

**CITY OF MESA**  
**MINUTES OF THE**  
**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**  
**MARCH 5, 2003**

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Utilities Conference 640 North Mesa Drive, at 3:45 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman  
Lesley Davis  
Debbie Archuleta  
Charlie Scully  
Richard Dyer  
Enda Melvin  
Maolin Zheng  
Dave Schukai  
Steve Peters  
Kurt Frimodig  
Steve Cooper  
Kym Levesque  
Boyd Thacker  
Susan Stewart  
Ron Stupi

Jackie Redpath  
Becky Thorsen  
Laurie Marin  
Mark Freeman  
Mary Smith  
Jon Martin  
Don Andrews  
Gregg Lollis  
Bill McDermott  
Russ Ferris  
David Newquist  
Others

MEMBERS ABSENT

1. Call to Order:

Chair Carie Allen called the meeting to order at 3:45 p.m.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the February 5, and February 18, 2003 Meetings:

On a motion by Rob Burgheimer seconded by John Poulsen the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

3. Design Review Cases:



## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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. **Work with staff to revise the building to provide additional color on the building, solar control for the windows, additional building materials, and curved elements on 3 sides.**
6. 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.
7. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
8. 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 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. 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.  
Screen all parking areas and vehicular circulation aisles adjacent to the public right of way.
12. 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.
13. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
14. 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 7 – 0

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

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR03-15**                      **Phillips 66**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**            2431 & 2435 E. McKellips (west of Lindsay)  
**REQUEST:**                            Establish service station and convenience store  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**            District 1  
**OWNER:**                                The Carioca Company  
**APPLICANT:**                        Ron Stupi, Esencia  
**ARCHITECT:**                         Jeffrey Winter, Esencia

**REQUEST:**     Approval of a renovated 1,995 sq. ft. convenience store, a 1,079 sq. restaurant and a 1,172 sq. ft. gas canopy.

**SUMMARY:**    Ron Stupi represented the case.    He explained that the previous gas station had closed approximately 5 years before, and that the project had been through the SCIP process.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer felt the restaurant and store needed to be differentiated. He suggested changing the chroma of the colors and maybe using darker color in the score lines.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen felt the building was very pale. She suggested using stone on the restaurant or changing the roofline.

Boardmember John Poulsen wanted the wainscot and the building canopy to be different colors. He confirmed the gas canopy would have a new fascia and the columns would be stone. He confirmed the food mart windows would remain and the top fascia would be replaced.

Boardmember Randy Carter wanted to see more color contrast. He wanted more pizzazz on the canopy. He felt the use of stone was arbitrary, suggested using it as a wainscot or using it on the restaurant instead of between the restaurant and the store. He also suggested shifting the location of the stone to identify the restaurant. He suggested changing the roofline on the restaurant to differentiate the restaurant from the store.

Chair Carie Allen did not want the building to be too bright.

**MOTION:**    It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR03-15 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 conditions of the Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit (SCIP) approved by the by the Board of Adjustment (BA02-048) at their meeting in December 2002.**
3. **A revised Site Plan showing a conforming fuel truck service route with no changes to landscaping is to be submitted for approval by Design Review staff prior**

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**to submittal of construction documents to Building Safety Division.**

- 4. Any freestanding monument signs to include materials, colors and design details compatible with the main building. Submit color design details of the monument signs for approval by Design Review staff prior to submittal of construction documents to Building Safety Division.**
- 5. Provide more interest to the building through the use of deeper, brighter colors, and location of stone.**
6. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
7. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. 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.
- 14. 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. Screen all parking areas and vehicular circulation aisles adjacent to the public right of way.**
15. 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.
16. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
17. 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 7 – 0

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

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR03-16** Chick-Fil-A  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** Stapley & Inverness  
**REQUEST:** Approval of a 4,197 sq. ft. fast food restaurant with drive-thru  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 4  
**OWNER:** Dennis Johnson  
**APPLICANT:** L.E.A.D.S  
**ARCHITECT:** CRHO

