

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

October 2, 2002

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
Griswold
John O'Hara- Vice Chair
Robert Burgheimer
John Poulsen
Jillian Hagen

MEMBERS ABSENT

Randy Carter (excused)
Ann Schwaderer (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman	Councilmember Rex
Lesley Davis	Mike Reidy
Debbie Archuleta	Sherman Cawley
Charlie Scully	Bob Winton
Richard Dyer	Allan Williams
Matt McMahan	Rick Reigel
George Melara	Mark Cooley
Steve Chucri	Others

1. **Call to Order:**

Chair Carie Allen called the meeting to order at 3:44 p.m.

2. **Approval of the Minutes of the September 4, 2002 Meeting:**

On a motion by Rob Burgheimer seconded by John Poulsen the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

3. **Design Review Cases:**

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 2, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR02-41 **Cactus Waste Transfer Station**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: North of the northeast corner of Pecos & Mountain
REQUEST: Design Review approval of a waste transfer station
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Mark Cooley, Cactus Waste Systems
APPLICANT: Robert Winton
ARCHITECT: Robert Winton

REQUEST: Approval of a 19,600 sq. ft. waste transfer station with a 300 sq. ft. scale house

SUMMARY: Staffmember Charlie Scully briefly explained the use of the property and reason for the unique design of the building including the open east elevation, which is necessary to allow vehicles to access the building in order to dump their load within the building. He stated that Phase II of the project would be required to come back to the Design Review Board for approval. Staffmember Scully explained the changes the applicant had made to the original submittal in order to address staff concerns. He explained that the Zoning Ordinance allows for a 20% increase to the maximum height for partial parapets. One unresolved issue is the monument sign which could be reviewed by Design Review staff prior to submittal for a permit. Another concern staff had was with the revised color choice. He stated that staff would prefer the original color submittal which had more contrast. Staffmember Scully stated that the scale house structure is compatible with the perimeter wall.

Bob Winton and Mark Cooley represented the case. Mr. Winton stated that they were willing to revise the colors and signage.

Boardmember John Poulsen confirmed that the main panels pop-out about 2' and the others about 1-1/2', then the louvers come out again. He also confirmed that the base of the building would be tilt panel with metal above.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed that the future Phase II area would be native vegetation. In the future it could be developed as offices, however the Phase I building would not be expanded. He was concerned with how the trash would be contained within the building.

Boardmember John Poulsen confirmed that the trash would not be left "on the floor". It would be pushed into the large trucks right away.

Boardmember Burgheimer confirmed that this facility would not be sorting the trash, simply transferring it to larger trucks.

Mr. Cooley stated that the building was designed so that the open elevation faces the tire recycling facility. Mr. Cooley explained that the station in Scottsdale has bay doors, however, in reality they are open all day.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 2, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Carie Allen had the same concerns regarding trash blowing around. She confirmed the traffic pattern for people bringing trash to the facility. She confirmed that the large trucks the trash is transferred into are in a tunnel 17' deep.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen liked the landscape plan along Mountain Road. She wanted the landscape palette along the drive to be more native varieties with additional shrubs, and placed in a more natural pattern.

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR02-41 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 the Preliminary Plan Review Team comments relating to Development Engineering, Fire Department, Plan Review and Building Safety concerns.
3. Prior to submittal of construction documents for the waste transfer station, submit revised elevations and color sample sheet to Design Review staff for approval of the exterior paint colors to show the colors originally proposed with the first submittal to show a darker color palette with greater contrast, including the concrete panels and the pre-finished metal siding on the transfer building and the stucco and concrete block on the scale house, as follows:
 - A. "Walrus Tusk" revised to "Botany Beige"
 - B. "Tequila" revised to "Crisp Khaki"
 - D. & E. "Light Stone" revised to "Sahara Tan"
4. Prior to submittal of construction documents for the waste transfer station, submit revised elevations to Design Review staff for approval of the detached freestanding monument sign to include a border around the sign cabinet comprised of the same materials and colors as used in the base.
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. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with the Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 20' height at the perimeter.
7. Fire risers and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
8. **Provide additional species of shrubs along the south landscape area.**
9. Provide two full size and two 8-1/2 X 11 sets 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.

