

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
DECEMBER 6, 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
Vince DiBella
Robert Burgheimer
Tim Nielsen

MEMBERS ABSENT

Tom Bottomley

OTHERS PRESENT

Kim Steadman	Doug Himelberger
Lesley Davis	Wes Balmer
Debbie Archuleta	Al Cappello
Mia Lozano Helland	Sean Lake
Jim Hash	Scott Wahbla
John Wesley	Charles Mannino
Jennifer Gniffke	Boyd Thacker
Krissa Lucas	Steve Cox
Rich McAllister	Joe Murray
Ryan Matthews	
Rob	Emily Diver
Pat Mahoney	Gonzo Grasis
David Allan	Jay Adams
Crystal Lassider	Cindy Carpenter
Bob Berg	Bill Hunse
Fred Woods	DJ Stapley
Corrine Nystrom	Don Thrailkill
Liz Gaston	Others

1. Work Session:

CASE: Riverview AutoMall
202 & Dobson

REQUEST: Approval of three new car dealerships and a body shop building

DISCUSSION: Trent Jones and Jeff Fisher represented the case and stated they tried to dress up the facades and address Riverview by adding awnings, pilasters, and Mesa Stone as a wainscot. They stated they would be using ACM panels on each building with EIFS on the showroom and office; smooth and split faced cmu at the service bays. The window wall would be backlit like at Superstition Springs and Avondale.

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Roof mounted mechanical screened by parapet
- Would like the buildings broken out into separate cases to make it easier to address concerns and establish conditions of approval for each building
- They have come a long way but still need a few little details
- Like the awnings and the addition of color
- Like the modern look with the angles

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Body shop is independent of the dealerships
- The wainscot won't be visible past the landscaping; maybe the Mesa Stone could be used so that it is visible

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Will Mesa Stone be visible from the street?
- Appreciates the Mesa Stone
- Understands the high tech theme
- Could go further with patterning of the masonry; maybe roloc
- The awnings help with shade with so much brightness and glass

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Color of Nissan slightly darker than Toyota
- Added color and dimensions of the awnings very important
- Similar characteristics; wanted to see more differences

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Still concerned that it doesn't go with existing signs
- Needs to be a unifying element
- Awnings across the street are different colors
- These are prototypes, which isn't necessarily a bad thing

CASE: Commercial Center
NWC Stapley & McKellips

REQUEST: Approval of multiple retail buildings

DISCUSSION: Al Cappelo and Bergen King represented the case, they stated they had met with neighbors and they were OK with the buildings heights.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Dessert Museum Palo Verde would be a better screen; it grows faster, denser and has a longer bloom

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Should screen the bay doors on Big O Tires
- An 8" step in the building could alleviate the bay doors
- No storage of used tires unless they provide an enclosure

CASE: Monolith Storage
SEC Southern & Ellsworth

REQUEST: Approval of a two-story storage building and a future retail building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Do they need all the pilasters?
- If they keep the pilasters they should be integrated with the arch

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Curves and vaults maybe but not flat and curved and arches; need to choose
- Perhaps the forms could be unified
- East side piers do not seem to support the arch

CASE: Mt. Vista Medical
Hampton E of Crismon

REQUEST: Approval of two industrial buildings and two medical office buildings

DISCUSSION: Wes Balmer represented the case and stated the buildings along the freeway would be light industrial but could transition to high end offices with mezzanines. The front buildings would be class B offices.

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- These are very plain in comparison to the hospital

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Will customers park in the rear?
- Pink oleander should be replaced with a color more harmonious with buildings
- Provide another row of trees at entry

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Maybe they could use sandstone at entries
- The integral block will be very nice

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Looks like they are trying to attract two worlds
- They may not be successful at attracting medical uses
- Concerned with massing and flatness
- Suggest popping in the bands or using 6" block 8" block to create shadow
- Awnings on rear windows too punched
- Recess windows

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Rear elevation visible from freeway
- Too linear
- Bring red block up and change proportion so its not 50/50
- Vary windows so they are not horizontal
- Articulate the rear

CASE: Mulberry Business Park Phase 3
242, 244, 246 S Mulberry

REQUEST: Approval of three industrial buildings

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Doesn't want the area between buildings 4 and 5 to be storage and trash
- The employee break area is not a good people space, provide a shade structure over it to soften the harshness

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Landscape areas along railroad become areas for transients; open fencing like view fence could mitigate that

