

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
NOVEMBER 7, 2007

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

Tim Nielsen - Chair
Wendy LeSueur – Vice Chair
Robert Burgheimer
Vince DiBella
Craig Boswell
Delight Clark (left at 6:30)

MEMBERS ABSENT

Tom Bottomley

OTHERS PRESENT

Kim Steadman
Lesley Davis
Debbie Archuleta
Joe Welliver
Josh Mike
Rob Dmohowski
Joy Spezeski
Vic Shill
Richard Dyer
Tom Schultz
Don Nance
Don Cox
Henry Chan
Steve Collins
Neal Pascoe
Michael Jorgensen
Mike Rienz
Doug Himmelberger
Gail Janezich
Sean Wood
Luigi Talanic
Steve Weiss
Lou Vergme
Tony Ozmra

Gary Crosby
Greg Williams
Will Gladback
Curtis Krausman
Mark Bowker
Corinne Nystrom
Carl Schaffer
Lon Carruth
Darren Kilker
John Harrison
Others

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

1. Work Session:

CASE: Springhill Suites
East of Crismon south side of Hampton

REQUEST: Review of revised elevations of a 4-story hotel

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- Wants the cornice at main tower to protrude out
- This is much better than previous

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Cable awning to be rigid rod and anodized aluminum awning with metal underside
- Yellow color is very bright
- Concerned with pedestrian level building material
- Use a more durable material than stucco at base of building, something that won't get stained from splash back and foot traffic

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Cornice is much better
- Agree there needs to be more richness around the base of building
- Concerned with how they will work the cantilever; may need columns
- Likes the sandstone
- Look at using masonry also
- The blue glass may not work well with the proposed colors
- Look at warm colors for glass
- Need more solar control

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Superstition Canyon
9565 E Southern

REQUEST: Review of a 200 unit apartment project

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Queen palms are too marginal and they are a maintenance concern

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- Very intricate and detailed
- Concern with traffic flow

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Nice detailing

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Likes the fact they are using different color schemes for different buildings
- Two different themes, choose one
- Could take some of the elements and make them more classical
- Site plan at south end of project is very rigid, could they soften it?
- Light color on bottom with dark on top doesn't work; switch the colors or using another material at the base

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Main Street Retail
1615 E Main

REQUEST: Review of a 6,443 sq. ft. retail building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Prefers the color board, rendition is too yellow
- Colors seem a little too green next to the adjacent building

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Why no entry on the north?
- It looks like an entry, but there is no door
- Use integral block
- It is a tight site

Rob Burgheimer:

- Concerned there is a lot there
- Will there be enough parking?
- Should be designed to look like a complex
- Nice building, concerned with the site design
- Doesn't have to "match" the adjacent building, it just needs to harmonize with it

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Arnett Office Warehouse
3757 E Main

REQUEST: Review of a 16,560 sq. ft. office/warehouse building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- Show the doors on the next submittal

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Building should have changes in roof line
- Need additional building material
- Feels very industrial

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Needs variety
- Even the banding is all the same
- Break it up

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Concern with putting stucco on a metal building
- What are you really building?
- Needs 4-sided architecture
- Too industrial

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- This Board is trying to bring up the level of design on Main Street
- The colors are very strong and the building is very weak

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Red Mt. Business Park
4400 block of East Virginia

REQUEST: Review of 8 industrial buildings totaling 258,750 sq. ft.

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Likes that the bay doors do not face the freeway

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Likes to see movement on tilt buildings
- Break the plane in and out
- Create more movement along the front
- Could the squares be inset 1" to 2"?
- Maybe some natural concrete or sand blasted

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Could they introduce some texture to the dark gray elements, like it appears on the rendering

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Gateway Bank
6860 E Warner

REQUEST: Review of a 5,705 sq. ft. bank

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Did not like the entry awning piece; he thought it looked out of place
- Doesn't like muttins and butt glazing on the same building
- Be very cautious with the yellow
- Make sure the yellow does not make the field color look pink

Boardmember Delight Clark:

- Likes the entry awning piece

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Thank you for being interesting
- Linear plays are OK
- Likes the entry awning piece

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- It could be a fun thing
- Provide a detail of the entry awning piece

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Gateway Commerce Center
7551 E Pecos

REQUEST: Review of three industrial buildings totaling 102,265 sq. ft.

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Provide changes in plane

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Provide a detail of the awnings
- Lights can really add to the building
- Likes the bold elements of the building, the landscaping should be bold also

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Like single score masonry; however, this may be too much
- Create some interest with stack bond or running bond in some areas
- The glass may be too dark, especially for office or retail
- The cornice looks odd

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Signal Butte Market Place
423 S Signal Butte

REQUEST: Review of two retail buildings totaling 27,769 sq. ft.