During discussion of the motion Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was still concerned that trash would be able to blow around. He wanted to see some type of doors or chain link to contain the trash.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 2, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember John Poulsen confirmed that the building and slab are 140' deep.

Boardmember Burgheimer confirmed that they need the height so that trash trucks can rise up in order to dump within the building.

VOTE: Passed 3 – 1 (Boardmember Rob Burgheimer voting nay) Boardmember John O'Hara arrived just prior to the vote.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is reasonably well designed for this unique use. The majority of the Board felt that the issue of trash would be monitored by employees, neighbors, ADEQ, and the City.

Recorded on Tape No.: 142 – 1 (side A & B)

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 2, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR02-50 **Outback Restaurant**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1830 East McDowell
REQUEST: Approval of a 6,200 sq. ft. restaurant
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 1
OWNER: Jay Harper
APPLICANT: Jamie Butler
ARCHITECT: George Melara

REQUEST: Approval of a 6,200 sq. ft. sit down restaurant

SUMMARY: Staffmember Laura Hyneman explained that this site is adjacent to an existing nursery, and that there is a shopping center to the east. She explained there would be parking on all four sides which reinforces staff's request for four-sided architecture. She explained that staff was not in agreement with the revisions the applicant had made to the building. She felt that a wraparound porch could be a nice feature in our climate, except that this was a faux porch. It is only a porch at the waiting area in front of the project, then it's simply a small overhang on the three other elevations. Staff was concerned that the building is a box with some windows and a green mansard roof. Staff was not supporting the green stripe and the stone base. The gable end detail had lost some of the details normally included in a gable. The heavy timber posts and pergolas don't seem to go with the building, she would prefer pulling out the roof for a wrap around porch. She stated that this applicant is proposing neon, the Board can approve the neon if they determine it meets the four criteria listed in the Zoning Ordinance. She explained neon is not really a part of this neighborhood. She stated that the proposed signage did not meet the Design Guidelines.

George Millara, Matt McMahon and Steve Schukery represented the case. Mr. McMahon then stated they were unwilling to revise the elevations as suggested by staff. Mr. McMahon stated that Outback's building is their image. Their building is everything to them. He stated their store in East Mesa has neon. The problem was keeping this building looking like a ranch house in the outback.

Mr. Millara asked the Board to approve the building as submitted without any of staff's modifications. Specifically the roofline, which is a trademark of the building. He stated that they had added a trellis element to wrap around the east and west sides of the building. They had changed from the siding they usually use to an EFIS material. They added stone to the base of the building, which gives the building a base but adds a considerable amount of money. They felt that the elements they had modified would be an improvement to what they had originally submitted. They did not want to do a wraparound porch. The neon proposed was consistent with what was approved 6 years ago on 72nd Street. Regarding the conditions of approval, on elimination of the green bands, they were in agreement with that condition. They were requesting that the landscaping be approved as submitted.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that the landscape plan as proposed does not meet Zoning Ordinance requirements; therefore the applicants would have to apply for a variance to reduce the required landscaping.

Regarding the other items brought out in the staff report, Mr. Millara stated that the reason the

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 2, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

wood posts are the size they are is so that they won't twist and warp. He stated that they could not redesign the roof because that is part of the image of Outback. They were proposing to maintain the trellises.

Boardmember John O'Hara confirmed the neon would be red and covered, except for the neon in the sign.

