and west elevations shall come back farther and provide variation in the straight parapet roof section.
 - d. Provide additional stone at the entrances.
 - e. Provide a more architectural light fixture for the building that enhances the design and residential character of the building.
 - f. Provide screen walls in accordance with §11-15-4 and provide elevations of those screen walls as well as elevations of the gates and walls for the trash enclosure.
 - g. Provide elevations and color specifications for the carport structures.
 - h. Provide a revised landscape plan with the required minimum of 8' x 15' landscape planters for the parking areas.
2. Review and approval for Site Plan Modification, and compliance with all requirements of that approval.
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.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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 5 – 0

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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-43 TCF Bank

LOCATION/ADDRESS: W of NWC Greenfield & Juanita
REQUEST: Approval of a 4,500 sq. ft. bank with drive thru tellers
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Lumberjack Capital
APPLICANT: HTG Architects
ARCHITECT: Jim Grover

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,500 sq. ft. bank with drive-thru tellers

SUMMARY: Mike Kraft represented the case. Mr. Kraft stated they had modified the roof pitch and tower; split the tower at the eave line; thickened the fascia; and lowered the stone wainscot.

Boardmember Dave Richins thought the building was symmetrical and flat. He did not think the tower related well to the rest of the building. He thought the modifications were still not quite there.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer appreciates their responding to the Board's concerns; however, he did not think they had addressed all of the concerns. He was still concerned with the proportions of the building. He thought the spring line of the roof should be lowered. He thought the tower still needed another color. He thought the roof line of the bank and the drive thru should be different, by 2' to 3'.

Boardmember Vince DiBella thought the canopy should have another step in the fascia. He thought the building had a monochromatic and traditional use of materials.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought the proportions were still to even. He did not think there had been enough change. He thought there should be an additional color. He thought the canopy looked tacked on. He felt the project should come back with changes to proportion and the tower element.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer suggested the canopy use a hip and gable. He also suggested the roof be revised to have a roof vent with a flat area on two sides, that could create a hip vent, then a hipped edge at the drive thru.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR06-43 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 Color/Material Board that includes actual paint chips with color and brand specifications, photo brochures of materials such as stone and roof tiles are acceptable. Include colors/material specifications for light

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

fixtures, glass and storefront. Also provide color/material call-outs on all elevations.

- b. Provide right-of-way dimensions for Juanita Ave. on the Site Plan and Landscape Plan.
 - c. **Work with staff to revise the driveway entrance element, introducing a hipped element instead of the gabled corner. Rework the cornice.**
 - d. **Work with staff to develop a complementary color on the building at the entry element.**
 - e. **Introduce a secondary cornice under the eave or lowering the spring line of the roof to scale down the building from the window height to the bottom of the eave.**
 - f. **Re-pitch the roof to introduce ridge vents if possible. Staff to review.**
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
 3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
 4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
 5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
 6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
 7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: As conditioned, the project meets the design standards of the Zoning Ordinance.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-44 Alliance Bank

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1110 E Baseline
REQUEST: Approval of an 11,260 sq. ft. bank w/drive-thru
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: Alliance Bank
APPLICANT: DFD Cornoyer Hedrick
ARCHITECT: DFD Cornoyer Hedrick

REQUEST: Approval of an 11,260 sq. ft. bank with drive-thru

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Dave Richins that DR06-44 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Compliance with the conditions of approval of the site plan modification memo that will be approved administratively with this Design Review Board case.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is well-designed and interesting.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-45 Colt Neck M.O.B.

LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC Val Vista & McDowell
REQUEST: Approval of a 9,725 sq. ft. medical office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Colts Neck Holdings
APPLICANT: Deutsch Associates
ARCHITECT: Deutsch Associates

REQUEST: Approval of a 9,725 sq. ft. medical office building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Dave Richins that DR06-45 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 elevations that show the correct material finish information in the Exterior Finish Schedule as described in the BUILDING COLORS/MATERIALS section of this staff report.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-46 Odyssey Professional Park
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2149 S Vineyard
REQUEST: Approval of five buildings totaling 85,848 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: Sydney OBP Mesa
APPLICANT: Odyssey Commercial
ARCHITECT: Thomas Kenrick

REQUEST: Approval of five buildings totaling 85,848 sq. ft.

