

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

January 4, 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
Vince DiBella

MEMBERS ABSENT

OTHERS PRESENT

Kim Steadman	Dan Brock
Lesley Davis	Kris Marten
Debbie Archuleta	Danny McKone
Mia Lozano Helland	Marc Makelbakken
John Wesley	Greg Hitchens
April Ward	Bob Saemisch
Suzanne Schneiger – Nitchals	Tom Toszak
Si Djahedi	Len Swartz
Rick Pannel	Marc Davis
Terry Manning	Mike Roth
Kurt Frinodig	Lawrence Enyart
Bill Heller	Doug Himmelberger
Dave Udall	Others
Boyd Thacker	
Nicole Posten	

1. Work Session:

CASE: Hickey Jeep
6743 E Main

REQUEST: Approval of an owner occupied retail building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Appreciated the extensive redesign
- Could use an additional color

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Could use slate

CASE: Wal-Mart Fueling
8335 E Guadalupe

REQUEST: Approval of a gas canopy and kiosk

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- The fueling station needs to relate to the existing store

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Revise the trim on the fascia
- Look at providing a reveal line or another layer of foam
- Too flat
- Needs more articulation of the columns; possibly an inset with tile
- Could the raised area at the pumps be continued out to the bollards
- Bring metal into the kiosk
- Don't step the roof line of the kiosk

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- The kiosk needs to relate to the building

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Needs to relate to the store

CASE: Wal-Mart Fueling
NEC Country Club & Baseline

REQUEST: Approval of a gas canopy and kiosk

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Needs to relate to the center
- Colors need to match proposed store

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Revise trim on the fascia
- Provide a reveal line or another layer of foam
- Too flat
- Need more articulation of the columns; maybe an inset with tile
- The raised island should extend out to the bollards
- Bring some metal back to the kiosk
- Don't step the roof of the kiosk

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Needs to relate to the main street theme of the store

CASE: ACS Building
550 E University

REQUEST: Approval of an office building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Quasi historical area
- Could the building relate to some of the bungalow homes in the area
- Looks a little sterile; add some residential detailing
- Could use a dormer vent

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Do something on the columns
- Could add decorative lamps on piers at the entry

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Could do something interesting with the window mullions

CASE: Mt. Vista MOB
1301 S Crismon

REQUEST: A medical office building adjacent to the proposed IASIS hospital

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Why roof mounted equipment?
- The equipment screens need to be carefully designed and integrated into the building
- Tie the equipment screening together
- The large glass section at the southeast corner of building needs solar control

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- The roof mounted equipment will be a dominant feature of the building and screening needs enhancement
- Materials should match the hospital

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- The roof mounted equipment detracts from the building

CASE: Samuelson McKone Dev.
2821, 2845, N Omaha & 4305 E Oasis

REQUEST: Approval of a two industrial buildings totaling 67,397 sq. ft.

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Building needs to have articulation and movement
- Show shadow lines on follow-up submittal
- Brown squares could be recessed
- Look at window treatments and mullions
- The steel frame could be surface mounted away from the window
- Maybe clear anodized aluminum, so frames aren't lost
- Could add a detail to top of roof; possibly add a cap for some zing.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Free-standing panels would be nice
- Storefront color is dark
- The large dark tower on the south elevation of A62C is too tall
- The squares should be recessed

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Don't like colors, there is too much brown
- Could use additional colors

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- The dark line should be a reveal line

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Concerned with missing signage locations on the building. Show proposed locations.
- Wants to see lighting details on the follow-up submittal

CASE: Wireless Toyz
344 S Power

REQUEST: Approval of multi-tenant retail building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- The store front system should be more interesting; could be a design with the mullions
- Wants to see a signage master plan so the signs are harmonious

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- The stripe on the canopy seems out of place. Consider an alternate design

CASE: Talon Airport Plaza
SEC Power & Ray

REQUEST: Approval of a shopping center

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Colors are nice; playful

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Too much stuff on small buildings
- Could be refined a little better
- Better integrated
- So many colors; earth tones, then teal

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Concerned with how the center portion of pad 'C' transitions
- Why don't the two buildings have the same cornice detail?
- The drawings for the follow-up submittal need to be drawn at the same scale

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- There is a lot happening for such small buildings
- Thought it was fun

CASE: Val Vista Groves Office Complex
3549 E Brown and 1118 & 1130 N Val Vista

REQUEST: Approval of three office buildings

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Corner building does not work
- The mass on top is out of scale
- Maybe different color

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Do they have to use roof-mounted equipment?