Boardmember John Poulsen confirmed that the neon would wrap the fascia of the building and along the signage. He confirmed that the Chuy's restaurant to the east had some neon signs but there was no neon wrapping the building. He confirmed that the overhang on the porch area was 8' or 10' with seating areas on both sides of the main entrance, then along the sides the trellised area was 10' at the widest point. Along the back there were downspouts and a minimal overhang. He noted that there was parking at the rear of the restaurant and he wanted to see more articulation on the rear elevation. He felt that the rear was plain.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen was concerned with the signage. She did not feel that it enhanced the building, was tied to the architecture, and did not have any detail to it. She wanted the signage redesigned. She confirmed that the attached signage would be a paneled back with the letters (raceway). She would prefer single letters lit. She wanted the signage to come back to the Board as a separate submittal. She wanted foundation landscaping on the rear of the building.

Boardmember John Poulsen confirmed that the rear drive aisle was wider than the 24' required, therefore they could provide some foundation landscaping.

Mr. Millara asked if they could use planters.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen stated that if they used planters they would have to be irrigated and maintained. She also wanted permanent shrubs, not annuals.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed that the rear drive aisle was shown at 30' in the rear and 24' in the front.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen asked where employees go for breaks; she was concerned that the planters would become ashtrays.

Mr. Millara stated that they provide places for employees to take breaks inside the restaurant. He stated that people are not allowed to smoke on their shift. He stated that as a security measure the back door is only opened for deliveries; 99% of all robberies are done from the rear of the building.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer agreed with staff comments. He liked the idea of pulling the overhangs out rather than trying to use this separate element. Regarding the trash he was concerned that the trash was visible from the main entrance drive. He confirmed that the applicant was moving the trash to the east side of the property away from the main entrance. He was concerned that the wood trellises would get beat up over time. He would prefer the building canopy come out.

Mr. Millara stated they didn't really want the trellises. They were proposing them in response to staff's request for awnings. He stated that it was extremely expensive to change the building, Outback has over 680 restaurants, and once they develop a prototype to a point with

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 2, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

engineering and architecture they try to stick to the plan. He wanted to do away with the trellises. The store looks like an Australian ranch house.

Boardmember Burgheimer liked staff recommendation to pull the awnings out and provide covered walkways around the building.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen confirmed that the rear of the building would be painted the same color as the rest of the building.

Chair Carie Allen had the same concerns as staff. She had seen pictures of Outback restaurants in other areas and they were different, she was tired of being told we won't change the prototype for Mesa. She felt that the Board had a responsibility to the business owners to allow them to build an affordable project, but they also have a responsibility to the citizens of Mesa to make this community a nice place to live. McKellips and Gilbert is a high traffic area. She was tired of being told we can't afford to build a different building, make improvements or add patios or outdoor seating in Mesa but we would do it in Scottsdale or Chandler. She did not like the appearance of the roof façade.

Boardmember Poulsen confirmed that the roof ridge of the gable could be extended deeper back so that it would not look so much like a façade.

Mr. Shukery stated that he had not designed the prototype but he felt that the front gable could be made deeper.

Boardmember John O'Hara felt that 12' was too high a sign for this size of building.