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 4,197 sq. ft. fast food restaurant with a drive-through

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

**MOTION:** It was moved by John O'Hara and seconded by Randy Carter that DR03-16 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 conditions of the Zoning Administrator's decision March 11, 2003.**
5. **Revise the design of the service yard enclosure. Provide cap on service yard enclosure wall, profile to match proposed trim.**
6. **Provide an alternative tree species for the Mondel Pine.**
7. **Provide an alternative flowering shrub for the Bougainvillea shown in the foundation planter beneath the dining room windows.**
8. **Revise the drive aisle radius at the southeast corner of the lot to increase the landscape area.**
9. **Monument sign to be approved by Design Review staff.**
10. **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.**
11. 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.
12. 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

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.

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.

**13.** 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.

Screen all parking areas and vehicular circulation aisles adjacent to the public right of way.

**14.** 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.

**15.** Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.

**16.** 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 7 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The development as proposed with conditions is attractive and compatible with adjacent development.

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR03-17**                      **Dental Office for Dr. Driggs & Dr. Turley**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**              Northwest of Greenfield and Southern / 4356 E. Florian Ave.  
**REQUEST:**                              Develop dental office building  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**                District 6  
**OWNER:**                                Stephen Driggs DDS and Rick Turley DDS  
**APPLICANT:**                        Boyd Thacker, Architect  
**ARCHITECT:**                         Boyd Thacker, Brock, Craig and Thacker, Architects

**REQUEST:**        Approval of a 4,352 sq. ft. dental office

**SUMMARY:**    Boyd Thacker represented the case. He explained that there would be an atrium along the north side of the building and then a screen wall beyond that. He also stated the dentists wanted the building to look like a home to make their patients feel less intimidated.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer liked the building but felt it was too rhythmical. He wanted to see more variation. He felt the roof pitch was too tall and pyramid like. He felt the building was too symmetrical. He confirmed the windows would not be black glass and suggested muttons.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen felt the columns on the atrium screen wall were too symmetrical and the north elevation was very stark. She wanted the roofline of the north elevation changed. She wanted to see more treatment for the windows.

Boardmember Christine Close agreed the roof pitch was too drastic. She confirmed the height of the building fascia was 11' above the ground and the highest point of the roof was 28'.

Vice-Chair John O'Hara felt the columns on the north wall were too repetitive, he suggested eliminating some of them.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt the building was too residential. He was concerned with the roof pitch, the regularity of the windows, the proportions of the roof to the building. He suggested a 5 to 12 pitch so the building is not so castle like. He did not object to the columns on the north wall. He felt the entrance was too understated, he felt the arches were too shallow. He suggested using stone at the entrance. He did not want every building within this subdivision to look like this one. He wanted the other buildings to be unique and have variety.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR03-17 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 provisions of the Greenfield Court Project Description and**

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**Design Guidelines, as approved by the City Council on November 6, 2000, through Zoning Case Z00-75.**

3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.  
Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. **Eliminate some of the stone columns on the north elevation. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
5. **Redesign the roof to have a 5 to 12 pitch. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
6. **Add stone to the columns at the main entrance. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
7. **Refine the details around the windows. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. 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.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. 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.
13. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
14. 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

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

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR03-18**                      **Wal-Mart Neighborhood Market**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**              NWC Horne and McKellips  
**REQUEST:**                              Approval of a 39,910 sq. ft. grocery store  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**                District 1  
**OWNER:**                                Roger Yu-Shang Kao & Pearl Yo-Jo Kao  
**APPLICANT:**                         Enda Melvin  
**ARCHITECT:**                         Chris Rhea

