

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

JUNE 7, 2006

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

MEMBERS PRESENT

Pete Berzins - Chair
Dave Richins- Vice Chair
Tom Bottomley
Robert Burgheimer
Tim Nielsen

MEMBERS ABSENT

Vince DiBella (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

Kim Steadman
Lesley Davis
Debbie Archuleta
Mia Lozano Helland
John Wesley
Rick Sterre
Bill Wells
Bob Hunt
Loren Dickinson
Kevin Page
Jeff Welker
Robert J Blaney
Shane Kuber
Craig Boswell
Don Cramer
Tim Short
Ray Center
Jay Stallings
Terri Jones
Harold Decker

Doug Himmelberger
Michele Lorange
Wayne Rockwood
Robert Orsi
Fred Woods
John Brown
Bozo & Kristina Skrbic
Stephen Surgener
Ann Fitzpatrick
Richard Garcia
Michael Jorgensen
David Ross
Ted Watson
Mike Hall
Don Pratt
Bob Weiber
Jeff Pipkin
Terry Tull
JD Berryman
Others

1. Work Session:

CASE: Alta Mesa Villas
5750 E Main

REQUEST: Approval of a multi-family project

DISCUSSION:

The applicants stated they had added a couple of colors since the previous review. They had also added split face on the A unit patios.

Chair Pete Berzins:

- You lose the impact of the split face if it's hidden by landscaping. Use it somewhere.
- The reason the Board wanted additional color was to break up the way each unit was done.
- Vary the colors on the same buildings.
-

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Liked the use of texture and color
- Block is a great finish but could be a different color
- Stone should be a different plain than the stucco
- The stone needs to have a termination point
- The stone should not be paper thin; it should be heavy

CASE: Park N Ride
Superstition Springs & Power

REQUEST: Approval of a City of Mesa park n ride facility

DISCUSSION:

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Should be done about the same time as US 60 – springs of 2007

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Could have really interesting trash enclosures and lights
- Make this a really nice people space

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Concern with visibility from US 60
- Trash enclosures at bus shelters

CASE: Superstition Gateway – PAD D
1923 S Signal Butte

REQUEST: Approval of a shops building at Superstition Gateway East

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Cornice looks like a crown
- Could the cornice be smaller; or combine the cornices so they don't appear so set-like
- Use decorative light fixtures not wall paks

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- It is all about proportion
- Maybe the middle portion could be taller instead of the two sides

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Agreed the middle portion could be higher

CASE: Homestead Sun Valley
SEC Sun Valley & Boise

REQUEST: Approval of a multi-family project

DISCUSSION:

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Front is inviting
- They could provide pop outs at the second floor of the rear elevations
- Could the roof elevation be varied in height
- Like the variety of the window sizes

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Too much repetition on the rear elevations
- The garages will be the focal point
- Variation of height
- Add a bulkhead or buttress stone above garage
- Need more layers of pop-outs
- Could some columns pop-up a couple feet for variety

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Agreed with comments
- Could provide variation
- Push in and out

CASE: Homestead on Center
SWC Center & McKellips

REQUEST: Approval of a multi-family project

DISCUSSION:

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Front is inviting
- They could provide pop outs at the second floor of the rear elevations
- Could the roof elevation be varied in height
- Like the variety of the window sizes

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Too much repetition on the rear elevations
- The garages will be the focal point
- Variation of height
- Add a bulkhead or buttress stone above garage
- Need more layers of pop-outs
- Could some columns pop-up a couple feet for variety

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Agreed with comments
- Could provide variation
- Push in and out

CASE: Power Ranch RV, Boat, Mini-storage
8200 E Germann

REQUEST: Approval of an RV, boat, mini-storage facility

DISCUSSION:

Harold Decker of Economic Development stated his office is very concerned with this type of development setting the precedent for development in this area. The Economic Development Office would prefer a use that produces jobs. They are also concerned with the quality of the design.