DISCUSSION:

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Concerned with durability of stucco at base of building
- Provide a detail of the cart corral screen
- Are they planning to do horizontal raking for shadow line?

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Good palette except for the pink oleander
- The pink does not match the building colors

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Provide all drawings at the same scale
- Nice looking center

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Addition to Clearview Business Park
1529 S Clearview

REQUEST: Review of a 6,244 sq. ft. addition to a previously approved industrial project

DISCUSSION:

The Board was fine with the elevations

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Gateway Airport Commerce Park
7361 S 89 Place

REQUEST: Review of a 10,831 sq. ft. office/warehouse building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- Use internal scuppers along front of building
- Screen the mechanical units from scuppers

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Prefers integral block

Rob Burgheimer:

- Nice looking building
- Concerned with how the element at the higher elevations wraps the corners then steps down
- Maybe a 3-dimensioned break for it to die into
- Maybe take a little of the parapet out
- Call Superlite direct to order integral block

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Compass Bank
8355 E Guadalupe

REQUEST: Review of a 3,595 sq. ft. bank with 5 drive-thru teller lanes

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- The screen wall should be back near the parking, it will hide the landscaping

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- The downspouts seem to interrupt in odd places
- There needs to be an overhang
- Roof is the biggest issue

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- The landscaping is staccatoed
- Concerned with the tubes at the teller lanes
- Landscaping needs to be designed
- Better massing of plants at the entry
- Move the screen walls farther back, closer to parking

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Stucco screeds are in very bad places
- Provide a section of the detail with follow up submittal

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Doesn't want Berridge red roof
- Tone down roof color
- The roof is very odd
- Roof needs to overhang
- 5/12 pitch is really steep
- Internal roof drains
- Stucco screeds should enhance the building and break it up

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Primrose School
N of NWC Guadalupe & Crismon

REQUEST: Review of a 10,540 sq. ft. preschool and child care facility

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- There is a lot of roof
- Actually more roof than building
- How will A/C units work?
- Maybe an edge vent

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Agree there is a lot of roof
- Maybe dormers
- How will they vent the roof?
- Cupola is cliché
- The cupola should be engaged to the roof

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Replace the Sweet Acacia with another tree
- The Sissoo would be a good screen

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- A lot of horizontality
- Break the line of the overhang
- Maybe stone could be rethought so it isn't horizontal
- Take stone off the rear and use it more creatively on other elevations
- Why is the cupola a tower and not on the roofline?

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: CW Express Carwash
104 N Val Vista

REQUEST: Review of a 3,145 sq. ft. car wash; a 9,800 sq. ft. service and retail building; and a 12,000 sq. ft. service building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- The downspouts need to be more of a design element
- The project doesn't feel pulled together
- There is a lot going on, on this site

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Doesn't want the 8' screen wall in the parking lot
- Could they extend the walls at the north and south ends of the building?
- Could the building break and step in and out
- Concerned the wash solution will come through the openings in the tunnel and ruin the surface of the car wash building
- Wondered why they couldn't turn the building to the bay doors face north and south, and move the retail portions of the building

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Landscaping won't work to screen the bay doors because the landscape maintenance companies usually trim the trees so they no longer screen

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Confirmed all three buildings will be the same materials and colors
- The color palette is very dark and foreboding

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Golden Corral
1900 block of W Bass Pro

REQUEST: Review of an 11,634 sq. ft. restaurant

DISCUSSION:

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Concern with neon placement
- The temple stepping look is odd and out of character
- Re-work the entry and make it masonry
- Provide additional masonry

Boardmember Delight Clark:

- Could the trash be moved behind the restaurant?

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Riverview is about the cornices and the details
- This building doesn't have any of that
- The canted wall doesn't go with that either
- It needs a little of the cornicing
- The downspouts need to be internal, or they need to be placed and designed to be a design element
- Needs some more masonry
- Create boxes with masonry, not bands
- Need to have a better queuing set up
- Provide more outdoor area for people waiting

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Piper Plastics
4818 & 4762 E Indigo

REQUEST: Review of a 56,131 sq. ft. manufacturing facility

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Consider exposed aggregate

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Copper mirrored glass like the rendering, would be nice
- Show reveal screeds on follow-up submittal

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Plans lack detailing
- Better rendered drawings
- Seems very blank

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Riggs Brothers
3821 E Main

REQUEST: Review of two commercial buildings totaling 2,094 sq. ft.