Applicant stated they put in the masonry wall because of the transients

CASE: Manco Investments Office Building
NWC McDowell & Val Vista

REQUEST: Approval of an office building

DISCUSSION: Boyd Thacker represented the case and stated it is in the sub-area going through Planning and Zoning

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- They will replant citrus
- The trellis/rafters connects two buildings

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Don't put site lighting on top of the site wall

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Massing and scale
- Detail the tails
- Suggest using a fascia
- More color

CASE: Signal Butte & Baseline Retail
SEC Signal Butte & Baseline

REQUEST: Approval of two multi-tenant retail buildings

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Steel trellises are nice
- Concerned with attached building lights on rear
- No signage on rear
- Nice materials

CASE: Falcon View Lot 9
W of SWC McKellips & Recker

REQUEST: Approval of a retail building

DISCUSSION:

The Board generally liked the project and felt that

- The colors should match existing shopping center colors

CASE: Guadalupe & Crismon
NWC Guadalupe & Crismon

REQUEST: Approval of a shopping center

DISCUSSION:

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Screen the trash compactor

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Cornice too pronounced

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur

- Likes the building
- Agrees the cornice should be replaced
- Replace the pink oleanders

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Likes the wedge but not with the cornice
- Should be more mass driven and lose some of the detail on top
- It doesn't have to match the CVS, it just needs to complement it

CASE: Neon for existing check cashing facility
SWC Country Club and Southern

REQUEST: Approval of neon for an existing building

DISCUSSION:

Staffmember Jim Hash explained the application to the Board.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The building is already loud

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Neon needs to be integrated into the architecture of a building

Chair Pete Berzins:

- The building is right on the corner and it is already very bright

CASE: Mountain Vista projects
SWC Signal Butte & Southern

REQUEST: Approval of four projects

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Could they get some of the richness of the apartments on the hotel

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Hampton will have entry features at Signal Butte and at the center of the project
- Retail it is too flat
- The hotel is not as well designed as the apartments

Chair Pete Berzins:

- For its size this project is very nice as a start

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Target needs more architecture, the rear will be visible
- Hampton should be more of a boulevard than a highway

2. Call to Order:

Chair Pete Berzins called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the November 1, 2006 Meeting:

On a motion by Dave Richins seconded by Tim Nielsen the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

4. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-111 Carrigan's World

LOCATION/ADDRESS: The 310 to 320 block of North Alma School Road (east side)
REQUEST: Approval of an 11,416 sq. ft. daycare facility
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: Towanda Carrigan
APPLICANT: Bill Hunse, Architectural Team Three
ARCHITECT: Bill Hunse, Architectural Team Three

REQUEST: Approval of a 11,416 sq. ft. day care facility

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

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR06-111 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 'Sunset Blend'.
 - b. Provide exterior light fixture cutsheets. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.
 - c. All trees along the east and south property lines shall be at least twenty-four inch (24") box size, pursuant to Section 11-15-3(A)2-a-iv of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - d. Provide trash enclosure and gate elevations, as well as, material/color information. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.
2. Review and approval of a Development Incentive Permit (DIP) by the Board of Adjustment.
3. Compliance with all conditions of approval for zoning case, Z06-063.
4. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
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 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-112 UPS Expansion
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 5552 East Inverness Avenue
REQUEST: Approval of a 65,625 S.F. expansion
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: United Parcel Service
APPLICANT: Keith Green
ARCHITECT: John Johnson

REQUEST: Approval of a 65,652 sq. ft. expansion

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

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR06-112 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 9 additional trees at the north property line.**
 - b. **Compliance with the conditions of approval of Z06-92.**
 - c. **Compliance with the conditions of approval of DR03-37.**
 - d. **Removal of the administratively approved temporary buildings upon completion of this expansion.**
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

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-113 Falcon 7 Executive Hangars

LOCATION/ADDRESS: McKellips & Falcon Drive
REQUEST: Approval of 71 office hangar buildings totaling 262,600
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: City of Mesa – Falcon Field
APPLICANT: John Manross
ARCHITECT: John Manross

REQUEST: Approval of 71 office hangar buildings totaling 262,600 sq. ft.