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- The question is how this project is designed, which affects future projects
- Concerned with the design of the office
- Office looks like a portable class room
- Don't hide bad design behind landscaping

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Look at Shurgard facilities as examples
- This is a long linear line

Chair Pete Berzins:

- The walls need to be the same height
- There should not be a view into the project

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The step down to 8'4" is a concern
- Design of the gate should be very decorative
- Look at the mini-storage project at Brown & Recker
- Wall should be nicer and more decorative

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Understands it sets back quite far from Germann
- Need to raise the 8'-4" portion
- Could step the lower portion down

CASE: Superstition Commerce Park
SWC Sossaman & Hampton

REQUEST: Approval of an industrial park

DISCUSSION:

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Too symmetrical – 4 dots, 4 dots etc.
- Roof should vary more in height
- Changes in plain
- More variety
- Vary parapet heights

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Bring samples of block to next meeting
- More color
- Punch up the colors
- Integral block if possible

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Appears very flat
- Horizontal play
- Very brown
- More color
- Needs more life
- Less monochromatic
- Panels of color can add to variety
- Could use different score patterns
- Could use additional material
- High tech
- More light and shadow

CASE: Mountain Rd. Industrial Park
SWC Mountain & Underwood

REQUEST: Approval of an industrial park with 14 buildings

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Looks more like an office
- Not a lot of glass

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Likes the colors and materials
- Nice looking project

CASE: Banner Baywood Children's Choice
E of NEC 63 & Broadway

REQUEST: Approval of a day care facility

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Not the same quality as surrounding projects
- Too simple
- Doesn't like the detached entry
- Racing stripes look cheap
- Look at what is in the area

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Porte cochere looks attached, not integrated
- Primary colors fight the main body colors
- Use the primary colors inside the building, they look gratuitous
- The grid is still horizontal

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Sidewalk next to drive aisle is dangerous
- Use landscaping next to drive aisle and sidewalk next to building
- Trash location in conflict with cars

The applicants then showed the Board a revised elevation for the building

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Grids are very difficult to execute in EIFS
- Thicker fascia
- Want to see the playground equipment with follow-up submittal
- Use nicer light fixtures
- Show the fence detail
- Most hospital employees will come from Baywood so move trash to Broadway

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Should be Mesa Stone, or something similar, at wainscot
- Add reveal lines
- Echo design features on the fence
- Two way drive aisles need to be 24' wide

CASE: QuikTrip
N of NEC Southern & Crismon

REQUEST: Approval of a gas station and C-store

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Thought it was still too similar to previous designs

Staffmember Kim Steadman explained this was based on the styles approved by the Board at the special meeting with QuikTrip. He also explained the colors match the center and are not prototypical.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Thought they could express detailing from the building on the canopy
- Could use brighter colors
- The flat, shallow arch detail could be transferred to the canopy
- Canopy columns are spindly
- The element between the canopy columns could be arched like the building or could be repeated as an element on the building
- Screen the S.E.S.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- The center columns on the rear elevation should be dark, so they look like they can hold up the arched element

CASE: Shops H at Mesa Riverview
913 N Dobson

REQUEST: Approval of a multi-tenant shops building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Tower element should pop-out

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Roof element should cover one third of building at tower, or use only a cornice, or use the hipped roof on the on the tower and expand the center portion of the building

CASE: Banner Desert Tower
1400 S Dobson

REQUEST: Approval of a new 7 story patient tower

DISCUSSION:

It was determined that due to the size of this project it would be best to hold a special work session, so the Board could devote the time necessary to this special project.