**REQUEST:**        Approval of a 39,910 sq. ft. grocery store.

**SUMMARY:**     Shawn Lake, Dave Chicai, Dennis Pelts and Enda Melvin represented the case. Mr. Lake stated the applicants were willing to work with neighbors and staff. Mr. Lake suggested that the Board discuss the three Wal-Mart Neighborhood Market stores together since many of the issues were similar.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer felt the three stores look the same; they were a box with details applied to them. He felt they needed more variation, shadow lines, pedestrian scale. He wanted the applicants to break the box and pull things out, don't just apply things to it. He liked the colors of the project on Horne. He also liked the building materials being proposed. He felt they were not varying the pieces enough. Boardmember Burgheimer wanted the parapet heights varied. He felt the middle element competed with the entrance, and the drive through canopy was too tall. He felt there needed to be a theme not just a box with some pieces attached to some of the sides.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen liked the colors and materials proposed. She agreed they were simply attaching pieces to a prototype building. She felt the building lacked depth and movement. She felt there was no clear entry and the hierarchy of the building was confusing. She wondered why the sign element at the middle of the building was so large and the entry was smaller than the sign element. She wanted the applicants to choose a style like "ranch style" and make the whole building that style, don't just add an arch. She did not like the use of columns that don't hold anything up. She felt that since this is a new and unique store for them it should not look like other "Wal-Marts".

Boardmember John Poulsen felt the buildings had some nice touches. He stated this Board generally sees at least one pharmacy every month and this is a larger version of a pharmacy - a rectangular building with things attached to it. He wanted the applicants to look for something in the neighborhood to tie in with. He suggested adding a porch like awning to look more inviting especially at the Lehi site.

Boardmember Christine Close felt the building were too boxy. She liked the use of stone. She liked the way the Hawes elevation (not on this agenda) was broken up.

Vice-Chair John O'Hara felt these stores were much better than the old Smith's stores. He felt that the buildings needed to be revised, especially the one in Lehi.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt the Hawes elevation was a much stronger building; although the front works better and the rear is worse. He suggested using larger cornice at the pop-outs. He felt the sign façade did not work. He stated that CVS and Eckerd pharmacies had made changes to their prototypes, and he wanted Wal-Mart to enhance

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

their buildings to better fit into the neighborhoods they were being built in. He wanted the building shapes to be different and to have unique design. He wanted the cases continued for redesign.

Chair Carie Allen wanted the building elevations to move, she suggested using covered walkways. She liked the stone. She did not like the colors of the store. She preferred the colors for the other stores.

Chair Carie Allen then invited those present in the audience to come up and speak regarding the design of the buildings, landscaping, and issues, which this Board could address. She explained that this Board could not discuss land use issues.

Mark Freeman of the Lehi Homeowners Association questioned how the retention area would be landscaped. He did not want shrubs because Lehi has a problem with vagrants. He wanted the applicants to use dry wells because they did not want any bugs from standing water. Boardmember Burgheimer explained that the City very rarely allows drywells. Mr. Lake stated the project at Horne would be tying into the storm sewer. Mr. Freeman felt the northern driveway was too close to the Fire Station. He wanted a decel lane combined with the bus stop.

Becky Thorson wanted to know how high the light standards would be along Horne. Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated the applicants had agreed to use 14' light standards there. Boardmember Burgheimer stated that lighting standards were very technical and Mesa has very strict lighting requirements. Ms. Thorson did not like the proposed colors and wanted muted colors like the office project to the east of the Chevron.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-18 be continued to the April meeting:

**VOTE:** Passed 7 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** To allow the applicant time to meet with neighbors and to redesign the buildings.

Recorded on Tape No.: (side A)

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR03-19**                      **WalMart Neighborhood Market**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**              NWC University and Higley  
**REQUEST:**                              Approval of a 39,910 sq. ft. grocery store  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**                District 5  
**OWNER:**                                Standard Chartered Bank  
**APPLICANT:**                        Enda Melvin  
**ARCHITECT:**                         Chris Rhea