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- If ground-mounted equipment is used they can break up the roof plane and get rid of the boxiness
- Could they nudge the ridge line down, to avoid intersecting edges
- A lot of bulk and weight on the top

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- If ground-mounted equipment is used the building would look cleaner

CASE: Riverview Comp. Sign Plan
Dobson & Loop 202

REQUEST: Approval of a comprehensive sign plan

DISCUSSION:

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Not in favor of allowing signs to be placed on a base without wrapping the signs
- The design of the signage for the pads and auto dealerships need to be reviewed on a case by case basis

CASE: Fiesta Towers
NWC Grove & Westwood

REQUEST: Approval of two 15 story and two 25 story condo towers with retail on the first floor, and two levels of below grade parking

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Plans are too schematic
- Need detailed drawings
- Concern with phasing of project and parking
- Address solar concerns in desert heat
- How will they address drapes/blinds in all those windows?
- All three sides are exactly the same
- Concern with mechanical “pyramid” on top of building
- Go look at the Meier building downtown
- Suggest high performance glass
- Consider how they handle the view of top of the building from pedestrian level
- Could be fretted glass
- Likes the modern building, but must respond to climate and reflectivity
- Glass at balconies a concern; balconies can be very cluttered

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Bring photos of existing buildings they have built to next meeting

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- It is a positive departure for Mesa

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Liked the soft edges of the triangles
- Need to be sensitive to desert sun and heat
- Need to look at people scale
- Entries have to relate to the street
- Don't want to walk through a heat oven; should be an oasis

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- High performance glass
- Nothing reflective on the outside
- Overall likes the mix of two glass colors; could even be three, if subtle difference
- Look at darker mullion color
- Wants a stipulation that requires stepping and hierarchy to the buildings

- More articulation so it doesn't look stacked

2. Call to Order:

Chair Pete Berzins called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the December 7, December 12, and December 19, 2005 Meetings:

On a motion by Vince DiBella seconded by Tom Bottomley the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

4. Review and consider possible revisions to Freeway Landmark Monument Sign regulations:

Staffmember Gordon Sheffield explained the Planning and Zoning Board had met with City Council to discuss the FLM Guidelines. An ad hoc committee with two members of the Planning and Zoning Board and Rob Burgheimer and Pete Berzins of the Design Review Board met to discuss revisions to the FLM Guidelines. The results of the ad hoc committee were in the report given to this Board in their packet. Based on the three cases that had been heard and decided there was some thought that additional direction needed to be given to the applicants and the Boards regarding these cases. The major changes had to do with being more specific regarding submittals so there would be better information for the Boards to review; there were also some protections to residential properties through additional setbacks; some limitations and general guidelines to give an overall philosophy regarding the signs themselves; in addition there was more direction given to the approval process. Specifically it now requires a proportional distance for the notification radius. For each one foot in height they must notify an additional 15 feet. It provides for a mandatory neighborhood meeting, and a mandatory notice to all neighborhood associations within one mile. He stated a couple of things that had been added since the ad hoc committee had met, because of meetings between staff and the City Attorney's office. One was under design and construction section, there was some discussion about how to determine how big a sign area the applicant could have. The ad hoc committee had indicated that it might be determined by the legibility of the sign copy. The City Attorney's office felt that was not specific enough, so that was substituted by a ratio that gives one square foot of sign area for each two feet of freeway frontage, and caps it at 750 sq. ft.. In addition, there was some thought as to how deviations from these guidelines might be approved by the Council. Previously there was a five part criteria at the end and the Council only had to choose one of the five to approve a modification to the guidelines. Now it would be a three out of five criteria. Basically it mandates superior design, some sort of special conditions, and one of three items primarily having to do with something special about the sign or the site. The thought would be that the City would be getting a high quality sign in return for the deviations.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated he and Chair Berzins had tried to address their concerns with the previous cases through this ad hoc committee. He stated the committee was concerned with how many of these signs there could be along the U.S. 60 and Loop 202. He stated they were surprised that as currently written there were not many sites that could have FLM; however, they were concerned that over time that could change and there could be more.

Boardmember Burgheimer and Chair Berzins thought that with the revisions would help make it easier for the Board to determine what the sign would actually look like.

Boardmember Dave Richins appreciated that the committee had addressed notification to surrounding residential neighborhoods. He confirmed the notification area would be increased.

Chair Pete Berzins confirmed that the intent of FLM Guidelines was to identify centers and not tenants.