SUMMARY: John Manross represented the case. Staffmember Kim Steadman stated the applicant was working with the Engineering Division to resolve their issues. He stated the applicant would also be applying for variances to for the 8' screening wall to encroach into the 30' setback, and for reductions in the foundation base requirements. Staffmember Steadman stated the applicant had added vertical corten as a building material.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated the quality level was not strong. He understood there were existing buildings in Falcon Field that are of this quality level; however, there are a lot of buildings along McKellips and his issues were with detailing and massing. He did not think the project was consistent with the quality level of other projects approved along McKellips. He stated the Board has seen storage buildings with more design. He wanted to see an exhibit that showed the entire McKellips Road frontage.

Boardmember Vince DiBella did not think this project was a signature piece as an entry to Falcon Field.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur thought that this project would be a gateway to Falcon Field and should make a statement.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen stated he understood there was a 50 year lease; however, there could be enhancements that make it fun. He thought the streetscape could be a lot more striking, a lot more interesting along McKellips. He appreciated the corten, but suggested they punctuate the round turret. There could be more window fenestrations along corridors that would bring in natural light. He agreed they should see the entire streetscape along McKellips so they could understand the impact of the massiveness of the project. He confirmed the project would be phased. He thought the curved roof element needed to be a more dramatic curve. He was concerned that the curve was so too subtle and would be lost from a short distance away.

Mr. Manross stated he struggles with the amount of money spent on the façade of the building, not that he thought it looked bad, but the quality of that building was much more than what exists on any part of the street. He stated the Board had previously eluded to the Wal-Mart across the street, it was not a Wal-Mart it was an office. It was meant to be what worked financially and planning wise. He thought the façade of the building did what it had to do. It was 38' tall. It was a very big building.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that was what scared the Board. This would be a very

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

big building. He confirmed that the Airport was in charge of this project for the City.

Mr. Manross stated he had been working with the Airport for 10 years on this property and it finally took him doing it himself to get it done. He stated this was not a project they wanted to venture into to lose money. And they wanted to be proud of it when it was done. He stated that as an architect his entire life, he thought the building would look good.

Boardmember Dave Richins was concerned that the submission seemed to be lacking information and detail. He wasn't opposed to the colors and architecture; however, he did think there could be more design. He thought airplanes on the fence were good, but wanted to see more details on the buildings, he did not think that would take a lot more money. He was having a hard time understanding the project because the details were missing from the documents. He had questions about how the end details integrated with the rest of the building. Normally they receive color elevations of all the buildings. He wanted to see details of the fence in front of buildings 24 and 25. He stated that if the Board was going to continue the case he wanted to see more detailed elevations.

Mr. Manross then stated we are not going to continue this, we are to the point where this is costing us so much money for the process that we'll go to the Town Council rather than continue it.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated the Board would have to deny the case for it to go to Council. Mr. Manross stated he wanted the case denied.

Chair Pete Berzins asked what additional information would be necessary for an additional submittal.

Staffmember Kim Steadman confirmed the Board wanted the elevation of all the buildings along McKellips in color elevations with detailing. Boardmember Richins stated he also agreed that some of the richness of the detailing of the building is missing.

Chair Pete Berzins agreed with the previous comments. He thought the planes on the screen wall were a nice element. He understood the applicant was frustrated, but as a Board they need to see additional details of all the elements and how they integrate. He stated this Board's responsibility was to help ensure for the City of Mesa that what is built has some thought to it from an architectural side. This property is a key location. This will be a signature piece. Once it is built it will be there for at least 50 years, the Board wants it to be a nice project. He agreed that the curved roof element should be more of a wing. As there would be three of these buildings repeated, there needs to be more thought. He didn't think it needed to cost more to construct, there just needed to be more thought in the design. He didn't think the richness and details were adequate for the size and location of the project.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated the purpose of the Board was to try to set direction for these areas and to look at consistent quality levels throughout Mesa. If the project were hidden in an industrial area it might be different, but this project is being compared to projects approved along McKellips.

Boardmember Vince DiBellis confirmed the Planning and Zoning Board never reviewed this project. He stated the project was 80% storage of planes. He wondered what Economic Development thought. There is no light manufacturing. He thought it should be

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

an employment base.

Mr. Manross stated there was an FAA directive that stated on an airport you cannot have anything that is not aeronautically related.

Boardmember DiBella questioned what the constraints were that made it so expensive that they could only do this. Mr. Manross stated that when you spend 20 million dollars and you get none of it back, that is a constraint. He questioned who was imposing the restrictions, the FAA, the City, who? Mr. Manross stated it was the City lease that required them to forgive the buildings at the end of the lease.

