

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
JANUARY 8, 2003

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Lower Level of the Council Chambers 57 East First Street, at 3:45 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Carie Allen - Chair
John O'Hara - Vice Chair
Randy Carter
Jillian Hagen
John Poulsen
Robert Burgheimer

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman	Greg Hitchens
Veronica Gonzalez	Sean Lake
Debbie Archuleta	Jesse Macias
Charlie Scully	
Richard Dyer	
Brent Fike	
Ron Duacu	
Jay Adams	

MEMBERS ABSENT

Tara Plese

1. Call to Order:

Chair John O'Hara called the meeting to order at 3:45 p.m.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the December 4, 2002 Meetings:

On a motion by John O'Hara seconded by Rob Burgheimer the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

Approval of the Minutes of the December 18, 2002 Meetings:

On a motion by Randy Carter seconded by John O'Hara the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

3. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 8, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-01 **“Baywood Professional Center”**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: Lot 6 Broadview Center
REQUEST: Approval of a 32,133 sq. ft. medical office
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Jere Planck
APPLICANT: Tim Rasnake
ARCHITECT: Jere Planck

REQUEST: Approval of a 32,133 sq. ft. office complex

SUMMARY: Jere Planck represented the case. He explained that Alta Dermatology, would be located at the northwest corner of the site. Building A would be multi-tenant with no proposed tenants. He stated that staff's concerns with the Alta Dermatology building were: Moving the columns back on the secondary entrance; they were willing to do that to give the 7' of clearance. The location of windows in the tower; they were willing to re-space the windows to make the tower element edges appear to be larger. He also stated that the fire lane on the site had been resolved. Regarding the design of the side elevations of Building A, the top of the peak should be the same height as the remainder of the roof. Mr. Planck stated that all of the buildings on the site with the exception of Alta Dermatology would meet foundation base requirement: 15' setback between the curb and the face of the building. They would be filing for a variance for the Alta Dermatology building. They were willing to install the 5' temporary landscape buffers at phasing lines. Regarding the parapet height of Building A they were willing to work with staff to reportion that.

Chair Carie Allen confirmed that the applicant would be placing the roof-mounted mechanical units in a well, therefore the height of the parapet can be lowered.

Boardmember John Poulsen felt that lowering the parapet would help and that with a few subtle changes Building A should be fine.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed that the lighter green color would be the eave element. The darker green would be used on the EFIS on the entry tower element for the Alta Dermatology building. He was concerned that the tops of the stone columns appeared small and weak.

Mr. Planck stated that the column would stop approximately one foot below the canopy; and column the structural support would come up and tie the canopy to the structure under the canopy. The stone column would not tie in to the canopy.

Boardmember Carter felt that the fascia was too thin for the size of the building. He confirmed that the wainscot was EFIS painted a darker color. Boardmember Carter wanted to see more of the stone used.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen confirmed that the band on the north elevation of the Alta Dermatology building was an EFIS pop-out that would stick out from the rest of the building. Boardmember Hagen felt it looked too much like a stripe with the EFIS pop-out wainscot.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 8, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer felt that the building needed to be redesigned and come back to the Board. He felt that the proposed buildings were not the same level of sophistication as some of the other buildings in this area. He felt that the tower was out of scale with the rest of the building, and wondered why it needed to be so tall. He did not like the colors; the band around the north elevation; he suggested the band be raised and broken, or the windows above it be larger so they pull into it. He did not feel this building was of the same caliber as the Swagel Wooten building or the Desert Pain building. He wanted to see more stone used. He felt that Building A was too simple.

Chair Carie Allen felt that lowering the parapet on Building A would look much better. She was not concerned with the size of the columns. She liked the idea of using the stone on a portion of the wainscot. She agreed that there needed to be changes.

Mr. Planck stated that the Alta Dermatology building would be a single tenant building and the entry tower was a two-story lobby that would spill light into the waiting room. The stone would be used on the skirt of the entry tower piece. Regarding the band on the north elevation, he was willing to remove it. Mr. Planck stated that the doctor for Alta Dermatology wanted a high-end residential look. He felt the columns were proportional.

Boardmember Poulsen agreed there should be more stone used on both buildings. He liked the entry.

Mr. Planck stated that they did not use stone on the wainscot because there were no obvious starting and stopping points.

Chair Allen confirmed both buildings would be the same colors.

Boardmember Hagen did not like the design of the entry tower as seen from the north, it would be visible to people to the north of this project. She suggested lowering the tower. Boardmember Hagen felt that the tower roof looked like a hat from the rear.