There was some discussion regarding electronic messaging of the FLM Guidelines on the signs. Staffmember Sheffield stated the changeable messages allowing Example: a 750 sq. ft. FLM as an option could have 400 sq. ft. on the center identification, could still have up to a 350 sq. ft. changeable message board. The Board felt the signs should emphasize destinations not be tenant bill boards.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated they tried to prevent the signs from coming before the buildings. Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought there should be language to say there had to be building designs established for the signs to relate to.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated there was a provision that the applicant would need to demonstrate a need for additional height, so there would not be a very tall sign where the freeway was level with the land and the sign height wasn't really needed.

Staffmember Sheffield stated staff has received comments from Bill Allison, who is an attorney who represent the sign association. They have concerns regarding how the top of the sign is determined as the focal point rather than the middle of the sign copy. The Sign Association also has concerns about the limits on illumination. They would like the sign to be more visible. They do not oppose the additional setbacks and additional notification, and they agree with the idea of protecting residential neighborhoods.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought the revisions would make it easier to judge the signs on a case by case basis. He liked the fact that the applicant would need to demonstrate a need for a higher sign. He liked the idea of regulating the spacing to identify the center and keeping it fairly clear after that.

Boardmembers Vince DiBella and Tim Nielsen liked the changes. Boardmember Nielsen agreed the FLM should identify the center. He thought they should be a regional destination point and then let sub signs carry into the other places.

Boardmember Dave Richins appreciated the change in notification distance.

It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tim Nielsen that the Board approve the changes as presented.

Vote: 6 – 0

5. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-101 Gin Building

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 206 & 214 N Power
REQUEST: Approval of a 4,056 sq. ft. office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Gene Gin
APPLICANT: Shawn Clow
ARCHITECT: Gerald Deines

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,056 sq. ft. office building

SUMMARY: The applicant requested this case be continued to the February 1, 2006 meeting.

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR05-101 be continued.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The applicant requested additional time to make revisions to the project.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-01 City of Mesa Fire Station 215

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 5945 S. Sossaman Ave.

REQUEST: Approval of a 26,162 sq. ft. expansion to an existing fire station

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6

OWNER: City of Mesa

APPLICANT: Randy Jones

ARCHITECT: Larry Enyart

REQUEST: Approval of a 26,162 sq. ft. expansion to an existing fire station

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

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-01 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 WGAA conditions of approval DRC05-21.
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 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The building with conditions is well-designed and should be a nice addition to the Williams Gateway Airport

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-02 **Chili's**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1857 S Signal Butte
REQUEST: Approval of a 5,881 sq. ft. restaurant
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: CTW Superstition Gateway East
APPLICANT: Len Swartz
ARCHITECT: Kevin Henrichson

REQUEST: Approval of a 5,881 sq. ft. restaurant

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

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-02 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 manufacturer's names, paint numbers and door/window materials on a revised color/material board.
 - b. Provide a network of convenient and safe pedestrian paths to connect areas within the project, to adjacent properties and the public right of way.
 - c. Provide fully dimensioned revised landscape plans for the entire Chili's site that includes the required foundation base on all elevations, compatible plant material with the approved landscape palette for Superstition Gateway East and the revised parking area for the Chili's project.
 - d. The hardscape and landscaping at the immediate intersection corner between Pad 'A' and Pad 'B' (Chili's) will be installed by the developer as part of Pad 'A'.
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.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The building as conditioned is reasonably well designed

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-03 Holdings 101 Broadway

LOCATION/ADDRESS: South side of Broadway just east of Price
REQUEST: Approval of a 9,697 sq. ft. office-warehouse
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: 101 Broadway Holdings
APPLICANT: Daniel Brock
ARCHITECT: Daniel Brock

REQUEST: Approval of a 9,697 sq. ft. office-warehouse

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

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-03 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. Specify the color of the metal doors and frames in the south elevation inset to blend with the adjacent black CMU.
 - b. Work with staff on the color of window frames set in the black CMU areas.
 - c. Specify black finish for the LSI "Challenger" wall sconces.
 - d. Make noted landscape revisions to bring the project into compliance.
 - e. Fully recess the Service Entrance Section into the building. Staff to review and approve.
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 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The building, as conditioned is reasonably well designed.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-04 **Brown & Recker Mini-Storage**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 5932 E Brown
REQUEST: Approval of a 83,513 sq. ft. mini-storage facility
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Brown Recker SS Investments
APPLICANT: Mark Davis
ARCHITECT: Brian Moore

REQUEST: Approval of a 83,513 sq. ft. mini-storage facility

SUMMARY: Marc Davis and Mike Roth represented the case. Mr. Davis stated he thought they had addressed all of the Board's concerns.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer appreciated the changes. He was concerned with the panels proposed for the second floor of the office/ caretakers building. He was also concerned with the design of the windows. He suggested brining the overhang out so the roof would not look like a hat. He thought the fascia was too thin. He thought the whole building should be masonry. He thought the design of the main entry gate should be improved.