Some questions the Board wanted addressed at the special work session were:

- How does this tower connect to the main hospital
- Concern with way finding, this tower is a stronger element than the rest of the hospital
- Circulation pattern to the main hospital entrance

CASE: Classic Car Spa
2737 S Ellsworth

REQUEST: Approval of a car wash and related retail

DISCUSSION:

The Board liked the proposal

2. Call to Order:

Chair Pete Berzins called the meeting to order at 6:24 p.m.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the May 3, 2006 Meeting:

On a motion by Dave Richins seconded by Tom Bottomley the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

4. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-50 Mesa/University Mixed Use Centre
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC University & Greenfield
REQUEST: Approval of a 119,692 sq. ft. mini-storage and retail center
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: Bagaca LLC & 312 West Eighth, LLC
APPLICANT: Jared McQuarrie
ARCHITECT: Bruce Jordan

REQUEST: Approval of a 119,692 sq. ft. mini-storage and retail center

SUMMARY: Terry Tull represented the case. He explained they had tied the retail center into the scheme of the self-storage. They had also moved the trash enclosures. They also changed the building material to integral CMU and split face. The blue and terra cotta colored towers on the retail portion would still be stucco.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer wondered why the buildings needed to be so tall. He stated they would be very visible behind the retail. The lighting on the retail building would be under the arcade. On the self-storage units the wall paks would be no higher than would be viewed from outside the facility. He was concerned with the design of the gate.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen appreciated the texture and coordinating the retail with the storage. He thought the gates should be a design element. He confirmed a variance had been approved for the setbacks.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley confirmed the entry gates are about 14' wide. He thought the gates should have a design element, not just pickets with horizontals at the top and bottom. He confirmed the terra cotta on the storage buildings was split face, and painted stucco on the retail. He thought the buildings needed something else where the horizontal bands are. He agreed the buildings were very tall. He understood the 10' ceiling heights, but the buildings were 28' tall. Could some of the height be brought down. He thought the buildings would look dated. He thought there was too much of the horizontal bands. The buildings would be very blank for the customers. He thought the buildings were too plain for the size of the project. The applicant stated the other buildings along University would hide this. Also landscaping would hide the buildings from the apartments. Boardmember Bottomley stated it was not good to use landscaping to hide bad design.

Boardmember Dave Richins referred the applicants to the Crime Free Mini-Storage Facility program.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Dave Richins that DR06-50 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

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:

- a. Provide a sample of the Angelus Block, Charcoal.
 - b. Reduce the height of the western-most light pole in front of the retail area to 14' maximum.
 - c. All roof-, ground-, and wall-mounted equipment, including the S.E.S.'s and fire risers, are required to be screened and/or located within the buildings, per Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
 3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
 4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
 5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
 6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
 7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 4 – 1 (Boardmember Tom Bottomley voting nay)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project as conditioned meets the intent of the Design Guidelines.

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-51 Gateway Norte Pads S1, S2, S3, S4
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 4314, 4320, 4328, 4330 S. Sagewood
REQUEST: Approval of four office/industrial buildings total of 15,310 S.F
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Trudy Licano
APPLICANT: J D Berryman
ARCHITECT: Kristjan Sigurdson

REQUEST: Approval of four office/industrial buildings totaling 15,310 sq. ft.

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

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR06-51 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Compliance with the conditions of approval for Z00-30 and an Administrative Approval dated 3/30/2006 for site plan modifications.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The buildings should be an attractive addition to the Gateway Norte Center.

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-52 Lucky Star Auto
LOCATION/ADDRESS: West of 430 W Guadalupe
REQUEST: Approval of an 8,000 sq. ft. auto repair building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: M.I.T. LLC
APPLICANT: Bozo Skrbick
ARCHITECT: John Eldo Brown

REQUEST: Approval of an 8,000 sq. ft. auto repair building

SUMMARY: John Brown represented the case. Mr. Brown explained the changes since the work session.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen liked the split face masonry. He thought the glass seemed short and out of proportion. He suggested the height of the glass be raised. He thought the building was top heavy. He suggested using additional color.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley agreed the glass was too low. He suggested raising the center element and the glass at the office. He agreed they should introduce more accent color. He thought the saw-tooth pattern should be mirrored.

Boardmember Dave Richins agreed there was too much of the Adobe Brown color.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was concerned with the quality of the project. He thought the front elevation needed work. He thought the elements looked very applied. He did not think this project met the minimal level of quality for development. He was concerned with the top cornice. He thought there should be two level cornice all the way around not all in pieces.