DISCUSSION:

No one was present to represent the case

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Waveyard Design Guidelines
8th Street and Dobson

REQUEST: Presentation of design guidelines for Waveyard

DISCUSSION:

Ralph Pew briefly explained the concept for the design guidelines and the Waveyard project. He then asked the Board to have a special work session to review and comment on the guidelines.

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Urban Oasis Condos
715 N Country Club

REQUEST: Review of a condominium project

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Look at sandblasted cmu
- Need changes in plane
- South facing glass needs shade
- How are they treating the pavement
- Very brutal, pavement then garages
- What parts of the building pop-out?
- Alleviate pavement with landscaping along drives
- How re the materials articulated

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Mass some of the units and provide landscaping

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- 20's hard urban industrial look
- Is it in context with the area?

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Details need to be thought out and better rendered
- The Board needs a lot more information
- The presentation is too schematic
- The details will be very important, if you cheapen it, it won't work
- It will take a very sophisticated Architect to design

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

2. Call to Order:

Chair Tim Nielsen called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the October 3, 2007 Meeting:

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

4. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 108 Circle K

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1202 N. Power Road
REQUEST: Approval of a new 4,400 square foot convenience store in conjunction with fueling facilities.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: John Ortle and David Sleater
APPLICANT: David Cisiewski, Law Offices of David Cisiewski, PLLC
ARCHITECT: Ahmad Ghaderi, Civil Engineer and Richard Shubert, Landscape Architect
STAFF PLANNER: Monique Spivey

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,400 sq. ft. convenience store and a 4,704 sq. ft. gas canopy

SUMMARY: Boardmember Craig Boswell abstained.

David Cisiewski represented the case and explained the changes since the October meeting.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer liked the changes. His only concern was that the entry element at the roof could be larger. He suggested they stretch it horizontally. He also suggested the medallions have more color and be used on the other sides of the building. He confirmed they were proposing integral block.

Chair Tim Nielsen thought the building had come a long way.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Wendy LeSueur that DR07-108 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. Correlate the elevations with the site plan and landscape plan to correctly identify the approved building footprint.
 - b. Show screed or reveal lines on the building.
 - c. The applicant shall submit bollard or railing details with final submittal to staff. Bollards and railings for the project should be painted the main building color.
 - d. Provide a revised color/material board that incorporates changes to the proposed colors/materials and provides real paint sample/chips.
 - e. **Work with staff on the proportions of the front entry canopy.**
 - f. **Verify integral color.**
 - g. **Work with staff regarding placement of medallions and score lines on rear and sides of the building.**
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. The project must comply with all conditions of approval listed for zoning case (Z07-

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

081).

4. The service station use must receive a Special Use Permit approval (SUP).
5. Compliance with the approval of the Development Incentive Permit (DIP) (BA07-057).
6. Provide photometric details and lighting cut sheets. All lighting must be in conformance with City standards.
7. All roof equipment, ground mounted equipment, service entrance sections, and wall mounted equipment must comply with §11-15-4 (Screening Standards) of the Design Guidelines.
8. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
9. Provide trash enclosure details in final submittal. Trash enclosure and gate design should be complimentary to the main building.
10. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
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 green.
12. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
13. Provide two half-size color elevations, 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 – 1 (Boardmember Craig Boswell abstained)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-114 General Aviation
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2425 N Greenfield
REQUEST: Approval of a 3,482 sq. ft. aircraft hangar
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Falcon Field Airport
APPLICANT: Mo Adib
ARCHITECT: John Manross
STAFF PLANNER: Kim Steadman

REQUEST: Approval of a 3,482 sq. ft. aircraft hangar

SUMMARY: John Manross represented the case and explained the revisions to the elevations since the October meeting. He stated the owner wanted to change the green roof to an off white.

Boardmember Vince DiBella questioned how the horizontal stripe would be done. Mr. Manross stated it was shown as a channel; however, the owner wanted to do a stripe instead. Boardmember DiBella confirmed the Hangar One side was proposed to be attached to the building and the at the center would be a sign cabinet. Boardmember DiBella was not in favor of painted stripes. He also thought the signage placement was odd. He was OK with the off white roof.

Chair Tim Nielsen was concerned with the cable awning. He questioned how it would transition from the wall.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer understood this was a simple building but it fronts onto Greenfield. He questioned how they could construct the curve that cuts through the metal. He did not think the signage was well integrated with the building. He confirmed there would be 3' screen walls for the parking; however, the applicant had received a variance to keep the existing chain link.

Boardmember Craig Boswell thought the design was interesting but it is still a box. He suggested the curve be reveals and be sealed. He thought painted stripes would be a maintenance problem.

Chair Tim Nielsen suggested the green curved element be something attached so it would stick out, and there would be a shadow line.

