

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
NOVEMBER 5, 2003

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
John Poulsen - Vice Chair
Robert Burgheimer
Randy Carter
Jillian Hagen
Vince DiBella
Pete Berzins

MEMBERS ABSENT

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman	Pat Mahoney
Lesley Davis	John Mahoney
Debbie Archuleta	Jake Tarenton
Charlie Scully	Dorothy Shupe
Kurt Frimodig	Chuck Hill
Joe Dotty	Stephen Krager
Jerry Torr	Kari Kent
Michele Lorance	Others
Ron Ault	
Thomas Bottomly	

1. Call to Order:

Chair Carie Allen called the meeting to order at 3:45 p.m.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the October 1, 2003 and October 15, 2003 Meetings:

On a motion by Vince DiBella seconded by John Poulsen the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

3. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-81 **Via Homes Office**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 6857 East Parkway Norte
REQUEST: Approval of a 4,113 sq. ft. office
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Trudy Licano
APPLICANT: Michele Lorance
ARCHITECT: Bob Ball

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,113 sq. ft. office building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-81 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, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
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. **An updated plat will be required prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner - 480 644-2642, for additional information.**
5. **Provide manufacture, style and color of proposed veneer stone.**
6. **Minimum parking space size for spaces against the wall south of the building is 18' x 9'. Minimum drive aisle width at the gate is 20'.**
7. **Maximum eight parking spaces between landscape islands is allowed.**
8. **Provide concealed roof vents.**
9. **Provide parking spaces required by Code.**
10. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
11. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of 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 development as proposed with conditions is consistent with the design theme established for the subdivision.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-82 **Superstitions Springs Honda**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: Lot 6 of Superstition Springs Auto Park
REQUEST: Approval of a 5 acre new car sales facility
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Bob Zamora
APPLICANT: John Mahoney
ARCHITECT: John Mahoney

REQUEST: Approval of a 5 acre new car sales facility

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-82 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, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations. **Site development standards are required to comply with June 12, 1996 Design Guidelines, which was established under Ordinance #3246, and all other conditions of approval established with the approval of Zoning Case Z96-68.**
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. **The 8' walls proposed in the parking area that will screen the back of the building are to match the CMU proposed on the building, which is 8"x8"x16" ground face CMU with vertical score, color – Trendstone "Pebble Beach".**
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 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 development as proposed with conditions is an attractive addition to the Auto Park.

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

requirements would be enforceable.

Boardmember Randy Carter was concerned with the fence along the retention basin. Boardmember Burgheimer was concerned with the view of the Wal-Mart service area; he suggested the wall be solid. Boardmember Jillian Hagen suggested a wall that is a combination of solid wall and then portions of wrought iron. She stated that there would be a lot of trees within the retention basin. The applicants stated the Wal-Mart would have a landscape strip behind their retention basin.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed that the problem was Wal-Mart would not allow building to be attached to them and the Wal-Mart should have been required to allow cross-access.

The applicant stated that the Wal-Mart had been asked to restrict truck access onto St. Paul and there would be no way to do that if there was cross access along the north of the center.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen confirmed that on the west side of Shops B there was a turn down on the concrete walkway along St, Paul but not a screen wall. She was concerned that there was no foundation planting shown, on that side of the building. She confirmed the applicants were agreeing to meet Code requirements.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Pete Berzins that DR03-83 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, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
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. **Revise the color of the rear service doors to match the wainscot base, which is indicated as Sherwin Williams "Smokey Topaz".**
8. **Revise column placement at Pad "A" to show five (5) foot setback from base of columns to face of curb.**
9. **Provide building foundation base landscaping along the front entry exterior walls for all three buildings to include landscaping equal to at least fifty percent (50%) of the exterior wall length with minimum three (3) foot wide planters for shrubs and eight (8) feet wide for trees.**
10. **Provide building foundation base landscaping along the side elevations equal to twenty-five percent (25%) of the exterior wall length.**
11. **Show building foundation base landscaping at rear elevation and along drive-**