Chair Pete Berzins agreed with previous comments. He thought the side elevations were OK. He agreed the front elevation still needed work. He also agreed the glass needed to be raised to 8'.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-52 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:
 - a. **Work with staff to develop and refine the front elevation.**
 - b. **Increase the height of the glass.**
 - c. **Increase the total mass of the of the front/office area.**
 - d. **Develop a cornice detail that is continuous around the building.**
 - e. **Revise the saw tooth of the truss as directed in the summary.**
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations..
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project with conditions is reasonably well-designed.

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-53 Falcon Commons

LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC Ingram & Higley – Lot 8 of Falcon Commerce Park
REQUEST: Approval of three buildings totaling 75,072 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: L.G.E. Corp.
APPLICANT: Cawley Architects
ARCHITECT: Sherman Cawley

REQUEST: Approval of three warehouse buildings totaling 75,072 sq. ft.

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

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR06-53 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. Maximum heights of exterior light fixtures shall be 20'. All exterior light fixtures must be installed per City of Mesa Outdoor Light Control as specified in Title 4 Chapter 6.
 - b. Design for parking canopies to be reviewed and approved by Design Review Staff.
 - c. Design for monument signs to be reviewed and 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 Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project was reasonably well-designed.

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-54 Signal Butte Market Place
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC Signal Butte & Main
REQUEST: Approval of 3 retail buildings totaling 13,609 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: L & G Apache PAD LLC
APPLICANT: Bob Weigel
ARCHITECT: RSP Architects

REQUEST: Approval of 3 retail buildings totaling 13,609 sq. ft.

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

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR06-54 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 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 includes the storefront material and glass color to be provided. This information should also be included on the black and white elevations.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Board of Adjustment for the SCIP (BA06-024).
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
6. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
8. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The buildings should be a nice addition to the center.

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-55 Sunrise Pre-School

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 102 North Lindsay Road
REQUEST: Approval of an 8,775 sq. ft. preschool
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: GRRO II
APPLICANT: Wayne Rockwood
ARCHITECT: Wayne Rockwood

REQUEST: Approval of an 8,775 sq. ft. preschool

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

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR06-55 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 to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Compliance with the conditions of approval for Development Incentive Permit BA06-023 approved on 5/9/2006.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project was reasonably well designed.

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-56 Gateway Norte Parcel A
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 4207 S. Power Rd.
REQUEST: Approval of a 10,551 sq. ft. retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Richard Garcia
APPLICANT: David Ross, Ross Design Group, LLC
ARCHITECT: J. Stephen Surgener, Ross Design Group, LLC

REQUEST: Approval of a 10,551 sq. ft. retail building

SUMMARY: Stephen Surgener David Ross represented the case and explained the revised drawings they brought to the meeting and how they addressed staff concerns.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought the entries were not balanced. He thought the single doors and mullions should be the width of the double doors, plus wider on the sides. He also thought the double doors should be centered. He did not like the choice of profile of the roof tile, he suggested mission S. He thought the center element on the south elevation seemed unresolved. He suggested another arched element. He suggested the recessed element on the tower be incorporated onto the sides. He thought the cornice thickness should be consistent.

Boardmember Dave Richins suggested no cornice on the center area of the south elevation.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought there was a lot going on for the size of the building. He thought the building should be cohesive. He thought the changes were an improvement. He confirmed that on the south elevation there was an 8" pop-out. He confirmed the west elevation was a colonnade and the east elevation was engaged. He thought the rear elevation could be simplified.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed the stucco element would return around the corner. He confirmed the stucco would be in the same plain as the tower. The top portion would pop out 8". He suggested the glass wrap the corner at the tower instead of the stucco. He appreciated the changes. He was concerned with the old world details of the rafters and modern details of the streamlined cornice trying to blend together. He was worried about the colors change. He suggested there could be shadow lines and not so many color changes. He thought they could clean it up and simplify the colors. Did the sign area really need a color change?

