

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
SEPTEMBER 1, 2004

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Lower Level of the Council Chambers 57 East First Street, at 3:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Pete Berzins - Chair
Dave Richins - Vice Chair
Randy Carter
Jillian Hagen
Vince DiBella
Tim Nielsen
Robert Burgheimer

MEMBERS ABSENT

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman	Kathy Schimack
Lesley Davis	Ron Etter
Debbie Archuleta	Vince Dahlke
Charlie Scully	Barry Barcus
John Wesley	Phil Reina
Stephanie Rowe	Sean Lake
Greg Bowen	Doug Dewey
Bob Winton	Regina Sandoval
Irwin Pasternack	Allen Willis
Richard Presto	Rob Terrell
James Mannin	Jere Plank
Gordon Sheffield	Mark Ward
Harold Decker	Others

1. Call to Order:

Chair Pete Berzins called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the August 4, 2004 Meeting:

On a motion by Vince DiBella seconded by Randy Carter the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

After the Board voted, Staffmember Gordon Sheffield stated Councilmember Claudia Walters had questions regarding the minutes from the August 4, 2004 meeting. She felt the minutes regarding the in-fill discussion were somewhat incomplete. Mr. Sheffield asked for clarification regarding the In-Fill Working Committee report. Boardmembers Vince DiBella and Randy Carter stated their recollection was that the Board was in favor of the report going forward. Mr. Sheffield stated there were four parts to the recommendation and he asked if those four parts were in fact being recommended by this Board.

Boardmember Dave Richins stated he did not think the report was ready to go to Council. He thought there needed to be a single family element in this policy and he thought there needed to be a survey of all the vacant parcels in west Mesa. He asked if Mr. Sheffield wanted a vote.

Mr. Sheffield stated he did not need a vote but would like to confirm that a consensus of the Board favored the recommended actions described in the report.

Boardmember Dave Richins stated that if this was going to be put into an ordinance he wanted to see something built into the policy for periodic review. He stated there was some great stuff in the report but he thought it was short in the research department.

Mr. Sheffield stated this report was not intended to become an ordinance; it was intended to be an overall direction to staff to begin working toward a more specific in-fill policy on a city wide basis; both for transportation corridors and for neighborhoods. He stated the document was open ended because there were several questions that needed to be answered on a neighborhood level.

Boardmember Dave Richins wanted the document to reflect the open endedness. He also wanted a policy for encouraging single family residential development; particularly, he wanted a component addressing properties zoned R1-6 and R1-9.

Boardmember DiBella thought the In-fill Working Committee Report advocated a policy direction worth pursuing.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen was glad the City was working on an in-fill policy.

3. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-54 **Sonic**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Southern & Higley
REQUEST: Approval of a Sonic Drive-In
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Southern & Higley Realty Partners
APPLICANT: Stephanie Rowe
ARCHITECT: Stephanie Rowe

REQUEST: Approval of a Sonic Drive-In with a 1,536 sq. ft. building and 5,618 sq. ft. of canopies

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Randy Carter that DR04-54 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. 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.
5. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
6. Provide two half-size color elevations, 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 approved shopping center.

Recorded on Tape No.: Tape 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-55 **Stapley Corporate Center**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1860 S Stapley
REQUEST: Approval of 2 office buildings and 2 retail buildings
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: Deslo Southwest
APPLICANT: Ronald Francis
ARCHITECT: Jere Plank

REQUEST: Approval of two office buildings and two retail buildings totaling 184,944 sq. ft.

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Jerry Plank and Harold Decker represented the case.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed the curved roof element would be standing seam metal, the glass would have horizontal mullions and butt glazed verticals, and the windows would be recessed 3" to 4". He thought the office building was too flat. He wanted more than a 1/2" off set between the vertical elements. He liked the richness of the materials.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen liked the contrast with the mullions and butt-glazed glass. She also liked the pop-outs and the color of the building.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen was concerned that Retail Building 1 should have more interest.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed that the pilasters on the office cant out 4'. On Retail Building 1 he suggested the curved element be raised slightly, to allow the signage adequate space.

Chair Pete Berzins was thought the project was very nice. He was concerned future signage could take away from the building.