There was discussion regarding the size of the sign. The Board felt that the proportions of the sign were out of proportion to the restaurant. Adding stone at the base as proposed by the applicant would be helpful. The applicant agreed to resubmit the signage as a separate submittal.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman then stated that the landscaping along McKellips needs to be extended out to the sidewalk.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR02-50 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. Provide a revised site plan showing the following changes:
 - Relocate cross access drive aisle so that it aligns with the existing drive aisle in the shopping center to the east.
 - Relocate the sidewalk from the public right of way to the front of the building.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 2, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- Separate the sidewalk from the entrance drive with a 5' wide landscape planter.
6. Provide a revised landscape plan showing the following information:
 - Provide one tree and three shrubs (min.) per 25 linear feet of street frontage along McKellips Road. Trees and shrubs may be clustered.
 - Provide at least 10 trees and 30 shrubs along the north property line.
 - Provide a site plan showing lot dimensions along the east and west property lines. Provide one tree and three shrubs per 25 foot of adjacent property line. Trees and shrubs may be clustered.
 - Revised landscaping plan to be approved by Design Review staff.
 7. Provide a revised design for the monument signage and attached building signage that complies with Chapter 14 and 19 of the Zoning Ordinance.
 8. The neon is not to be exposed it is to be behind a cover.
 9. Provide elevations of the refuse enclosure gates. Material and design should complement the architecture of the building and should be approved by the Design Review staff.
 10. Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened by a parapet wall equal to or exceeding the height of the mechanical units. To the extent permitted by law, satellite dishes shall be fully screened by a parapet wall. Ground mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened from public view by a combination of a decorative wall and dense landscaping. The screen wall shall be equal to or exceed the height of the mechanical units.
 11. 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.
 12. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with the Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
 13. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 20' height at the perimeter.
 14. Screen all parking areas and vehicular circulation aisles adjacent to the public right of way. The screen walls along the street frontage should be varied in alignment, broken up with naturally contoured berming and staggered dense shrubs to achieve a continuous screen of no less than 36 inches above the highest adjacent grade.
 15. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
 16. **Submit the sign package to the Design Review Board as a separate submittal.**
 17. **Extend the front gable back at least 8' to 10'.**
 18. **Eliminate the green stripes.**
 19. **Provide additional landscaping along the north property line to at least meet Code.**
 20. **Decrease the rear drive aisle width to allow room to provide foundation landscaping at the rear of the building.**
 21. Provide two half size color elevations and two full size and two 8-1/2 X 11 sets 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.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 2, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

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

Recorded on Tape No.: 142 -1 (side B) and 142 – 2 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 2, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR02-54 **Nextcare Urgent Family Center**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1066 North Power Road
REQUEST: Approval of a 11,293 sq. ft. office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 5
OWNER: Mike Reidy
APPLICANT: Mike Reidy
ARCHITECT: Cawley Architects

REQUEST: Approval of a 11,293 sq. ft. medical office building

SUMMARY: Staffmember Laura Hyneman explained that this proposal was for an urgent care facility on Power Road in an area which has undergone a great deal of recent development. She explained that staff is very pleased with the landscape plan with the exception of the shoestring acacia adjacent to the residential properties, and the linear placement of the oleanders. She stated that staff's main concern was with the design of the building elevations.

Mike Reidy and Sherman Cawley represented the case. Mr. Reidy stated that they were in basic agreement with most of staff's conditions. Mr. Cawley then explained the project. Mr. Cawley stated that the building was designed as a small-scale medical office building. They felt that the porte cocheres provided enough articulation for the building. Regarding shade structures for the windows, he stated that only the leased portion of the building needed windows and they did not feel shade structures were necessary.

Mr. Reidy then stated that the only issue they really had was with the request for window screening. Mr. Reidy explained that "Nextcare" was not really concerned with the exterior of the building, their main concern was with the floor plan. He stated that Nextcare did not want windows. He felt that the pattern of the windows, the borders around the windows, and the contrasting colors along with the porte cocheres provided enough articulation. He stated that when they had driven around the area they did not find anything to identify with. He felt that the office condominiums to the northeast of this site were too residential in nature. He asked the Board to eliminate condition 7. The other issue Mr. Reidy wanted to revise was condition 9, regarding screening the SES.

Discussion ensued regarding the SES. It was determined that the SES would be turned 90°, recessed, and placed on the northwest corner of the building facing west, with sufficient landscape screening.

Regarding the signage, the Board felt the sign was too big. Mr. Reidy confirmed that the base would be masonry.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen wanted to see additional desert trees along the west and south elevations. She agreed with staff that a desert shrub should be used in a more natural placement along the front of the property to screen the parking.

Boardmember John Poulsen felt that the building looked like a box. He confirmed that the window pop-outs are 4" with a cold joint in the brick veneer. There is a sill cap on the

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 2, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

masonry. The brick veneer below the windows will be recessed about 4". The coins at the corner would be stucco done in a contrasting color. He confirmed that the coins would be 12" x 8". He was concerned that without the porte cocheres the building would be stark and flat. He wanted to see more mass to the building details. He suggested using awnings.