Chair Pete Berzins stated he would assume that because it was a lease rather than a purchase that when you amortize it out you would have some up front benefit as well versus the cost of purchasing the property.

Boardmember DiBella thought the RFP/Q process was tying the developers hands somewhat, but he did not think this was the solution to the site.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated maybe the best thing for the applicant was to deny it so he could talk to the Council. Maybe they would rethink the 50 year lease agreement.

Boardmember DiBella stated he was in favor of denial because he did not sense that this applicant would come back with anything different.

Chair Pete Berzins stated that his objective for this Board was to get a decent project. He was concerned that if it was denied, the Council would discuss design of the building rather than re-working the economic side of the project. He was concerned the project would be approved as submitted.

Mr. Manross stated economic development is based on economics. This project is economic. It's not the Taj Mahal but its pretty nice. He thought it would be an advantage to Falcon Field. He did not think any other developer could do a better job for the amount of money he was spending on the project. Economic development has to do with economics.

Boardmember Wendy LeSuer stated they were all consistent in the thought that it needed improvement. She agreed with Chair Berzins that if it goes to Council what would drive their decision.

Boardmember DiBella stated the Board has already made recommendations for what they would like to see, so the Council would take those into consideration.

Boardmember Burgheimer thought Council might say re-work the lease and then go back to Design Review Board to work out the changes.

Chair Pete Berzins stated his concern was whatever is built will be there for 50 years, is this what he wants for 50 years? Boardmember Burgheimer agreed the Board needs to promote good development.

Chair Pete Berzins questioned what the applicant's options would be based on the Board's action. Staffmember Kim Steadman stated the applicant cannot appeal a continuance. He

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

could appeal a denial, or if they approved the case with conditions, he could appeal some or all of the conditions. Chair Berzins asked Mr. Manross if he were willing to compromise and work with the Board. Mr. Manross said no. He stated he had already spent an immense amount of time making a project that was economically feasible and making a project that was the gateway to Falcon Field. He stated he is also the managing partner of the Monastery, across the street. He stated this would be an attractive project, if the Board disagreed that was their prerogative, but the people who might come behind him for this project would have it equally difficult, if not more so than him to make it economically feasible and fit into the perspective box the Board has.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer asked if the Board was willing to have a special meeting in two weeks to help the applicant get the project moving, would the applicant be willing to work with them. He stated he had not seen much change since the work session and wondered if a line were being drawn in the sand and this was it. Chair Pete Berzins understood what Boardmember Burgheimer was trying to do, but he didn't think the applicant would submit anything different. Mr. Manross stated he did not know anything else he could do to fit it into the budget he thought they were implying he should do. He stated he could not build hangars out of split face block, fluted block, or exotic materials. These were hangars with offices not offices that he could get \$12 a foot for rent. This is an economic development project.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur stated the Board was not asking for different building materials, they were asking for changes in design. They weren't asking him to spend more in construction costs, they were asking for changes in design. Mr. Manross stated everyone has their own opinion on design. He thought it was an adequate design.

Staffmember Kim Steadman asked the Board if they thought there were specific improvements that could be made that would allow the project to be approved with conditions that staff could work with the applicant on.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated that he looks at this project and thinks of warehouse projects that are close to this project. He thought there was more detailing on those projects than there was on this project.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed the reason for starting at the west end was because of the taxi way.

Mr. Manross stated that the design of the project is different because it is designed on an airport, on City property, with the economics of hangars with a 50 year lease there's a whole string of factors that don't go into the face of the building. This building is designed around the economic development of the project. This building has to be 38' tall, it has to have a certain amount of office on the second floor to make it economic. If he only built hangars you wouldn't get any of this. He was the one who wanted to make it a better economic engine than what the airport wanted. He stated he had thought this was a prime piece of property for ten years, submitting RFP's 2 or 3 times, and finally when they were able to negotiate a lease that was much beyond what they expected to pay for this property, to get to this point. The project you see here is the best project that the economic development of this piece of property could ever be.

Chair Pete Berzins confirmed that the cost of the changes being requested by the Board would be upfront in the design and not in materials and construction costs. Boardmember

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

DiBella stated they were asking for more of an aeronautical theme, there were some site issues with how some of the hangars were exposed to the street that would not be in construction costs.

Chair Pete Berzins stated that there was a difference between increases in construction costs versus the applicant not being willing to spend the time to revise the design. Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated that any changes would have some financial impact. He confirmed the project would be a pre-engineered steel system.