**REQUEST:**    Approval of a 39,910 sq. ft. grocery store

**SUMMARY:**    Shawn Lake, Dave Chicai, Dennis Pelts and Enda Melvin represented the case. Mr. Lake stated the applicants were willing to work with neighbors and staff. Mr. Lake suggested that the Board discuss the three Wal-Mart Neighborhood Market stores together since the issues were similar.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer felt the three stores look the same; they were a box with details applied to them. He felt they needed more variation, shadow lines, pedestrian scale. He wanted the applicants to break the box and pull things out, don't just apply things to it. He liked the colors of the project on Horne. He also liked the building materials being proposed. He felt they were not varying the pieces enough. Boardmember Burgheimer wanted the parapet heights varied. He felt the middle element competed with the entrance, and the drive through canopy was too tall. He felt there needed to be a theme not just a box with some pieces attached to some of the sides.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen liked the colors and materials proposed. She agreed they were simply attaching pieces to a prototype building. She felt the building lacked depth and movement. She felt there was no clear entry and the hierarchy of the building was confusing. She wondered why the sign element at the middle of the building was so large and the entry was smaller than the sign element. She wanted the applicants to choose a style like "ranch style" and make the whole building that style, don't just add an arch. She did not like the use of columns that don't hold anything up. She felt that since this is a new and unique store for them it should not look like other "Wal-Marts".

Boardmember John Poulsen felt the buildings had some nice touches. He stated this Board generally sees at least one pharmacy every month and this is a larger version of a pharmacy - a rectangular building with things attached to it. He wanted the applicants to look for something in the neighborhood to tie in with. He suggested adding a porch like awning to look more inviting especially at the Lehi site.

Boardmember Christine Close felt the building were too boxy. She liked the use of stone. She liked the way the Hawes elevation (not on this agenda) was broken up.

Vice-Chair John O'Hara felt these stores were much better than the old Smith's stores. He felt that the buildings needed to be revised, especially the one in Lehi.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt the Hawes elevation was a much stronger building; although the front works better and the rear is worse. He suggested using larger cornice at

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

the pop-outs. He felt the sign façade did not work. He stated that CVS and Eckerd pharmacies had made changes to their prototypes, and he wanted Wal-Mart to enhance their buildings to better fit into the neighborhoods they were being built in. He wanted the building shapes to be different and to have unique design. He wanted the case continued for redesign.

Chair Carie Allen wanted the buildings to move, she suggested using covered walkways.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by John O'Hara that DR03-19 be continued to the April 2, 2003 meeting:

**VOTE:** Passed 7 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** To allow the applicant time to redesign the building

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR03-20**                      **Wal-Mart Neighborhood Market**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**              NWC Baseline and Lindsay  
**REQUEST:**                              Approval of a 39,910 sq. ft. grocery store  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**                District 2  
**OWNER:**                                Baseline & Lindsay Project  
**APPLICANT:**                        Enda Melvin  
**ARCHITECT:**                         Chris Rea

**REQUEST:**      Approval of a 39,910 sq. ft. grocery store

**SUMMARY:**    Shawn Lake, Dave Chicai, Dennis Pelts and Enda Melvin represented the case. Mr. Lake stated the applicants were willing to work with neighbors and staff. Mr. Lake suggested that the Board discuss the three Wal-Mart Neighborhood Market stores together since the issues were similar.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer felt the three stores look the same; they were a box with details applied to them. He felt they needed more variation, shadow lines, pedestrian scale. He wanted the applicants to break the box and pull things out, don't just apply things to it. He liked the colors of the project on Horne. He also liked the building materials being proposed. He felt they were not varying the pieces enough. Boardmember Burgheimer wanted the parapet heights varied. He felt the middle element competed with the entrance, and the drive through canopy was too tall. He felt there needed to be a theme not just a box with some pieces attached to some of the sides.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen liked the colors and materials proposed. She agreed they were simply attaching pieces to a prototype building. She felt the building lacked depth and movement. She felt there was no clear entry and the hierarchy of the building was confusing. She wondered why the sign element at the middle of the building was so large and the entry was smaller than the sign element. She wanted the applicants to choose a style like "ranch style" and make the whole building that style, don't just add an arch. She did not like the use of columns that don't hold anything up. She felt that since this is a new and unique store for them it should not look like other "Wal-Marts".