Mr. Reidy suggested using trellises along the east elevation with climbing vines.

Boardmember Poulsen wanted more depth and interest to the building. He wanted to see shading for the windows.

MOTION: It was moved by John O'Hara and seconded by John Poulsen that DR02-54 be continued to a date to be set by staff:

VOTE: Passed 4 – 0 (Boardmember Rob Burgheimer left prior to discussion of this case)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The Board gave the applicant time to redesign the elevations.

Recorded on Tape No.: 142 - 2 (side A and B)

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 2, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR02-55 **Pad 2 at McKellips MarketPlace**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 6855 East McKellips
REQUEST: Approval of 5,000 sq. ft. of retail shops with a 2,793 sq. ft. patio
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 5
OWNER: Power & McKellips Retail, L.L.C.
APPLICANT: Tri-Plus Partners L.L.C.
ARCHITECT: Reigle & Associates

REQUEST: Approval of 5,000 sq. ft. of retail shops with a 2,793 sq. ft. patio

SUMMARY: Staffmember Laura Hyneman explained that the overall shopping center had been approved by the Board in July of 2001. The developer has since revised the plans for pad 2 which had been planned for a drive-through restaurant. The revised plan was for in-line shops designed to accommodate restaurants with a large covered patio. The architecture matches the shopping center. Staff's only concern was with the east elevation which will be very visible to traffic on McKellips.

Rick Riegle represented the case. Mr. Reigle stated that the majority of the project would be under construction soon. He felt that they were fortunate to replace the drive-through restaurant with a multi-tenant restaurant building, which would have covered dining. He explained to the Board that the architecture and building materials for this building would match the remainder of the shopping center. He felt that the landscaping to the east of this pad would screen the rear of the building.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen confirmed that the applicant was in agreement with staff's conditions of approval. She also confirmed that the 4' screen wall was required by Ordinance to screen the drive-through queuing lane. She suggested adding a few trees in that landscape area to further screen the east elevation. She wanted the screen wall to match the wainscot of the shops so the screen wall would not disappear.

Boardmember John Poulsen stated that the building turns at an angle. Boardmember Poulsen confirmed that the columns are surface mounted stucco, they do not pop-out, and they do match the remainder of the shopping center. He would prefer that the columns pop-out; however, he did not want this building to be different from the remainder of the shopping center.

MOTION: It was moved by Jillian Hagen and seconded by John O'Hara that DR02-55 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.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 2, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

5. **Provide 3 to 4 additional trees in the landscape area to the east of the shops.**
6. **All outdoor storage areas for materials, equipment, and service entrance section (SES) shall be recessed or fully screened from view by a masonry wall the same height as the utility cabinet.**
7. **All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.**
8. Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened by a parapet wall equal to or exceeding the height of the mechanical units. To the extent permitted by law, satellite dishes shall be fully screened by a parapet wall. Ground mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened from public view by a combination of a decorative wall and dense landscaping. The screen wall shall be equal to or exceed the height of the mechanical units.
9. 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.
10. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with the Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
11. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 20' height at the perimeter.
12. Light standards (poles) for pad sites are to match the light standards used within the shopping center.
13. Screen all parking areas and vehicular circulation aisles adjacent to the public right of way. The screen walls along the street frontage should be varied in alignment, broken up with naturally contoured berming and staggered dense shrubs to achieve a continuous screen of no less than 36 inches above the highest adjacent grade.
14. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
15. Provide a 8-1/2 X 11 color board for the file.
16. Provide two full size and two 8-1/2 X 11 sets 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 4 – 0 (Boardmember Burgheimer left prior to this case being heard)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is well-designed and matches the remainder of the shopping center.

Recorded on Tape No.: 142 - 2 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 2, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da