Greg Williams then spoke and stated he had been waiting for a hangar at Falcon Field for 10 years. He stated all you need is a rectangle with a roof to park planes. He did not think the Board should worry about details.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated the Board is concerned with being consistent. He did not think it was fair to say because this is an airport they should not have to be of the same quality level as industrial buildings 3 blocks away to the north. It is an equality issue.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Craig Boswell that DR07-114 be approved with the following conditions:

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications 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 landscape counts to meet code.
 - b. Provide manufacturer and color of all materials.
 - c. Provide a pedestrian path from the entry area, uninterrupted, to the public sidewalk.
 - d. Provide location of SES. Fully recess into building, or provide architectural screening. Staff to review and approve.
 - e. **Work with staff regarding color of roof, awning feature, signage and the treatment of the reveals.**
 - f. **The reveals are not to be paint.**
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 green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
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 3 – 2 (Boardmembers Rob Burgheimer and Wendy LeSueur voting nay)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-117 Riverview Tract F2
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NEC 8th & Dobson
REQUEST: Approval of a 40,286 sq. ft. retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: DeRito Partners
APPLICANT: Dave Udall
ARCHITECT: Saemisch DiBella
STAFF PLANNER: Monique Spivey/Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of a 40,286 sq. ft. retail building

SUMMARY: This case removed from the consent agenda. Boardmember Vince DiBella abstained.

Doug Himmelberger represented the case.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur confirmed the red shown in this project is not the same red used anywhere else in Riverview. She also confirmed the red was a corporate color. She thought the building should have some of the dental work used on other building in Riverview. She stated she thought the Liberty Red on the Riverview color palette was richer than this red.

Chair Tim Nielsen was concerned that only the entertainment district has the dental details. He confirmed the "goal posts" were proud of the red. He thought the sign would "pop" more if the background was the richer Liberty Red.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was concerned that if Sports Authority were allowed to have their corporate color, it would set a precedent and other stores would want them, possibly even stores already built.

Staffmember Kim Steadman stated that since the red is a corporate color it might be considered part of the sign.

Doug Himmelberger suggested using the red on the awnings to help spread it out on the building so it did not appear to be signage.

MOTION: It was moved by Wendy LeSueur and seconded by Craig Boswell that DR07-117 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. All light fixtures and pavement surfaces need to be consistent with what has been approved/installed for the overall Riverview Development.

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- b. Revise the site plan and landscape plan to correctly label all right of way and setback dimension and position trash enclosures so they are not located within the setback.
 - c. **The red behind the sign is to be Liberty Red.**
 - d. **Evaluate the cornice.**
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
 3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Impact Summary from the Preliminary Plan Review Team.
 4. Parking lot landscaping is to be provided in accordance with §11-15-5(B) of the Zoning Ordinance. The islands at either corner of the front (north) elevation do not comply and will need to be revised.
 5. Foundation base landscaping is required in accordance with §11-15-3(C) 2 of the Zoning Ordinance.
 6. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
 7. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket *and painted green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
 8. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
 9. Provide two half-size color elevations, 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 – 1 (Boardmember Vince DiBella abstained)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-118 Buffalo Wild Wings Grill & Bar
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 6560 E. Superstition Springs Blvd.
REQUEST: Approval of a Buffalo Wild Wings Grill and Bar
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: BV Development Arrowhead, LLC
APPLICANT: Blazin Wings Inc.
ARCHITECT: CM Architects
STAFF PLANNER: Rob Dmohowski

REQUEST: Approval of a Buffalo Wild Wings Grill and Bar

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Craig Boswell that DR07-118 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. Identify the SES location on the site plan, floor plan etc. This equipment should be fully recessed and painted to match the building unless otherwise approved by Design Review staff
2. 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.
3. 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 green*.
4. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
5. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
6. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc).
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

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 119 Chester's Harley Davidson

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 922 S Country Club
REQUEST: Approval of one 17,270 sq. ft. building and one 4,000 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: Chester's Harley Davidson
APPLICANT: Ideation Design Group
ARCHITECT: Carl Schaffer
STAFF PLANNER: Kim Steadman

REQUEST: Approval of one 17,270 sq. ft. building and one 4,000 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 Craig Boswell that DR07-119 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 area indicated for Future Building #3, including the entire area bound by drive aisles to the west and north, and by the perimeter picket fence to the east, shall be fully landscaped per Code requirements for landscape areas.
 - b. The proposed murals of old-fashioned signage, etc. will require a request for a comprehensive sign plan.
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 green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
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

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-120 Heritage Village

LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC 80 St. & Brown

REQUEST: Approval of an office and 8 assisted living buildings totaling 54,308 sq. ft.