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- through lane for Pad "A" with minimum two (2) feet of foundation base area except at pick-up window project area.
12. Provide revised landscape plan showing landscape island with at least one tree and three shrubs at each end of a row of stalls and in between for maximum of eight (8) contiguous spaces, including at Shops "B", Shops "A" and Pad "A".
 13. Provide the Design Review Board with color elevations showing the design and materials of any proposed freestanding signs.
 14. Revise the Site Plan and Grading and Drainage Plan to include irregular contours and berms for all on-site drainage retention basin areas.
 15. Revise site plan to include 32" to 40" screen walls staggered in plan every 50 feet for all parking areas facing on the street, including staggered screen walls along N. Higley Road and complete screening of parking areas along N. St. Paul Street.
 16. Provide the Board with elevation detail describing materials, colors and design details of the fence and gate to be installed between the Wal-Mart Neighborhood Market and the rear area of Shops "A".
 17. Eliminate the north driveway along St. Paul that lines up with Covina.
 18. Relocate the trash enclosures per Solid Waste standards.
 19. Lower the stucco pop out, on the rear of Shops B, 18" or 16".
 20. Either eliminate the guardrail on the west side of Shops B or provide a decorative guardrail; to be approved by Design Review staff.
 21. Revise the curved parapet element to be more compatible with the shopping center. To be approved by Design Review staff.
 22. Signage to come back as a comprehensive sign plan through Design Review.
 23. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of 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 development as proposed with conditions is compatible with the design of the Wal-Mart Neighborhood Market.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B) and Tape 2 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-84 **Southern & Crismon Retail**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC Crismon Rd. and Southern Ave.
SUMMARY OF REQUEST: 9,600 sq. ft. Inline retail commercial building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: NWC Crismon and Southern, LLC
APPLICANT: J. Taranton Development and Management Services
ARCHITECT: Chuck Hill, Hill Group Architecture

REQUEST: Approval of a 9,600 sq. ft. retail building

SUMMARY: Chuck Hill and Jake Tarenton represented the case. They stated that the building materials and colors, with the exception of the teal, matched the Walgreen's but they had added more interest to their building.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated the Board's concerns were how far the elements popped out and how the glass storefront was set in. The Board wanted to know if the storefront was flush or recessed.

Boardmember Randy Carter was concerned with the height of the west elevation and the view for the residents to the west. He wanted the parapet and the towers lowered. He understood they were trying to match the towers on the front of the building, but he felt they needed to be lowered on the rear. The applicant stated that they have a tenant who needs a 12' ceiling. He was concerned that if the parapet were lowered their mechanical units would be visible. Boardmember Carter stated that if the parapet could not be lowered then it needed to have more detail. He felt it would take 10 years before the trees could screen the building.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen stated that the landscaping along the west of the property is within a retention basin. The applicant stated that there would be 4' to 5' of level area at the west property line and then the retention area would drop. Boardmember Hagen stated they were showing Shoestring Acacia and Salicina, which would never be tall trees. The applicant stated they would be willing to use other trees or increase the density or size to create a buffer.

Boardmember Carter liked the front of the building and liked the fact the building did not look like Walgreen's.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen agreed with Boardmember Carter's concerns regarding the rear of the building. She felt that something architectural needed to be done to the west elevation. She felt that a taller tree would screen better.

Boardmember Vince DiBella was concerned with the proposed lighting along the west portion of the site. He confirmed they would be using wall-packs. He wanted to see more articulation along the rear of the building. He suggested awnings over the doors.

Boardmember Hagen suggested iron ornamentation, trellises and vines.

Boardmember Carter confirmed the slope of the roof was 1/2" per foot and the depth of the structure was 3' deep steel truss. He felt that the roof could come down based on the building section. The applicant stated that they needed to raise the ceiling height for a potential tenant.

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Carter did not feel they needed 3' for a steel truss.

Laura Hyneman was concerned that the proposal included a low profile mechanical unit and often in the field the contractor substitutes a less expensive, taller unit that then becomes visible. She felt the low profile unit needed to be stipulated.

The applicants were willing to lower the parapet height as long as they could have a 12' ceiling height, which was not what was shown in the section.

Boardmember Carter was willing to allow the height of the building as long as the monumentality of the building was mitigated.