Mr. Planck stated that they were trying to avoid having the eave of the tower engage with the parapet of the roof well. He was concerned that the side of the tower would be awkward.

Boardmember Carter felt that the tower roof could be raised a foot so that it would not appear awkward. He was concerned with the window placements. On the front there was the main entry then two small windows that appear to go with the exam rooms; then the three larger windows that go with the three offices; then you go around the corner to where the break room is and there are two slits; then around the next corner you have a different shaped window, then there are small windows that appear to be in the file room and the restroom; but they don't seem to coincide with the back side of the building. On the west side, there are very small windows for the special procedures rooms. He felt that the buildings needed a little more work.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that he felt the tower was a tall element and seemed to be designed by one person and the rest of the building seemed to be designed by someone else. He was troubled by the sizes of the windows and felt the design was not well-balanced. He did not like the colors. He did not feel this building was well harmonized.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 8, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Carter felt that Building A appeared to be the plain sister to the main building. He felt that the same attention was not being given to Building A because it was a spec building.

Boardmember Hagen felt that the entry tower element was the best-designed part of the building.

Boardmember Burgheimer felt that the entry tower was not a bad element in and of itself; however, the rest of the building did not work well with that element. He wanted the rest of the building to tie in with the entry tower or change the entry tower to look more like the rest of the building.

Mr. Planck stated that Arbor Street was on the west and 63rd Street was on the east. 63rd Street is more heavily traveled. The Alta Dermatology building was the anchor building for the site and would be the largest building on the site, but it was at the far northwest corner of the site. They were trying to create a larger entrance to make that building more prominent to make it more visible from 63rd Street when the other buildings develop.

Boardmember Hagen agreed that the building design was not consistent.

Boardmember Burgheimer felt that Building A was actually more consistent; although he agreed that the parapet was too tall. He also agreed that the fascia was too thin and needed to be accentuated. He wanted to see the changes. He wanted the elevations to be shown with the actual colors.

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR03-01 be continued to January 22, 2003 at 9:00 a.m. The following issues were identified:

- Either raise or lower to tower so that it has more differentiation between it and the parapet wall.
- Add more width to the columns.
- Remove the band in the middle of the elevation.
- Provide additional stone at the wainscot or somewhere to tie the rest of the building into the entry tower.
- Reduce the size of the parapets on both buildings.
- Tie the character of the building to the design of the entry tower.
- Recolor the elevations so that they more accurately represent the proposed colors.
- The Board prefers the colors as shown on the Alta Dermatology colored elevations over the colors shown on the color board.
- The fascia to be 10" or 12" thick.
- Revise the building section to show the actual size of the overhang on the tower and show the flat soffit.
- On the south elevation of the main building it was suggested they try pulling one of the gables using stone on the middle window on the gable on the right hand side and pull those design elements together.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 8, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: To allow the applicant to redesign the building.

Recorded on Tape No.: 145 – 1 (side A and B)

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 8, 2001 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-02 **“Fletcher’s Tire & Auto”**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 5851 East McKellips
REQUEST: Approval of a 2,478 sq. ft. addition to an existing building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Fletcher’s Tire & Auto Service
APPLICANT: Gerald Kesler
ARCHITECT: Gerald Kesler

REQUEST: Approval of a 2,400 sq. ft. addition to a 4,968 sq. ft. tire & auto facility

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

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by John O’Hara that DR03-02 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. **Precast concrete cornice on the addition to match the cornice on the existing building.**
5. **Provide a landscaping plan showing existing and proposed landscaping.**
 - a. **Provide additional landscaping along the north property line: 231.89’ street frontage requires 9 trees and 27 shrubs. Existing landscaping, trees and shrubs, count toward meeting this total.**
6. **Provide a color chip of the proposed metal grille paint color for the Design Review case file.**
7. **All outdoor storage areas for materials, equipment, and service entrance section (SES) shall be recessed or fully screened from view by a masonry wall the same height as the utility cabinet. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.**
8. **If building elevations change in order to accommodate roof-mounted equipment, Design Review Staff must approve revised elevations.** Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened by a parapet wall equal to or exceeding the height of the mechanical units. To the extent permitted by law, satellite dishes shall be fully screened by a parapet wall. Ground mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened from public view by a combination of a decorative wall and dense landscaping. The screen wall shall be equal to or exceed the height of the mechanical units.
9. All backflow preventers 2” or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6’ radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2” shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 8, 2001 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- building color.
10. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
 11. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
 12. Provide two half size color elevations, two full size and two 8-1/2 X 11 sets of revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is