The Board was concerned that the architect should review the future signs to make sure they do not detract from the project. Placement, color and style of signs could have a detrimental impact on this very attractive project.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Dave Richins that DR04-55 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:
 - a. Provide a variety of trees in the retention basin between the existing restaurant and the office project, along the south property line between the car wash, the bank, and the Retail 2 and along the east property line east Retail 2. Revisions to be approved by Design Review staff.
 - b. Provide required landscaping in the foundation base around the buildings.
 - c. Provide a 5' wide temporary landscape area around all undeveloped pad sites.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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 producible revised landscaping plans showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

Discussion: The Board agreed that raising the curved element on Retail Building 1 was a good idea; however, they did not want to make it a condition of approval. They suggested the applicant work with staff to raise the curved element.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

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

Recorded on Tape No.: Tape 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-56 **Red Mountain Retail Center**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC Power & McDowell
REQUEST: Approval of a 126,517 sq. ft. shopping center
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Leon & Carol Shell
APPLICANT: Irwin Pasternack
ARCHITECT: Dick Presto

REQUEST: Approval of a 126,517 sq. ft. shopping center

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Randy Carter that DR04-56 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:
 - a. Design Review Board approval of the restaurant pad buildings.
 - b. Provide a 5' wide temporary landscape area around all undeveloped pad sites.
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, 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 project.

Recorded on Tape No.: Tape 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-57	AZ Footwear
LOCATION/ADDRESS:	SEC Main Street and Harris
SUMMARY OF REQUEST:	Design Review for an AZ Footwear Building
COUNCIL DISTRICT:	District 2
OWNER:	LGE Corporation
APPLICANT:	Vince Dalke
ARCHITECT:	Vince Dalke, Archicon L.C

REQUEST: Approval of a 10,017 sq. ft. retail building with accessory office and warehouse

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Randy Carter that DR04-57 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 submitted to Design Review staff for approval at least one week prior to submitting for building permits:
 - c. Provide metal awnings over the three windows on the east side in a manner similar to the two storefront windows in the center of the north elevation.
 - d. Revise the southeast and southwest corners of the building to include a similar pop out masonry frame as shown around the center entry on the east side of the building. The similar design element at the rear corners will include revisions to the west, south and east elevations with additional pilasters, single score CMU and darker split face block popped out to create a frame effect.
 - e. Sign raceways or mounting platforms to be painted to match building or concealed within the masonry.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised 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 SEPTEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

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

Recorded on Tape No.: Tape 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-58 **Mountain View Retail Shops Pads C & E**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NEC of Brown Rd. and Greenfield Rd.
SUMMARY OF REQUEST: Request to approve two new inline retail buildings in the Mountain View Plaza commercial center.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Glenwood Development Company, LLC
APPLICANT: Kathy F. Schimack
ARCHITECT: Douglas Sperr, KFS & Assoc.

REQUEST: Approval of a two retail buildings; pad 'E' 6,000 sq. ft. pad 'C' 6,600 sq. ft.

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

Sean Lake, Jeff Kost, Kathy Schimack represented the case.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed that the site plan misrepresented pad E and pad C. The building on Greenfield would have two towers. Boardmember DiBella was glad they were introducing another color. He thought the tower element was awkward.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen thought the new color helped. She thought the colors were still too monochromatic. She wanted to see more contrast. She liked the "buttery" color on the elevations.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought the towers were a little too wide and squat. He suggested raising the towers. He wanted to see more color.

Boardmember Randy Carter agreed with the previous comments. He wanted to see a more vibrant color that would still work with the bland center behind it. Mr. Kost stated he was willing to add more color and also to raise the tower element. Boardmember Carter thought the proportion of the towers was awkward. They were also willing to add more tile. Boardmember Carter wanted the roof pitch changed to 4 & 12, at least. He wanted the diagonals used on each of the towers. He suggested that might be a good place to introduce an additional color. Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated the applicant has spoken to her about adding the diagonals and additional color to the retail building currently under construction.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen stated they did not want another shade of tan. Boardmember Randy Carter suggested using the olive represented on the elevations. Boardmember Hagen stated the "buttery" color on the elevations looks white on the paint chips.

Boardmember Dave Richins agreed the project needs more color.