Boardmember John Poulsen felt the buildings had some nice touches. He stated this Board generally sees at least one pharmacy every month and this is a larger version of a pharmacy - a rectangular building with things attached to it. He wanted the applicants to look for something in the neighborhood to tie in with. He suggested adding a porch like awning to look more inviting especially at the Lehi site.

Boardmember Christine Close felt the building were too boxy. She liked the use of stone. She liked the way the Hawes elevation (not on this agenda) was broken up.

Vice-Chair John O'Hara felt these stores were much better than the old Smith's stores. He felt that the buildings needed to be revised, especially the one in Lehi.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt the Hawes elevation was a much stronger building; although the front works better and the rear is worse. He suggested using larger cornice at the pop-outs. He felt the sign façade did not work. He stated that CVS and Eckerd

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

pharmacies had made changes to their prototypes, and he wanted Wal-Mart to enhance their buildings to better fit into the neighborhoods they were being built in. He wanted the building shapes to be different and to have unique design. He wanted the cases continued for redesign.

Chair Carie Allen wanted the buildings to move, she suggested using covered walkways. She liked the stone.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR03-20 be continued to the April meeting

**VOTE:** Passed 7 – 0

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

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR03-01**                      **Baywood Building B**  
**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 5,617 sq. ft. office building

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

**MOTION:**      It was moved by John O'Hara and seconded by Randy Carter that DR03-01 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. **Provide additional space for pedestrians at the secondary entrance to the Alta Dermatology Building. Shift the columns closer to the building and provide 7' clear between the face of the columns and the face of the concrete curb. Details to be approved by Design Review Board staff.**
6. **Provide Design Review staff with a site plan approved for fire access; revised site plan to be approved by Design Review staff.**
7. **Revise the landscape plan as follows: replace the "Shoestring Acacia" in the parking lot planter island with a fuller canopy tree, such as "Chilean Mesquite" or "Sonoran Palo Verde".**
8. **Provide details about attached and detached signage for review by Design Review staff.**
9. **Provide temporary landscaping along edge of Phase II undeveloped parcel consisting a 6" extruded concrete curb with a 5' wide landscaped area.**
10. 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.
11. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
12. 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

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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.

13. 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.

14. 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.

15. 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.

16. 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.

17. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.

18. 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 7 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The development as proposed with conditions is

Recorded on Tape No.: (side A)

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR02-61**                      **Retail Center**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**              NWC Crismon and Guadalupe  
**REQUEST:**                              Approval of 56,726 sq. ft. shopping center  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**                District 6  
**OWNER:**                                Newquist Ault Commercial Properties  
**APPLICANT:**                        Newquist Ault Commercial Properties  
**ARCHITECT:**                         Don Andrews

**REQUEST:**      Approval of a 9.59 acre retail center

**SUMMARY:** Don Andrews represented the case. He explained that they had designed the center to be compatible with Augusta Ranch. He also explained that they were working on where to place the trash enclosures.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer felt the project could be higher quality. He felt it needed more variety. Every building looks to same, but they are proposing very different uses: day care, shops, offices. He wanted to see a change in the scale and detailing on the different buildings.

Mr. Andrews explained the buildings would step in and out and there would be courtyards. He stated that tenants want landscaping, courtyards, plazas, etc. in front of their shops. He stated that the rear of the buildings would not be seen and they would like to remove the stone. He stated they could introduce different colors and break up the elements.

Boardmember Burgheimer felt the stone could be removed from the rear if they added something to the front. He felt the day care looked too much like retail.

Mr. Andrews stated that they were designing the day care so that if that tenant moved out they could use the building for retail shops.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen felt the day care and the office should have different facades. She suggested using different colors schemes for each building. The parapet heights, canopies, and massing are all the same. There needs to be variety. She felt the day care was too blocky and needed to be a different scale and should have more of an office feel.