Recorded on Tape No.: 145 - 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 8, 2001 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-03 **“Kiowa Village”**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Power & Kiowa
REQUEST: Approval of Commercial Center
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: West USA Realty
APPLICANT: Michael Pearce, Patrick Hayes Architecture
ARCHITECT: Patrick Hayes Architecture

REQUEST: Approval of a 45,843 sq. ft. shopping center

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

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by John O’Hara that DR03-03 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
5. Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened by a parapet wall equal to or exceeding the height of the mechanical units. To the extent permitted by law, satellite dishes shall be fully screened by a parapet wall. Ground mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened from public view by a combination of a decorative wall and dense landscaping. The screen wall shall be equal to or exceed the height of the mechanical units.
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. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with Chapter 6 of the City Code “Outdoor Light Control” and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25’ for the interior and 20’ height at the perimeter. Light standards (poles) for pad sites are to match the light standards used within the shopping center.
8. Screen all parking areas and vehicular circulation aisles adjacent to the public right of way. The screen walls along the street frontage should be varied in alignment, broken up with naturally contoured berming and staggered dense shrubs to achieve a continuous screen of no less than 36 inches above the highest adjacent grade.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 8, 2001 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is

Recorded on Tape No.: 145 – 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 8, 2001 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-04 "Eckerd #5037"
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC Southern and Greenfield
REQUEST: Approval of a 13,824 sq. ft. drug store
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 6
OWNER: Unicorp National Developments
APPLICANT: Skyline Consultants
ARCHITECT: RHL Design Group

REQUEST: Approval of a 13,824 sq. ft. drug store

SUMMARY: Brent Fike and Jesse Macias represented the case. Mr. Fike explained that they were willing to meet all but one of the concerns listed in the staff report. They were willing to pull the roof element on the towers back into the building. They were willing to revise the colors. He stated that Eckerd's prides themselves on not tying their identity to a particular color. He stated that the architectural review by the Greenfield Court and Dan Reeb had approved the project including the colors. They were willing to replace some of the palm trees with another specie of tree. The only concern that was still a problem was the loading area. The pad had originally been approved for a convenience store under the old Design Guidelines. This project was designed to meet the new Design Guidelines. In doing that it became impossible to provide physical screening for the loading area. They had made some revisions to help mitigate the loading area. The loading area is a small door; they removed the yellow striping they originally proposed at the loading area. They removed the overhead canopy/shed roof that had been proposed. They brought the arched arcade around the building. They would also use paint to disguise the doors. He felt that when the building to the north was built it would screen the loading area. They were willing to supplement the landscaping to help screen the loading. He also felt that the main tower element along Greenfield would help pull your eye away from the loading area as you drive past.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed this building was a prototype. Mr. Fike stated that some of the buildings would be very different. He stated that Eckerd's was dedicated to making centers work as integral units. Mr. Fike stated that on this project Eckerd's would be the first building built. Mr. Burgheimer wanted the applicant to be aware of the Board's policy regarding prototypes. Mr. Burgheimer wanted the applicant to know that the Design Review Board looks at prototypes on a case-by-case basis and that are concerned that any prototype fit the neighborhood or center in which it being proposed. Mr. Burgheimer did not like the monument sign. He confirmed that on their signs Eckerd has two proposals; one is "the capsule" which is a blue illuminated sign with white lettering. The applicant stated that, in Cities with stricter Sign Ordinances, such as Mesa, they revert to blue individual letters, which are backlit or halo lit, and then if they are allowed to they raise the capsule shape by raising the stucco 1 or 2 inches.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman explained to the applicant that if the "capsule" is raised it may be counted toward the total sign area.

Boardmember Burgheimer was concerned that the accent tiles above the attached signs are too close to the sign. He agreed with staff that the tower roofs are too thin; however he wondered why they needed to have so many towers. The tower on the rear of the building was almost the same size as the entrance. He understood that the tower element was breaking up the rear elevation; however, he did not feel it needed to be the same scale as the entry. He suggested varying parapet heights on the front elevation. He did not object to the

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 8, 2001 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

colors.

Boardmember John Poulsen wanted the arches to pop-out at least 8". He liked the way the towers broke up the mass of the building, but not so tall. He was concerned that the columns were shallower than they are wide. He wanted to see them squared off. He did not like the colors.

Boardmember Randy Carter was concerned that the colors of the Eckerd not be too similar to the proposed CVS across Southern Avenue to the south. He had several concerns: he would not support the monument sign package; he confirmed that the arches would not be flat, the shadow lines on the elevations were incorrect; he agreed the attached sign was too close to the accent diamonds, and felt it took up too much of the gable; he agreed the tower element on the rear of the building was too large; he agreed the columns are too thin. Also if the cart storage is to be outside, the area must be screened; he agreed with staff that the tower roofs needed to be extended back into the building; he agreed the parapets should be varying heights.