Chair Pete Berzins was concerned with the glass on the east. He did not want spandrel glass. He confirmed the color board was labeled incorrectly and would need to be revised for the file.

MOTION: It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-56 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

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

elevations presented at the meeting 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 color specifications for the cornice and pop-out accents. Also provide specifications for the storefront window system and glazing. Details to be approved by Staff.
 - b. The arch recesses in the tower need to be a minimum of 6" in depth.
 - c. Relocate the interior columns/piers on the south elevation to the interior edge of the hipped roof tower to give a visual means of support for the tower. The additional stone pier at the corner of the glass could be eliminated. Details to be approved by Staff.
 - d. Provide a revised color/material board and revised elevations that specify **all** building colors/materials in their appropriate location with corrected color specifications.
 - e. Provide dimensional and color specifications for the wrought iron detailing. Details to be approved by staff.
 - f. Revise the cornice at the southeast corner of the building on the black line elevations to match the more simplified version depicted on the color elevations provided.
 - g. Provide location of SES. If exterior must be appropriately located not to conflict with required landscape, be recessed and painted to match building.
 - h. **Tower element to have recesses on the south end of the west and north end of the east.**
 - i. **Cornices to be consistently applied around the entire building.**
 - j. **Storefront alignments be symmetrical and mullion alignment be continued from either side of the storefront, and side light proportions be equally distributed on either side of the doors.**
 - k. **Tile not be Villa type but Mission S with textured valley.**
 - l. **Glass to turn the corner on the south elevation.**
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
 3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
 4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
 5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
 6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
 7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project as conditioned was reasonably well

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

designed.

5. Appeals of Administrative Design Review:

VLJ Aircraft, LLC
5030 E Falcon Drive

Ted Watson, Mike Hall and Don Pratt represented the case and explained that the two-story office portion of the building was not going to be built. They stated Falcon Field staff had requested additional hanger space.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the case should have been a new Design Review submittal rather than an appeal. Staffmember Kim Steadman stated that three sides of the building would remain the same. Boardmember Burgheimer thought the changes had gone in the wrong direction. He thought the building had lost its interest. He stated that if it was going to be only a hanger it should be a hanger and not try to look like an office. He thought the vent looked stuck on. He suggested the applicant's look at the Confederate Air Force building. He stated their hanger doors were well done. He thought this project was trying to be two different things. He thought they should let the gable form come through the building. He suggested they play around with the different panels "Butler" has. He suggested the design express the planes that will be in the hanger.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed the windows would not be mirrored.

Boardmember Dave Richins thought the canopies gave the building architectural interest. He confirmed the recess would be 10'. He liked the perforated metal.

Chair Pete Berzins confirmed the window system would be the same. He liked the arched element, and thought it gave the building an airplane wing appearance. He thought the building design should be unique to the airport.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley agreed the building needed an aeronautical theme. He liked the large vault element, and the glass entry.

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that the VLJ Aircraft appeal be continued to the July 6th meeting:

VOTE: 5 – 0

DR06-29 Gateway Commons
5114 E Southern

Jeff Pipkin represented the case.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the building had lost the drama that it had.

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed they did not need the entrance on Higley. He thought the corner piece should be more dominant. Since they have more square footage, they should have a more dominant entry.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley liked the red arch. He thought the center arch should be larger. He suggested they raise the whole element another glass row and raise the parapet and the red arched element. He suggested a color change.

MOTION: It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Dave Richins that the Gateway Commons appeal be approved with the following conditions to be approved by Design Review staff:

1. **Provide an additional panel of glass.**
2. **Raise the center element proportionally.**
3. **The end panels on the west and east be thickened to match the other 3.**
4. **Allow them the flexibility to add an additional color.**

VOTE: 5 – 0

6. Other Business:

Jim Smith: Trademark Law and FLMS. Mr. Smith will speak at the August 2nd meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da