Boardmember Vince DiBella thought the joints would be visible on the metal panels. He thought the applicants missed what the Board wanted. He stated the embossed panels would not work. The awnings were too shallow and need to be deeper and cantilevered. The roof color was too dark. The fascia was too thin.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley agreed with the previous comments. He stated there was a fundamental form issue. The way the roof read was not attractive. The building did not relate to the Checker Auto or the car wash. The masonry base did not look designed. The building needed to read as a commercial building. He stated he had seen the panel system being proposed and they appear cheap. He was concerned with the pitched roof. He thought the building needed to be redesigned.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought the building looked like a residential trailer set on top of a masonry base. The top did not relate to the bottom. He stated they were using really nice masonry on the storage units; they needed to enhance the building that will be visible from the street. He thought there needed to be one theme.

Boardmember Dave Richins and Chair Pete Berzins agreed with the previous comments.

MOTION: It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that the front building including the office and managers quarters, and the gates be continued to the February 1, 2005 meeting; the mini-storage portion of DR06-04 to 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

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

to the Building Safety Division:

- a. Provide a complete revised color/material board indicating the revised building materials and colors. This should include information on lights, doors, glass, etc.
 - b. Provide additional detailing on the exterior columns of the storage buildings such as a different texture for the column or color change to create vertical breaks in the elevations.
 - c. Provide height dimensions of the front office building on the elevations.
 - d. Provide an additional tree along the Brown Road frontage in accordance with Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - e. Revise the landscape plan to remove foundation plant materials from the stairwell area and include dimensions of the foundation base landscape area on the landscape plan. Foundation base must meet minimum standards.
 - f. Revise the retention basin to provide an irregular shape with berms in compliance with §11-15-3 (D).
 - g. **Any building material changes/revisions to the storage units must be on interior portions only.**
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 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: With the changes to the columns, the rear self-storage area is reasonably well designed and complies with the Design Guidelines. The office/managers quarters require additional changes. The gate details must also be enhanced to comply with the guidelines and enhance the overall project.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-05 QuikTrip

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 14715 S. Power

REQUEST: Approval of a 5,104 sq. ft. convenience store and a 9,879 sq. ft. gas canopy

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6

OWNER: QuikTrip Corporation

APPLICANT: Craig Boswell, QuikTrip Corporation

ARCHITECT: JMS

REQUEST: Approval of a 5,104 sq. ft. convenience store and a 9,879 sq. ft. gas canopy

SUMMARY: The applicant requested this case be continued to the February 1, 2006 meeting.

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-05 be continued.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The applicant requested a continuance

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-06 Riverview at Dobson Landscape Plan

LOCATION/ADDRESS: Dobson & Loop 202
REQUEST: Approval of the landscape plan for Mesa Riverview
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Bixby Arizona
APPLICANT: Saemisch DiBella Architects
ARCHITECT: Laskin & Associates

REQUEST: Approval of the landscape plan for Riverview at Dobson

SUMMARY: Boardmember Vince DiBella abstained.

Bob Saemisch and Doug Himelberg represented the case. Mr. Saemisch stated the quantities of foundation landscape areas had been approved for the Wal-Mart and the Home Depot; however, the plant species had not been determined. The applicants were requesting the plant materials and counts be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer wanted to see consistency of plant material along the west side of Dobson, and along Alma School with what was being approved with this case. He wanted the palms to continue along Bass Pro Drive for continuity throughout the project.

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR06-06 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 the above-noted corrections to landscape drawing LA.1.
 - b. Provide the above-noted corrections to landscape drawing LA.2.
 - c. Provide the above-noted corrections to landscape drawing LA.3.
 - d. Provide the above-noted corrections to landscape drawing LA.4.
 - e. Provide the above-noted corrections to landscape drawing LA.5.
 - f. Provide the above-noted corrections to landscape drawing LA.6.
 - g. Provide the above-noted corrections to landscape drawing LA.7.
 - h. Provide the above-noted corrections to landscape drawing LA.8.
 - i. Provide the above-noted corrections to landscape drawing LA.9.
 - j. Provide the above-noted corrections to landscape drawing LA.10.
 - k. Provide the above-noted corrections to landscape drawing LA.12.
2. Compliance with all Conditions of Approval of cases Z05-101; DR05-103; DR05-104; DR05-105; and DR05-106.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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 – 1 (Boardmember Vince DiBella abstained)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: As conditioned, the landscape plan complies with the Design Guidelines for Riverview at Dobson, and with the design standards of the Zoning Ordinance.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da