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Dave Richins that DR06-46 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 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: Interesting and varied use of forms, materials, color and landscaping make this project a very good addition to the City.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-47 Falcon Industrial

LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC Ingram St. & Higley Rd.
REQUEST: Approval of four buildings totaling 62,776 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: LGE Corporation
APPLICANT: Cawley Architects
ARCHITECT: Cawley Architects

REQUEST: Approval of four buildings totaling 62,776 sq. ft.

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Dave Richins that DR06-47 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 7 additional trees and 39 shrubs to the north property line landscape yard.
 - b. Provide type of material used for parapet wall cornices.
 - c. Approval and recordation of the larger plat, "Falcon Commerce Park", within which this preliminary plat is located, prior to applying for building permits.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: As conditioned, this project meets the design standards of the Zoning Ordinance.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-48 Power Mall Remodel
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2050 S Roslyn
REQUEST: Remodel of an existing outlet mall
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Infinity Mesa
APPLICANT: Bob Saemisch
ARCHITECT: Bob Saemisch

REQUEST: Approval of the remodel of an existing outlet mall

SUMMARY: Dave Udall and Bob Saemisch represented the case. Mr. Saemisch stated the intent was to provide covered parking and signage to the street because the center is buried. They were proposing a reader board, and an electronic reader board. This Board will review for color, location and design. Board of Adjustment will review for quantity and square footage of signage.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer liked the elements and thought the center needed the signage. He suggested they change the roof color to tie in better with the new structures. Mr. Saemisch stated the owner would be willing to paint the roof white if these panels don't hide it. Mr. Saemisch suggested there could be a taller panel at one corner and put the Power Plaza sign on that corner. He suggested the roof could be galvalume or a high tech like the adjacent Dolphin car wash. Maybe some of the panels could be perforated metal.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley liked the geometry of the panels. He agreed the center needs something. He agreed red and white would be easier on the eyes than black and white. He liked that the columns were in the planters. He confirmed the rain water would be directed to one end, and probably drain into the columns.

Boardmember Dave Richins thought the blue roof with the red seemed very odd. He would prefer the roof be painted to either the red or the white to tie in better with the new structure.

Chair Pete Berzins thought the white roof would be a necessity. He was concerned that this would set a precedent for other older centers that would want additional signage. He thought the structure was a big sign wrapped all the way around the building. He thought the structure looked tacked on.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Dave Richins that DR06-48 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. The approval includes a 24" tall, continuous LED panel at the bottom of the superstructure of the parking canopies. Any reduction in the length of LED

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

panel is to be filled by a 24" tall red metal panel. Staff to review and approve.

- b. Staff to review and approve any changes to the color of the LED display.
 - c. Staff to review and approve any revisions to existing monument signs.
 - d. **The applicant to revise the roof colors to white or galvanized metal.**
2. Modify or replace the current Comprehensive Sign Plan to permit the current sign proposal.
 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 3 – 1 (Chair Pete Berzins voting nay)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project adds design interest to an older commercial center.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-49 Dana Park Village Square 3
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1700 S Val Vista
REQUEST: Approval of 116,494 sq. ft. of retail
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: Village Square Dana Park LLC
APPLICANT: Bob Saemisch
ARCHITECT: Bob Saemisch

REQUEST: Approval of 116,494 sq. ft. of retail

SUMMARY: Bob Saemisch represented the case.

Dan Copeland, an adjacent neighbor passed out packets the adjacent neighbors had been given by the developers prior to development of the project. Mr. Copeland's objections pertained to the parking garage that was not part of this submittal. Mr. Saemisch stated the parking garage would be for the condominium project that won't be presented for some time.

Staffmember Kim Steadman explained that the Zoning Administrator had made a determination that the tower was a Freeway Landmark Monument Sign, and therefore cannot be a part of this discussion. The "FLMS" would have to go through other public hearings prior to being considered by this Board. He also explained that the tower, if it did not have signage was not part of the approved BIZ and would therefore require an amendment to the BIZ prior to being heard by this Board. The tower was also located within the 30' building setback, which would require a modification to the BIZ prior to being heard by this Board.

Mr. Saemisch stated they disagreed with the interpretation by the Zoning Administrator and felt the tower concept was architecture, and they wanted it approved now and then they would apply for the "FLMS" at a later time. He also stated the north-side piers of the tower should be larger, which would make the arch smaller.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer did not agree with staff. He thought the tower was no different from the Cinemark spier. He stated is was an architectural element that the Board could approve. Someone else could then discuss whether it has signage on it.