Chair Pete Berzins agreed color changes were needed. He did not think the diagonals needed to be on every tower.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed the light fixtures would be dark bronze to match the existing center. They would be decorative fixtures, not wall packs. He wanted the light

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

fixtures to be approved by staff. He thought the diagonal score lines were odd. He was concerned with the placement of signage, especially if the signage was placed over the diagonal score lines. Mr. Kost stated the signage would be on the canopies or the towers but not on the main walls.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR04-58 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 approved by Design Review staff prior to submitting building permits:
 - a. Attached signage to be limited to the fascia area on the tower elements and above the covered walkway and below the tile roof.
 - b. The SES panels need to fully screened on the sides by extending the depth of the pop out or integrating side walls with the building design.
 - c. Provide manufacturers cut sheets for exterior building light fixtures to ensure compatibility with the building architecture.
 - d. **Provide additional color. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
 - e. **Raise the tower elements and finish on both sides. The tower to be 3 dimensional. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
 - f. **Provide tile on building E.**
 - g. **Work with staff regarding the placement of the diagonal pattern on the towers.**
 - h. **Staff to review the light fixtures.**
 - i. **Staff to review signage.**
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff at least one week prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions enhances the existing shopping center.

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

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-59 **Design Guidelines for Eastgate Business Park**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NEC Jerome & Revere
REQUEST: Design Guideline approval
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: Millet Family Properties
APPLICANT: Swan Architects
ARCHITECT: Jeff Swan

REQUEST: Approval of Design Guidelines for Eastgate Business Park

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen thought the monument sign should come back for future review.

MOTION: It was moved by Jillian Hagen and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR04-59 be approved with the following conditions:

1. All future development applications within the Eastgate Business Park shall be in compliance with all applicable City of Mesa Codes, Ordinances and Regulations, and the Eastgate Business Park Design Guidelines.
2. City of Mesa Codes, Ordinances and Regulations that are otherwise more restrictive shall take precedence in the case of any conflicting requirements.
3. Development must be in compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.).
4. Revise the Materials and Colors subsection to include language ensuring that the use of various materials will be included in a well-balanced composition.
5. **The sign to be resubmitted for a future meeting.**

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The design guidelines establish the development basics for the park.

Recorded on Tape No.: Tape 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-64 **Integrity Infiniti**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 6200 block E. Test Dr.
REQUEST: Approval of a new car dealership
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Michael Scaringi
APPLICANT: Barry Barcus
ARCHITECT: Barry Barcus

REQUEST: Approval of a 3.14 acre new car dealership

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Randy Carter that DR04-64 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.
 - a. Compliance with all requirements of the Superstition Springs Community Master Association. A copy of an approval letter from that Association must be provided to Design Review Staff for the file.
 - b. Exterior lighting design to comply with all requirements of zoning case Z01-12.
 - c. Compliance with all requirements of the Comprehensive Sign Plan (BA02-29).
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. 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.
5. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
6. Provide two half-size color elevations 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 sales development.

Recorded on Tape No.: Tape 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-42 **Caseldine Dental Office**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 623 N. Gilbert Road
REQUEST: Approval of a 1,800 sq. ft. dental office
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: Robert Caseldine
APPLICANT: Phillip Reina
ARCHITECT: James Klein

REQUEST: Approval of a 1,800 sq. ft. dental office

SUMMARY: Philip Reina represented the case. He wanted to drop the roofline on the south elevation 6".

Boardmember Tim Nielsen was concerned with the placement of the light fixtures. He suggested the tile band be at different heights, maybe higher at the columns. Mr. Reina suggested using stone on the columns.

Boardmember Randy Carter thought the revisions were an improvement. He confirmed the building height had been raised. He also confirmed that the screen wall would match the building.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed the lavender color was not being used. He confirmed the compressor would be insulated. He was concerned with noise impact for the neighbors to the east.

Chair Pete Berzins liked the idea of stone on the columns, but not use the tile on the columns.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought this was an improvement over the previous submittal. However he does not like tile bands. He suggested the entry not have tile, and be wider and taller, so it was not the same as the other element. He thought the lights should be moved, maybe to the center of the columns.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed the south elevation would be only 2 planes not 3 as depicted on the elevations. He was concerned with how the roof worked. He thought the columns at the window looked too much like the entry.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen agreed the light fixtures should be on the columns. She also liked the idea of stone on the columns. She thought the wainscot should be lower. The windows under the canopies should have a different color trim at the bottom piece and then be extended beyond the window.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR04-42 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be submitted to Design Review staff

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

for approval at least one week prior to submitting for building permits:

- a. Ensure sound attenuation measures are incorporated into the exterior walls and doors for any compressor equipment associated with the proposed use;
 - b. Provide manufacturer's cut sheets for wall mounted lighting fixtures;
 - c. Provide an elevation showing location of attached signage;
 - d. Submit elevations and design details for any future freestanding monument sign to the Design Review Board for their approval;
 - e. Compliance with both Development Engineering requirements and Chapter 15 standards regarding the design of retention basins and retaining walls;
 - f. There shall be a maximum 4:1 outslope along the south property line with a maximum 18 inch high retaining wall and with a contoured drainage swale between the drive aisle and the south site perimeter wall.
 - g. **Lower the tile wainscot one foot to the sill line.**
 - h. **Relocate the light fixtures to the center of the columns.**
 - i. **Change the proportions of the entry monument.**
 - j. **Provide an additional color for individual pieces. (Architectural gabled elements).**
 - k. **Pull the entry back on the south elevation so it creates a shadow line like the elevation represents.**
 - l. **The screen wall and signage to be reviewed and approved by Design Review Board at a future meeting.**
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. 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.
 5. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
 6. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size set of design plans, 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 7 – 0

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

Recorded on Tape No.: 2 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-44 **Painted Mountain Townhomes Colors**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 6202 E McKellips
REQUEST: Approval of 311 townhouse units
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Mehan Construction
APPLICANT: Mehan Construction
ARCHITECT: Jerry Torr
 Seventh Angel Design Studio

REQUEST: Approval of paint colors for previously approved townhome project

SUMMARY: Staffmember Laura Hyneman explained the applicants brought in their color samples after the packets were delivered.

Greg Bowen and Rob Terrel represented the case. They explained they were presenting three additional color schemes. Mr. Bowen stated they had submitted elevations as examples of two of the color schemes. Mr. Terrel stated they had also provided a third color for each of the color schemes, which would be used on the wood surfaces.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed that there were actually 5 different color schemes being presented. He confirmed there would be three different roof tiles and three different stones.

Chair Pete Berzins stated there was not a lot of variety. He thought the colors were still too monotone. He liked the different stones.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought that two of the color schemes were too similar, he wanted the applicant to work with staff to create more variation of color.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen wanted more contrast within the color schemes. She thought they were all the same monochromatic colors.

Boardmember Carter clarified placement of the colors.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed the color would be the changeable piece within the units. Boardmember Nielsen confirmed the color and stone used on each unit would be determined by the applicant. Boardmember Nielsen thought the stone should be the unifying element.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR04-44 be approved with the following conditions:

Work with staff on the middle and the upper right hand of the color board presented. Colors to provide more differentiation in the tones specifically those located in the middle and upper right hand.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

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

Recorded on Tape No.: 2 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-60 **Social Security Building**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NEC Jerome & Revere
REQUEST: Approval of a 24,199 sq. ft. Social Security Building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: Millet Family Properties
APPLICANT: Swan Architects
ARCHITECT: Jeff Swan

REQUEST: Approval of a 24,199 sq. ft. Social Security building

SUMMARY: Staffmember Ryan Heiland presented the case. Mr. Heiland explained that the applicant had submitted revised elevations addressing concerns in the staff report. Some of the site plan conditions: the 50' building setback, the bollards, the controlled employee parking, were required by General Services Administration. The elevation changes made were: Windows were added, notches were added to the parapet, vertical bands were added and the wainscot was painted the darker color, the parapet had been pulled down on the west elevation.

Jeff Swan represented the case.

Boardmember Dave Richins stated it looked like a "government building". He did not like the small windows along the rear of the building. Mr. Swan stated the GSA preferred no windows and stated some of the windows would be covered up on the inside. Boardmember Richins wondered how the GSA guidelines restrict the Design Review Board. Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that because this building would be owned by a private developer and leased to Social Security, it was subject to Design Review Board approval. Mr. Swan stated that in order to make the land value work with the leasable rates with the very large setback they needed to build the office building in an industrial development. He stated that in 8 years this building could revert to an industrial building. Mr. Swan stated that the reason there were not as many enhancements on the north elevation was that Social Security might expand to the north. Boardmember Richins thought the building was very plain. He stated the adjacent building had a great deal of visual interest. Mr. Swan stated the difference was the Mahoney building was on Extension and this building would not be visible from major streets.