Boardmember DiBella asked Mr. Manross if he would come back with anything different if the case were continued. Mr. Manross stated he would not for two reasons: first every month it was delayed cost him \$15,000 dollars out of his pocket; in addition he did not know how he could make that design work any better than he had it. He did not see being able to fit all the pieces of the puzzle in that tiny box any other way. They could change the shape of the building but it would still be 38' tall and 1000'.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR06-113 be denied.

VOTE: Passed 4 – 2 (Boardmembers Pete Berzins and Wendy LeSueur voting nay)

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-114 **EI Pollo Loco**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 949 N Dobson
REQUEST: Approval of a 4,000 sq. ft. restaurant with drive-thru
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: DeRito Kimco
APPLICANT: David Allen
ARCHITECT: John Dodson

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,000 sq. ft. restaurant with drive-thru

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda due to a conflict by one of the Boardmembers.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-114 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 additional landscaping to provide screening between the drive thru aisle and Bass Pro Dr.
 - b. Provide an updated landscape plan to include the revised areas that surround the lease area.
 - c. Provide a tree and three shrubs in the parking lot island west of the building. Delete the light standard from this island. Also, delete the light standard from the landscape island south of the building.
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 – 1 (Boardmember Vince DiBella abstained)

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-115 Arby's

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 955 N Dobson
REQUEST: Approval of a 3,021 sq. ft. fast food restaurant with drive-thru
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: DeRito Kimco
APPLICANT: Looker & Cappello
ARCHITECT: Jeff Looker

REQUEST: Approval of a 3,021 sq. ft. fast food restaurant with drive-thru

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda due to a conflict by one of the Boardmembers

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-115 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 monument sign to be approved by Design Review. Signage will need to comply with Code requirements and with the conditions of approval of DR06-13 and BA06-005 (Comprehensive Sign Plan). The sign cabinet must be bordered by the architectural features, materials and embellishments per §11-14-3(E) of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - b. Provide 15' of foundation base along entry elevation.
 - c. All exterior light fixtures must be installed per City of Mesa Outdoor Light Control as specified in Title 4 Chapter 6.
 - d. Relocate the order menu so that it is at least 100' from the pick-up window to meet Code requirements.
 - e. Refuse enclosure to match adjacent screen wall.
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 – 1 (Boardmember Vince DiBella abstained)

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-116 **Taco Bell**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 917 N Dobson
REQUEST: Approval of a 3,042 sq. ft. fast food restaurant with drive-thru
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: DeRito Kimco
APPLICANT: Looker & Capello
ARCHITECT: Jeff Looker

REQUEST: Approval of a 3,042 sq. ft. fast food restaurant with drive-thru

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda due to a conflict by one of the Boardmembers

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-116 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 2' wide landscaped foundation base adjacent to the drive-thru lane.
 - b. Relocate the order menu so that it is at least 100' from the pick-up window to meet Code requirements.
 - c. Provide a monument sign to be approved by Design Review. Signage will need to comply with Code requirements and with the conditions of approval of DR06-13 and BA06-005 (Comprehensive Sign Plan). The sign cabinet must be bordered by the architectural features, materials and embellishments per §11-14-3(E) of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - d. All exterior light fixtures must be installed per City of Mesa Outdoor Light Control as specified in Title 4 Chapter 6.
 - e. Refuse enclosure to match adjacent screen wall.
 - f. All light fixtures revised to match what was approved as part of the Riverview at Dobson Design Guidelines.
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.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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 - 1

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

7. Appeals of Administrative Design Review:

ADR06-73 - Discount Tire
1947 S Greenfield

SUMMARY: Bob Berg and Don Thraikill represented the case and explained that Discount Tire has taken over an abandoned building that was originally built with drive-thru bays for auto repair. They were proposing to eliminate some of the glass garage doors and replace the others with solid bay doors. Where they were proposing to eliminate the doors they wanted to use matching materials to the existing building. They were proposing to use a contrasting color to be compatible with existing buildings in the surrounding centers.

Staffmember Kim Steadman stated that the Board is seeing this case because a design element is being removed. He stated that in the past the Board has looked for glass doors on these overhead door projects. Staff had suggested they keep two rows of glass on the doors; however since they were removing some of the overhead doors completely staff wanted the Board to review the changes.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed cars would enter from the north elevation. He confirmed they would keep two bay doors on the south elevations; one to receive inventory; and the other to exit the service area. Both doors would be closed most of the time. The non delivery bay door on the south elevation could also be used for situations where someone needed immediate service for a flat or repair.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed the solid areas where the doors are removed would be the same block used on the rest of the building. The block would be at the same plane as the rest of the building. He also confirmed that they would prefer the color to match the darker color of the building.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed site plan and parking would not change.