Boardmember Hagen was concerned that the planter along the front of the building was 3' with a 2' space between the planter and the back of the curb. She wanted shrubs used instead of the ground cover shown.

Boardmember Pete Berzins agreed with the previous comments. He was concerned that there would be a drive-through at the north end of the building. He was concerned with the noise for the adjacent residences. The applicant stated the drive aisle would be one way. The originally approved site plan for this site had parking behind the building.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer wanted to see the entire building come down 2'. He wanted some type of architectural treatment for the rear elevation. He also wanted more color. He suggested the towers be a half shade darker. The applicant's stated they wanted to use more color, but they were trying to stay close to the Walgreen's. Boardmember Burgheimer agreed that the building should complement the Walgreen's, but he felt that additional color would help the building.

Boardmember John Poulsen felt that the rear of the building needed something. He agreed that painting the tower elements could help, and that only the top portion of the rear elevation would be seen.

Chair Carie Allen would like to see the height of the building brought down. She also agreed that an additional color could be a good way to break up the front and the back.

Boardmember Poulsen confirmed that the overhang at the corners of the building would be 8" but there would be very little shading for the rest of the building. The awning could be a trellis material, which would provide very little shade.

The Board was concerned with the placement of the attached signs on the building. They wanted the signs to be placed so they did not interrupt the proportions of the architectural.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer did not want signage on the north elevation.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR03-84 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, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

submitted, except as noted below.

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. **"Future Pad A" is not included in the review or approval for DR03-84. Any future development of the Pad A site is required to be approved by the Design Review Board and will be required to meet all City requirements at that time.**
8. **Revise elevations to include stucco covered popout detail around the storefront windows. Popout to be similar to the detail, material and color shown around the arches at the towers.**
9. **Lower the parapets on the west elevation 2'.**
10. **Provide additional interest on the west elevation with architectural treatments; banding, trellises, vines, etc. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
11. **Provide a third color for the tower elements. Details to be approved by Design Review staff.**
12. **The sign plan to be approved by Design Review staff.**
13. **Provide shrubs in the landscape planter along the front of the building.**
14. **The retention basin needs to comply with Chapter 15 of the Zoning Code.**
15. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of 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 development as proposed with conditions is unique but complements the existing Walgreen's.

Recorded on Tape No.: 2 (side A & B)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-85 **Commercial Building**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 4460 East Main Street
SUMMARY OF REQUEST: Design Review of multi-tenant commercial building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Henry Wendt
APPLICANT: Joe Dotty
ARCHITECT: Jerry Torr

REQUEST: Approval of 37,576 sq. ft. of office, retail and auto repair

SUMMARY: Joe Dotty and Jerry Torr represented the case. Mr. Dotty stated the commercial building to the east of them is over 30 years and the shopping center to the west is over 20 to 25 years old. They had looked at placing the buildings along the sides with one drive in the middle but then they would have to cul-de-sac the drive, so they went to the Engineering Division and received permission to have two driveways. He stated that along the west side they have the back side of a shopping center with service doors. He asked for the Board's help in developing the property and stated he was open to almost any suggestion. Mr. Torr stated that since they had received the staff report he had redesigned the elevations and proposed colors, which he had brought to the meeting and staff had hung up on the Board. Staff explained that they had not had any time to review the changes and therefore could not comment on them including whether they meet Code requirements.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed that customers would be able to drive into the building from the west and exit the building on the east. He also confirmed they could enter and exit from the west. The west side would be the front of the project and the east side would be the service side.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed that internally the building would have automobile lifts.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer did not feel the building could be approved by Building Safety. The upper floor would be occupied area. Mr. Torr stated that the upper level would be storage only.

Boardmember Vince DiBella stated that the building is so long and linear, with the long alley like drives. He felt the drives were detrimental to the project. He suggested two building masses, one along the west side of the property and one along the east side to break up the mass. The building was so long with no break in the elevations. He agreed with Boardmember Burgheimer that there would be area separation issues. He felt that a two building scheme that you drive/"S" your way through would be better. He stated that as designed, with one building, it was very difficult to even give suggestions.