Boardmember Dave Richins thought this set a great design precedent for "FLMS" signs from what had been approved in the past.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the tower was consistent with the rest of the center and needed to be approved with this project.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley liked the tower. Speaking about the retail shops, he thought the windows at the left end of building #7 should be square.

Boardmember Dave Richins thought the rear elevation (facing the freeway) should match the front with windows and cornices. He supported the tower.

Chair Pete Berzins thought the overall center was nice. He did not want the tower to

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

become a sign. If it was only a tower he thought it should be moved into the project so it wasn't at the very end. He thought the tower at the end looked tacked on. If it were moved into the project he could consider it an architectural element.

MOTION: It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR06-49 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. Modify the north elevation, of the westernmost tenant space of building #7, so the gable element reflects what is happening on the south elevation.
 - b. The Freeway Landmark Monument Sign tower is approved without signage. The addition of signage to this tower will require future Design Review Board approval.
2. Any additional tower / Freeway Landmark Monument Sign will require a modification to the BIZ overlay for this property, as well as a Council Use Permit.
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 & roof access ladders are to be located within the bldg.
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 3 – 1 (Chair Pete Berzins voting nay)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The design of the retail shops is in keeping with the quality of the existing center. (Mr. Berzins thought the tower was located in the wrong place within the project).

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

5. Appeals of Administrative Design Review:

ARCO LED details

Eddie Vidales, Phil Reina, and Ernie Garcia represented the case. Staffmember Kim Steadman explained the application was for an illuminated light band on the bull nose at the canopies and convenience store entries on four ARCO stations. Mr. Steadman stated staff was in support of the LED; however, the approval had to come from the Board, per the Zoning Ordinance.

Chair Pete Berzins confirmed the bull nose was 12"; however, the LED would be 1". He also confirmed the LED would be red on the building and light blue on the canopies.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that the Board approved the LED as presented.

VOTE: 5 – 0

Gateway Commons

Jeff Pipkin and Michael Friers represented the case. Mr. Pipkin stated they agreed to the conditions except for the canopy. They don't see the need for a grand entry now that the building will be a multi-tenant shell instead of the one tenant they originally thought they would have.

Boardmember Vince DiBella did not think lowering the canopy worked. He thought it hurt the massing of the building and the columns no longer worked.

Chair Pete Berzins understood their problem but did not think this was the right solution. He thought they needed to break up the roof.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley agreed the solution did not work. The original canopy broke the roof line. They were stripping away the style and character of the building. They need to re-address the spindly columns. They need to mitigate the fact they have a long, low building. The building doesn't step. He suggested providing a form with an arc intersecting it.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated he was never really fond of the building, and the roof was the only thing breaking the form. He stated that if there were going to be multiple tenants the building should have more elements. He suggested repeating the free-standing archway canopy detail on the west elevation around the building.

MOTION: It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that the appeal be denied. Any other revisions to this building must come back to the Board.

VOTE: 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Sautee Sign Package

No one was present to represent the case.

Staffmember Kim Steadman explained the requested change to the sign.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tom Bottomley that the appeal be denied.

VOTE: 4 – 1 (Boardmember Dave Richins voting nay)

6. Other Business:

Discussion of Work Session procedure

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer questioned whether the work session should be more formal, or possibly split off to a different day or time.

Boardmember Dave Richins suggested staff take the number of work session cases and divide by one hour and assign time limits.

Chair Pete Berzins thought the Boardmembers needed to be more succinct.

It was decided the work session would remain at the same time and staff would continue to send copies of the site plan, landscape plan, and elevations to the Board in advance of the meeting, but also put aerials in their packet.

Discussion of background colors for FLMS panels

Staffmember Kim Steadman explained staff cannot control the background colors used on, monument, or FLMS signage if the background color is a trademark. He thought the Board should be aware of that, especially when approving monument and FLMS signage.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the shopping center management could set standards for colors.

Boardmember Vince DiBella thought the City might be able to be part of the decision making process with the developers.

The Board requested staff ask Jim Smith to attend a Design Review Board meeting so they can discuss the actual case law in order to understand exactly how far the

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Board can go.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da