Boardmember Burgheimer was concerned that the City not be all shades of tan. He was concerned that applicants were submitting beige and tan, and the Board would like to see different colors. He felt that using different colors would help applicants with their own marketing.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen was concerned that the drive-thru aisles were 9' and 11'; she did not feel that was adequate. She was also concerned that they proposed 4' between the building wall and the column and then 5' between the column and the curb. She suggested the overhang be larger and pull the columns out toward the curb. Mr. Fike stated that they were meeting the Design Guidelines to provide "green space" at the skirt of the building. This site is so tight they cannot move anything. She appreciated the fact that they were providing planting; however, the planters are shaded and they were proposing a plant material that requires more sun. She felt that the landscape area would make more sense on the other side of the columns.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that the reason for not wanting the landscaping close to the parking was probably to protect the plants from car overhangs and from being walked through.

Boardmember Hagen felt that if the applicant used shrubs and not ground cover, and left space for walking the plants could survive. She did not object to the colors. She did not like the signs. She agreed that the parapet heights at the front should vary and that the tower element at the rear was too prominent.

Vice-Chair John O'Hara agreed with the previous comments. He did not like the signs. The arched pop-outs should be extended to 8".

Mr. Fike suggested revising the tower element on the rear to have a parapet roof and lower the barrel vault in proportion to the building.

Boardmember Hagen liked the variation in the roof line.

Boardmember Burgheimer felt that that was an option. He felt that on the monument sign the gable shape did not relate to the shape of the pill. He thought that a vault would be a better shape.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 8, 2001 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Poulsen felt that the gable on the monument sign should go.

Chair Carie Allen agreed with most of the comments stated. However, she liked the colors being similar to what was around them in the area. She felt the tower elements needed to be revised. She felt that they appeared to be tacked on.

Boardmember Burgheimer felt that the drive-thru seemed to be fairly in small in relation to its function. He would prefer that the drive-thru be made larger and downplay the two sides. He was concerned that it would not be large enough to properly shade the window.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR03-04 be continued to the January 22, 2003 special meeting to address the following concerns:

- Re-evaluate the building entry element.
- Re-evaluate the east and west elevations based on the Board's concerns.
- Look at the landscaping around the perimeter of the building and its placement, as well as the columns.
- Look at the drive-thru widths.
- Deepen the arched areas to 8".
- Resubmit/redesign monument sign.

Boardmember Burgheimer then stated that there seemed to be a lot of screen wall he asked the applicant to look at using berming and landscaping.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen then stated that one of the monument signs appeared to be proposed in turf; she was concerned that overspray from the watering would damage the sign.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: To allow the Board to see the revisions.

Recorded on Tape No.: 145 – 1 (side B) and 145 – 2 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 8, 2001 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Other Business:

Greg Hitchens presented his proposal for neon on the Copper Peak Restaurant on South Stapley, DR02-49. Mr. Hitchens showed the Board detail of the shielded neon tube and a brochure sample of the proposed neon.

Boardmember Randy Carter was concerned with the wood detail shown.

Greg Hitchens stated that they would substitute EFIS.

It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by John O'Hara that the Board approve Snow White EGL 6500 as shown on the detail presented.

Vote: 6 – 0

Sean Lake then asked the Board to discuss the Board's policy regarding prototypes. He wanted to know how many pharmacy prototypes could be built before the Board would want significant revisions.

Boardmember John Poulsen then stated that his concern was that there are four pharmacy companies: Walgreen's, CVS, Eckerd, and Osco, and they are all doing basically the same thing. His concern was that one pharmacy would come in and propose a prototype that looked like another pharmacy prototype that was already approved across the street.

Sean Lake then proposed a distance separation be set by the Board. He understood that there are areas of the City that have their own character, such as Desert Uplands, the citrus area, Dobson Ranch.

Chair Carie Allen stated that she remembered the Board had determined they would not allow prototypes. They wanted to see each case design for the neighborhood or area they were in.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer felt that the Board was not saying there could be more than one prototype, however, the Board wanted to see each case reviewed on a case-by-case basis. He recognized that there was an economy of scale in developing prototypes; however, they could make a prototype look different with just a few minor changes.

Boardmember John Poulsen was concerned about what may happen in the future if one or more of these companies close and then their buildings are boarded up. The Board would like to see attractive buildings that could be re-used.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 8, 2001 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da