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5

OWNER: Crosby Enterprises, Inc.

APPLICANT: Gary Crosby

ARCHITECT: Mark Seidner

STAFF PLANNER: Kim Steadman

REQUEST: Approval of an office and 8 assisted living buildings totaling 54,308 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 Craig Boswell that DR07-120 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 details of the site walls. Staff to review and approve.
 - b. Add stone elements to the north elevations of Bldgs. 1,2,& 3. Staff to review and approve.
 - c. Staff to review details to confirm windows are recessed from the face of the wall.
 - d. Work with staff to replace plant materials that are not recommended in northeast Mesa.
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 green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
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

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-121 Bank of America
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1904 N Lindsay
REQUEST: Approval of a 4,488 sq. ft. bank
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: SC Lindsay Groves
APPLICANT: Steve Morrow
ARCHITECT: Jan Mittelstaedt
STAFF PLANNER: Kim Steadman

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,488 sq. ft. bank

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

MOTION: It was moved by and seconded by that DR07-121 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. Provide file drawings (condition 7) to Design Review staff at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
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 green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
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

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-122 Courtyard Marriott
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 4827 E. McKellips Rd.
REQUEST: Approval of a 111 room, 65,380 s.f. Hotel
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Hansji Hotels
APPLICANT: MCG Architecture
ARCHITECT: Brian Tiedge
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of a 111 room, 65,280 sq. ft. hotel

SUMMARY: No one was present to represent the case. Staffmember Lesley Davis explained the case.

Chair Tim Nielsen thought the building needed reveal screeds on all elements. He also thought the west facing glass needed shade.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought there was a lot of stucco. He thought there should be more block or stone. He thought the stone should be used at the entry feature up to the top of the second floor. He thought the harvest God was very strong.

Boardmember Vince DiBella thought the front entry had gotten lost on the revised elevations.

Boardmember Craig Boswell appreciates the changes they have made.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur agreed the changes to the elevations are an improvement. She still thought the landscape plan needed significant revision. The plant mix was odd and had no flow. She also stated Myoporum is not a long lived plant.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-122 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 revised elevations that include callouts for the color/materials on the building. Also provide a revised color/material board that includes manufacturer specifications for the various materials/colors on the building and site walls..
 - b. Revise the elevations of the monument sign to comply with the Design Guidelines established in Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - c. Screen walls are required in accordance with §11-15-4 of the Zoning Ordinance. Provide elevations of those walls and gates with color/material specifications. Screen walls must be designed to be compatible with the

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- building.
- d. Revise the landscape plan to replace the Dessert Willow at the building with another species and to create a landscape theme with the design and landscape palette.
 - e. **Resolve the landscape theme concept based on Boardmember LeSueur's comments. To be approved by Boardmember LeSueur.**
 - f. **Work with staff to provide stone up to the second floor at the entry. Look at stepping it down.**
 - g. **Clarify color placement with staff. Don't use the Harvest Gold as a main body color, only as an accent.**
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. Retention basin layout shall be irregular in shape, contoured and designed as an integral part of the landscaping theme and shall not take on the appearance of a ditch. Berms must be provided along the arterial street with 33% of basin frontage per §11-15-3(D) of the Zoning Ordinance.
 6. Pedestrian paths need to be a decorative surface wherever they cross drive aisles.
 7. The backside of the parapets should be finished with a fourth wall and detailed to match the front, wherever they project above 46'.
 8. Future Design Review Board approval is required for the 5,025 s.f. pad building shown on the site plan, west of the hotel.
 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 green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
 10. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
 11. Provide two half-size color elevations, 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

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 123 Mesa Supportive Housing
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1137 E Broadway
REQUEST: Approval of an 18 unit HUD Section 811 housing
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: Wayne Neil Evans & Jeanine Salmon
APPLICANT: Michael Knisley
ARCHITECT: Michael Knisley
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of a 18 unit HUD Section 811 housing project

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Craig Boswell that DR07-123 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Provide a revised color/material board that identifies all color/manufacture specifications and paint chips/photo brochures for the stucco colors, masonry, stone, window frames, glass, and light fixtures (including cut sheets). Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Board of Adjustment for the Development Incentive Permit (DIP).
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 green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half-size color elevations, site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Appeals of Administrative Design Review:

Chevron remodel at 1165 S Higley

The issues were resolved with staff prior to the meeting.

Other Business:

The Board agreed to hold a special work session on Friday, November 16, 2007 at 12:00 p.m. to review and comment on the Waveyard Design Guidelines.

Staffmember Debbie Archuleta gave the Board the submittals for the December 5, 2007 work session.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da