Mr. Dotty stated they couldn't get customers to the rear building.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen felt they had the same problem with the proposed design.

Boardmember DiBella agreed and felt that they would probably have to give up some square footage to make the project work.

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Randy Carter liked Boardmember DiBella's idea to split the building somewhere. If they were unwilling to look at that option, they need to redesign the roof. He suggested the bays could pop-up to break up some of the massing with a parapet roof; use a cornice; some awnings. He felt the pitched roof made the building look even more horizontal. He wanted the building broken up, or at least the pieces of the building broken up so it wouldn't look like a metal hangar. The building needed vertical elements.

Mr. Dotty stated they were willing to use flat roofs.

Boardmember Pete Berzins could understand giving the applicant some relief along the west side where they are adjacent to the back side of a shopping center; however he confirmed that there is someone living to the east of this property. He agreed breaking the building from being so long and losing some of the square footage would make the building friendlier for customers.

Mr. Dotty stated that the traffic works better if there are two drives, he stated he was willing to take 20' out of the building so it looks like two buildings.

Boardmember Carter asked if a Civil Engineer had looked at this project yet. He was concerned that they were not showing enough retention. The applicants stated that they were placing the retention along the west and east property lines. The only other option was to go underground.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated the proposed building was not very pleasant. He understood that the buildings in the area were older but this building had no consistency with what they have been approving. He agreed with previous comments that the building should be split into two buildings and felt that the building along the west could have a zero lot line. He understood the site was difficult, but felt the applicant had not come up with a very creative solution. He felt that what this site needed was creativity. He felt the gabled roof would not work; it made the building appear to be almost 3-story, he suggested a parapet roof and move the mechanical units. He stated that stucco is not an acceptable building material for this type of use, it needed a more substantial material that could withstand auto related uses. The fact that the building is so long and monumental makes it look like a big box. Mr. Dotty stated that from Main Street you could probably only see a fourth of the building. Boardmember Burgheimer stated that if you look at buildings that have been constructed recently along Main Street and this building was not even close in terms of quality. He suggested they look at automotive buildings built recently. Mr. Dotty stated they didn't have a problem changing the elevation; their problem was with the site. He stated they could use a flat roof, raise or lower the roof, they could even separate the building into two pieces; however, they could not change the site.

Boardmember Carter stated the problem isn't the site, the problem is the building. The building is unattractive and will not complement anything in Mesa. He was sure staff had been giving them suggestions but it didn't look like they had listened to staff.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that the site planning was not the only problem, it was also the building. They wanted to make sure the applicants understood that the Board wanted to see a building of the same quality as the other buildings reviewed by the Board at that meeting. He wanted them to understand that they were really going to have to step up what

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

they are proposing because what they were showing was not acceptable.

Boardmember Carter stated that this project was a long, narrow, big box, but it was still similar to other big boxes such as drug stores, but they have punctuated, broken up the façade, done vertical elements. He acknowledged it would cost more than what they were proposing, but they would probably get higher lease prices. He was concerned that the west elevation of this building would be very visible to traffic traveling east along Main, and since the building was tall the top portion of the building would be very visible. He felt the building needed masonry, cornice treatments, and creativity. It could not look like a big metal box.

Boardmember John Poulsen was concerned the applicant's were simply trying to maximize the property and this was not the right land use for this property. He suggested an office or retail building in the front with storage in the rear. He agreed the property was an odd shape, but did not feel the land use worked. He did not feel the Board could approve a building which is 516'-6" long on this property.

Boardmember Burgheimer was concerned this building would be very difficult to rent. He wondered how many tenants would take a two bay area. It would only be a very specialized business. He suggested clustering. He was still concerned that this building, as an automotive use could not be approved by Building Safety.

Chair Carie Allen agreed with previous concerns. She understood that they were frustrated that the buildings around them do not meet current Code; however, they were built many years ago and it is the charge of the Design Review Board to improve the look of the City.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-85 be continued.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: To allow the applicants time to completely redesign the building and site plan.