Chair Pete Berzins understood it was hard to build for this user and it would be hard to find another user for the building. He stated the existing Social Security building gets a lot of traffic. He was concerned that the people waiting outside the building have shade and a nice waiting area. Mr. Swan stated the covered canopy would provide shade. Chair Berzins thought there could be a large number of people waiting outside.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the term "government building" truly described this building. He thought government entities needed to take a leadership role in the communities. He stated this building would be like this forever. He thought the building was too bland and needed a lot of work. He wanted more variation in materials and textures. He thought it was too monochromatic and needed an accent color. The canopy should be a nice color. The building was too flat and needed to be broken up. He questioned why some windows have shade others don't. He suggested using landscaping to provide shade for the windows. The glass could provide a color change. He did not like the stepping of the building, he thought it was too regular. He suggested it come up and down, not just all lower. He thought the canopy heights needed to either be the same, or further apart. He did not like the tapered

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

steel columns above the curved canopy. He thought the building was too industrial looking. Mr. Swan stated the building was in the middle of an industrial park. He stated the building could become an industrial building in 8 years.

Boardmember Dave Richins stated the Board would expect more of an industrial building. He thought the building would get even more scrutiny if it were not a government building.

Boardmember Vince DiBella stated he is not in favor of painted cmu. He did not think it held up well over time. He suggested using integral color masonry. He thought the landscaping should relate to the building. In answer to a question regarding the stepping of the parapet, Mr. Swan stated the parapet steps up toward the entry feature.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen stated there was a Target store on Southern at Longmore that was also minimalist but it came off well because of the way textures, colors and contrast were used. She thought that if this building were patterned and had richer colors it would be more successful. The Target did not have a lot of windows, but it had bold forms and textures. She thought the awnings needed a color. She thought the landscaping was a potpourri of scattered plants. The landscaping could have minimum numbers of plants and have a plan that was sculptural and interesting.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen agreed with the previous comments. He thought the building lacked richness. He agreed the cmu should not be painted. He stated there are very interesting things you can do with masonry, such as turning the corners, soldier courses, other things that have not been used here. He wanted a more people friendly entry space. He suggested a landscape theme, with rhythm or pattern, or sculptural elements instead of being so monochrome. He thought the "box" could shine.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed the bollards would be the same color as the wainscot. He stated the building was boring. He understood the reality of building to these standards. He stated that even in-fill projects within industrial subdivisions the Board is seeing more interesting buildings. He liked the suspended canopy with the candid I-beam look. He thought the stepped parapet looked contrived and did not match the rhythm and pattern of the rest of the building. He was concerned that since this building would be leased it should have a commercial impact. He thought the building would be visible. He thought the introduction of color would help this building. He thought the flat planes broken up only by three horizontal bands of 4" split face block and a small change in parapet height was not enough variation. He did not want to see this building left vacant if/when Social Security moves out of the building. He thought there was more that could be done within the context of budget and security that they have.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Randy Carter that DR04-60 be continued to address the Board's concerns regarding people scale, richness, proportion, masonry detailing, color and landscape theme.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions did not adequately address design issues

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

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

cantilevered awnings for shade. He thought more could be done with the entry.

Boardmember Dave Richins was concerned with the long plane of west elevation.

Chair Pete Berzins confirmed the red was used on the railing at the truck well.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman was concerned with the height of the Palo Brea and Mesquite trees at the south property line. She wanted to see taller trees used. Boardmember Hagen stated they could use Sissoo, she thought there were a lot of Mesquite trees in the landscape plan. She agreed they should have another variety of tree.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Dave Richins that DR04-61 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, except for modifications as described below:
 - a. Compliance with development requirements for the Commons Industrial Park at Falconview, including submittal of letter of approval from the Commons Architectural Review Committee with building permits.
 - b. **Revise the proportions of the entry canopy in conjunction with the front entry, by articulating the connection of the bow truss to the columns, and looking at some articulation at the storefront entrance and how that relates to the inside lobby space. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
 - c. **Provide some shade canopies at the front entry windows. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
 - d. **On the west elevation provide pop-out center panels. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
 - e. **Revise the light fixture locations and provide decorative light fixtures.**
 - f. **Introduce an additional tree variety. 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. 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.
5. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
6. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised 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 reasonably well designed.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

disrupted. He also wanted more architecture particularly on the Brown Road frontage.

Boardmember Randy Carter thought they had missed the mark. He thought what was needed was a high-end residential feel. He did not feel this proposal met the richness of the surrounding area. He wanted more attention to detail. He thought the doors were very nice but the entrance did not fit with the doors. He did not like the way horizontal fascia stuck out from the wall. He thought the window style should be different. He suggested a gabled entrance and recommended a change to break up the sides. On Building A there are four windows, he suggested maybe they could use different proportions of windows or another gable. He also thought there should be windows along the rear of the building.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen thought windows along the rear of the building would help with security. With landscaping and no windows, people could be in that area and no one would know.