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded Tim Nielsen by that ADR06-73 be approved as submitted:

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

Sanctuary at SunValley and at Center

SUMMARY: Fred Woods represented the cases. He explained that the projects were approved together, with conditions, a few months before. Staff explained Mr. Woods had resubmitted drawings to comply with the Boards conditions, staff did not believe the revised drawings met the conditions. In fact, architectural details had been removed. Mr. Woods

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

stated he had worked out an agreement to provide a 2' stagger, every two buildings. They were providing two varieties of garage doors. Staffmember Kim Steadman explained that the Board saw these cases at a work session and asked for improvements, they saw then at the regular agenda and items had been removed. Staff asked for a continuance, but the Board approved the case with conditions. When staff received the follow-up submittal there was a new design that was not a continuation of what had been approved.

Boardmember Dave Richins stated it seemed a lot of the richness had been stripped off; the window types, the railings, the wrought iron, the detailing.

Mr. Woods presented new elevations at the meeting, which had not been reviewed by staff. He stated they were proposing to add the wrought iron element back, they were adding the mullions back, the windows would have an 8" pop-out.

Boardmember Dave Richins thought the Board should continue the appeal so that staff and the Board could review the latest drawings. Chair Pete Berzins agreed that staff should have time to look at the details.

Mr. Woods stated the drawings presented addressed all of staff's concerns with the exception of the colors that had changed.

Chair Pete Berzins asked for staff's comments on the drawings presented at the meeting. Staffmember Kim Steadman stated the window variety was gone, the gable elements never engage the roofline, the parapet element was thickened. Some of the elements have come back like the surrounds around the doors, but the interest and charm have been redesigned, it's a different project. Staff still did not think this was as good as what the Board approved, (with conditions for improvement).

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur questioned whether these changes were to save money. Mr. Woods said no.

Boardmember Vince DiBella stated they had added the change on the roof as a mechanical well.

Boardmember Dave Richins stated that at the regular meeting agenda the applicants stated the changes had been made to save money. Mr. Woods stated they were not backing off of anything the Board approved. Boardmember Richins stated other than the elevations, which were quite different, the windows were different. He asked if they could build what was presented at the July 2006 meeting.

Chair Pete Berzins thought that the changes pointed out by staff were significant.

Mr. Woods stated they were asking that they be allowed to use garage doors that did not have windows at the top.

Boardmember Dave Richins stated he was Ok with that. His issues were the roof line and the windows they were proposing and the way things linearly march across the buildings, were significant changes from what was approved in July.

Staffmember Kim Steadman stated staff was very happy with the 2' offset on the rear elevations at least every two buildings. He was concerned with the units that would have a

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

paint line. Staff wanted to see a slight change in elevation rather than just a paint line between units.

Boardmember Dave Richins wanted to get back to variations in the roofline and window types, the changes in the roofline with the pitches in the front. He also wanted the window varieties. After they lost all the detail with the stone and things they stripped off, they needed to make the architecture richer and now they have cheapened that.

Mr. Woods stated they were willing to go back to what they presented previously. Mr. Woods stated that if they concede on the roofline and windows, they wanted to eliminate the light kits on the garage doors and they would accept everything else. He stated they were also going to build a conventional ramada so it would be a lot nicer.

Chair Pete Berzins stated they would be jogging the rear elevations, eliminating the light kits in the garage doors, retaining the roofline and windows from the July submittal. After some discussion regarding a score line or change in elevation at the change in paint, it was decided that everything in the same plane would be the same color, but it would change at the pop-outs and gables, etc. The parapet is not to be green. He confirmed the only changes from the original approval was that the garage doors would not have light kits, the rear elevations would have a 2' jog at least every two buildings and the colors would change. They would also be replacing the glass front doors with solid doors for security reasons.

Staff stated the applicant needs to make a complete re-submittal that matches.

It was determined that no vote would be necessary, the applicant would be working with staff and making a resubmittal.

Cessna – Williams Gateway

SUMMARY: The issues were resolved with staff, therefore the case was not discussed

The meeting adjourned at 7:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

da