Recorded on Tape No.: 2 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-86 **Office Building for Delos Development**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC McKellips & Arboleda
REQUEST: Approval of a 19,700 sq. ft. 2-story office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Delos Developments
APPLICANT: Dorothy Shupe
ARCHITECT: Dreamcatchers

REQUEST: Approval of a 19,700 sq. ft., 2-story office building

SUMMARY: Boardmember Randy Carter declared a conflict of interest and left the room.

Tom Bottomly represented the case. He stated the owner had agreed to all of the conditions with the exception of the landscaping at the north end of the project. Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that was a condition of approval for the Planning and Zoning case and therefore was not something this Board could waive. She stated that it was typical for applicant to be required to provide the perimeter landscaping with the first phase of development.

Boardmember John Poulsen felt the building was very attractive and different from anything they had seen for a while and he appreciated that. He confirmed there was residential development to the east of this project. He did feel the building was tall next to residential. Mr. Bottomly stated they had tried to break up the mass with the use of textures, materials, colors, forms and elements. The darker element on the north and east elevation is a curved element, so element peels away from you. Boardmember Poulsen felt that even with that the homeowners would still see a lot of the building due to the height.

Chair Carie Allen was concerned that the people in the second story offices would be able to see into the neighbor's yards.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was also concerned that the people in the offices would be able to look into yards. He suggested turning the building so that the entrance feature faced northwest rather than northeast. That way the entrance would be closer to the parking, and the "south" elevation, which has fewer windows, would face the neighbors. He liked the building very much, he liked the textures, the detailing. He wanted the canopy structure to be a different color. He confirmed the glass and frame would be anodized aluminum, he felt the building deserved a Kinar finish. He suggested colored glass.

Boardmember Pete Berzins agreed that turning the building was a good suggestion. He liked the building and felt it was a very well done building. He suggested using larger trees to mitigate the height.

Boardmember Vince DiBella felt there was a lot of glass on the west elevation; so spinning the building might mitigate the solar exposure. He suggested high performance glass.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen agreed with previous comments. She felt it would be nice to a variation in the roof height. She liked the colors.

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Burgheimer would like to see colored grout used. He suggested popping some of the masonry in or out, or the small detail elements could be popped in, or substituted for tile.

Chair Carie Allen agreed with previous comments. She was pleased that they were not matching Tia Rosa's. She felt the materials and colors were very nice. She appreciated the quality of the architecture.

Boardmember Poulsen felt that if the neighbors had privacy concerns they could plant trees on their property also.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated this project had gone through the Planning and Zoning Board so the neighbors had been notified of the project.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-86 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, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
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 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 Randy Carter declared a conflict of interest)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is attractive and different from anything they had seen.

Recorded on Tape No.: 2 (side B) and Tape 3 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-80 **Mulberry Business Park – Phase 2**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 248 South Mulberry
REQUEST: Approval of a 36,008 sq. ft. industrial building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: MP Mulberry
APPLICANT: Euthenics Architecture
ARCHITECT: Euthenics Architecture

REQUEST: Approval of a 36,008 sq. ft. industrial building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-80 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, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
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 Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit.**
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. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
6. **Approval of future development by the Design Review Board.**
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 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 development as proposed with conditions is similar to the buildings previously approved on this site.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5. 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Other Business:

Revisions to the Val Vista Executive Suites:

Mr. Presented two color choices for the building.

The Board confirmed the applicant's choice of colors schemes was option 1. The Board concurred.

Chair Carie Allen stated she could approve a terra cota color but not an actual orange.

It was moved by John Poulsen, seconded by Jillian Hagen that color option 1 be approved.

Vote: 6 – 1 Carie Allen voting nay

Revisions to Eckerd at Stapley & McKellips:

There was no one present to represent the case. Staffmember Charlie Scully showed the Board the color revisions he had been given and explained, the proposed revisions. He explained that the applicant was asking to change the copper color roof to Colonial Red; change the trim from an ash to white, and use Fuego Red brick, for Hacienda Brick which they claim is no longer available.

After some discussion including comments that the brick is available if the applicant looks at more suppliers. The Board felt the Fuego Red brick is very unattractive. The Board determined that if the applicant wishes to make changes they need to have someone present to explain the changes, the Board also wanted actual samples of the materials being proposed not just photos.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da