Boardmember Carter stated there would not be room for a sidewalk and doors along the rear without guardrails next to the retention basin. He thought the mechanical units should be ground mounted along the rear of the building, which would also eliminate the need for access ladder and roof hatch in someone's suite. He liked the employee area in the breezeway. He thought this should be an example of what a neighborhood office in a residential area should look like. He said the "bones" were good it just needed better articulation. He said the building did not need to be expensive, but it needed to be nicely proportioned and nicely designed. He agreed the landscaping along Brown should be citrus to better tie into the surrounding area.

Boardmember Dave Richins liked the embellishment on the windows. He thought it was a shame to have parking in front of the entrance. He liked the covered parking and the screen wall. He agreed with previous comments on the building. He thought the entry should be a strong element.

Chair Pete Berzins agreed they should strengthen the entrance. He was concerned that the neighbors were looking at the worst of the building. He did not want the mechanical well close to the neighbors. He did not understand why they had doors on the rear of the building when you really can't use them with the retention basin there. He was concerned with how the entry for Unit A.3 would work. He wanted the applicant to provide a drawing so the Board could see what it would look like.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman was concerned with how the SES would look.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer agreed with previous comments. He thought the mechanical equipment should be ground mounted. He thought the project was not very exciting and could be a real jewel. He thought the colors were awful. He thought there should use citrus along Brown. He wanted the three projects at this corner to be coordinated.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR04-63 be continued until the design issues and zoning issues are resolved.

VOTE: 7 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: To allow the applicant time to improve the building

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

design and resolve zoning issues.

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

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-63 **Falcon View**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 5815 E McKellips
REQUEST: Approval of a 4,290 sq. ft. retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Fors Farms Inc.
APPLICANT: Thomas Miller
ARCHITECT: James Larson

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,290 sq. ft. retail building

SUMMARY: No one was present to represent the case.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen did not think the building fit with the center. She thought the tile was a mistake.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought the case should be continued so the applicant could be present to address the staff report. He agreed with the staff concerns.

Boardmember Randy Carter thought the building colors and theme needed to be the same as the center.

Boardmember Dave Richins agreed with staff concerns. He was also concerned that Lot 10 will be looking at the rear of this building.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer doesn't like the way the building engages with the shopping center. He thought the building needed to have 4-sided architecture.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Randy Carter that DR04-63 be continued:

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: To allow the applicant to address staff concerns and Board comments.

Recorded on Tape No.: 3 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-65 **Brunswick Bowl**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1754 W. Southern Ave.
REQUEST: Re-imaging of Brunswick Bowling Center
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: Brunswick Indoor Recreation Group
APPLICANT: Phil D. Fitzgerald
ARCHITECT: Phil D. Fitzgerald

REQUEST: Approval of a repaint of an existing bowling alley

SUMMARY: This case was withdrawn by the applicant.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Randy Carter that DR04-65 be withdrawn

VOTE: Passed

Recorded on Tape No.: (side A)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04- 66 **Freeway Landmark Sign**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1500 Block of South Sossaman Road, west side [north of US Highway 60 (Superstition Freeway)]
REQUEST: Council Use Permit (CUP) for a Freeway Landmark Monument (FLM)
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Superstition Springs Investors, LP
APPLICANT: Biskind, Hunt and Taylor, PLC – Karrin Kunasek Taylor
SIGN CONSULTANT: Bleier Industries, Paul Bleier
STAFF PLANNER: Gordon Sheffield
RELATED CASE: Planning and Zoning Board, case Z04-079 (to be heard Sept. 16, 2004)

REQUEST: Approval of a 90' tall freeway landmark monument sign

SUMMARY: Staffmember Gordon Sheffield represented the case.

Mr. Sheffield explained that since 1986 the City of Mesa has not allowed freeway signage. The one exception was the three-cylinder shaped structure at the intersection of the US 60 freeway and Greenfield Road. There were no graphics on this structure. The idea was that the cylinders would represent the auto mall that had been planned for this location, and become an icon for the site because they would be reinforced in their advertising. The auto mall never developed, the cylinders came into disrepair and the City eventually demolished them. Every other detached freeway oriented sign higher than 12' was reviewed by the Board of Adjustment and was denied. There are some signs along the freeway, but none are higher than 12'. The Board of Adjustment has allowed additional attached signage on the backsides of buildings along the freeway.

Continuing, Mr. Sheffield stated the City Council spent two years discussing the issue of freeway signage. These discussions resulted in adoption of a new Council Use Permit process for Freeway Landmark Monument (FLM) signs. Included in the Board's packet are copies of a document adopted by Council at the same time, called "the Freeway Landmark Monument Guidelines". These Guidelines outline a set of criteria by which the Planning and Zoning Board and the Design Review Board evaluate FLM requests. The recommendations of these two citizen boards then are forwarded to the City Council.

The Design Review Board is limited to reviewing the sign for aesthetics only, and may not comment on the location of the sign or any other location related issue. As part of the aesthetics review, the DR Board may consider the height of the sign, the sign area proposed, as well as the color, design and materials to be used. The justification for the height is based on a photographic test. The intent is to say that you can see the sign soon enough from the freeway to change lanes and get off at the next exit. As part of the packet there are photos of balloons taken from the freeway.

The zoning case for this auto mall was approved with an agreement at Council to have a freeway sign. The purpose and intent of the landmark sign is for identification not advertising.

Boardmember Vince DiBella stated that allowing electronic message boards meant you are allowing advertising. He wondered why the guidelines allow the electronic messaging? He confirmed the Board is not allowed to discuss signage only design. Mr. Sheffield responded

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

that the Council discussed the electronic sign issue in depth, and determined that some electronic signage would be okay; however, the FLM Guidelines adopted by Council also specify that the sign should be used principally to identify the site. In this case, the development agreement accepted by the applicant permitted 750 sq. ft. of sign area.; How that sign area is divided is part of what the Board should review. Again, based on the FLM Guidelines, identification of the site should be the major consideration in the design of the sign.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated he was fundamentally opposed to these signs.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen confirmed that the only thing visible from the freeway would be the message board.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed the messages could change every hour. Mr. Sheffield responded that the applicant was requesting a frequency of message changes every 4 to 6 seconds.

Boardmember Dave Richins thought this was tragic for the people across the street because he was concerned about the negative impact on the abutting neighborhoods.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed the sign would be placed in the freeway signage zone.

Boardmember Hagen confirmed there is no design theme or comprehensive sign plan to tie this sign into. Mr. Sheffield responded that there are currently no proposed buildings within the case site boundaries, so there is not yet any buildings designs by which to base a compatibly designed sign.

Boardmember Carter confirmed they want the entitlement for the sign so they can get tenants.

Chair Pete Berzins confirmed the Board can discuss the shape, colors and materials of the sign.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the Board should deny the case until there are buildings approved by which to compare the sign.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated the Design Review Board is acting as an advisory Board. The Board will forward a recommendation to the City Council for final consideration.

Boardmember Carter wondered if the Board could change the design after the buildings were approved. Mr. Sheffield indicated that it was his belief the Council would like to see a recommendation on a final design. It was his suggestion that the Board recommend a specific design, rather than ask the applicant to have a modified design reviewed at some unspecified later date. He also felt that it would be in the best interests of the applicant to be able to market the site with a specifically designed freeway sign.

Boardmember Nielsen confirmed the Sign Ordinance allows message boards, but requires the message to pertain to what is happening on-site.

There was some discussion regarding other Freeway Monument Signage in the Valley. Staffmember Gordon Sheffield stated there is a freeway sign adjacent to I-10 that has a changeable message board; however, it is approximately 20% to 25% of the overall sign area relative to the rest of the sign (which display a static message). He stated there are four or five

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

panels of equal size and one of those panels is the message board. He stated that staff would probably support a similar design because the electronic message panel constituted a smaller proportion of the sign. Reducing the percentage of the sign area devoted to the electronic message panel would reinforce the intent of using the FLM sign as a means to identify the site rather than advertise specials offers that could be advertised through print or other media.

By consensus, the Board agreed to the applicant's request to continue the case for one month, to the October 6, 2004 meeting.

Recorded on Tape No.: 3 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Other Business

Staffmember Lesley Davis explained to the Board, the applicant for The Wilson Office Building, DR03-66, wanted to change the green paint color to blue. The Board was not in favor of changing the color to blue. Staffmember Davis asked if the Board would be in favor of going to a deeper shade of green. The Board agreed to allow a deeper shade of Olive Green.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da