Boardmember John Poulsen liked the site plan, but felt the elevations were too repetitive, he wanted them broken up.

Boardmember Randy Carter agreed with the previous comments. He felt the scale of the canopies was too large. He suggested using 4 different colors. He felt the project needed more creativity. He wanted the applicant to think of the project as a village. He liked Shops A but felt the day care needed work. He felt the design for the front of the day care needed to be stronger. He liked the proportions of Shops A but not of the day care.

Mr. Andrews stated that he was only asking for approval of Shops A and the day care building. Shops B & C and the office would come back for future review by the Board.

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Jillian Hagen that **Shops A and the day care building for DR02-61** 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, **for shops A and the day care building** 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. **Any phasing for the development of the project is subject to Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance, which requires continuous extruded concrete curbing and five foot (5') wide landscape area along the undeveloped edge. If phased development is proposed, submit a revised Site Plan showing temporary landscaping and edge treatments for review and approval by Design Review staff prior to submittal of construction documents to the Building Safety Division.**
6. **The main retention basin at the northwest corner of the site needs to be revised to address several issues. Submit a revised plan of the retention area for review and approval by Design Review staff prior to submittal of construction documents to the Building Safety Division. The following should be addressed on a revised plan:**
  - a. **Address the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance as per Section 11-15-3 (D) regarding the design of Retention Basins.**
  - b. **Retention basins to be designed with irregular contouring so as to avoid the appearance of a ditch and have landscaping designed as an integral part of landscape theme.**
  - c. **Provide a ten foot (10') minimum transition area around the retention basin along the rear property line outside of the residential masonry walls to allow adequate planting of trees for screening purposes.**
  - d. **Maximum of 25% of basin perimeter may be retaining walls. Maximum height of retaining walls may be eighteen inches (18"). The walls along the south and east portion of basin need to be revised to meet the Ordinance requirements regarding retaining walls.**
  - e. **Submit typical cross section details or retention basins.**
7. **Provide revised site plan showing location of parking canopies and elevation drawings showing design, materials and colors of parking canopies for review and approval by Design Review staff prior to submittal of construction documents to Building Safety Division.**
8. **There are several outstanding issues regarding the trash enclosures. The locations need to be approved both Solid Waste Division and Design Review. Submit a revised plan showing trash enclosure locations for review and approval by Design Review staff prior to submittal of construction documents. The following issues need to be addressed:**
  - a. **The trash enclosures at the front of the Daycare building result in a narrow gap between the outdoor children's play area and the trash**

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- enclosure screen walls and should be moved farther to the west or to some other location.**
- b. **The location of trash enclosures next to the Pad "A" fast food restaurant is not acceptable for safety and aesthetic reasons and should be moved to the rear of building or to a landscape island away from the building.**
  - c. **The location of trash enclosures in the landscape median near the northeast driveway is not acceptable. The enclosure walls provide no setback from the adjacent drive aisles on both the north and east sides.**
9. **Provide typical elevations and design details for parking lot screen walls, trash enclosure screen walls for review and approval by Design Review staff prior to submittal of construction documents to Building Safety Division.**
  10. **Provide information for any monuments signs, including elevations, materials, colors and design details for review and approval by Design Review staff prior to submittal of construction documents to Building Safety Division.**
  11. **Provide a streetscape view from both Guadalupe and from Crismon.**
  12. **On the day care building address scale and proportion.**
  13. **The stone can be removed from the rear of building with no parking or pedestrian access; only if the termination of the stone is appropriately designed, and more articulation is added to those elevations.**
  14. **All future building are to be approved by the Design Review Board.**
  15. 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.
  16. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
  17. 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.
  18. 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.
  19. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with the Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
  20. 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.
  21. Light standards (poles) for pad sites are to match the light standards used within the shopping center.
  22. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
  19. 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.

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**VOTE:** Passed 7 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The development as proposed with conditions approved by Design Review staff is reasonably designed.

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR02-63**                      **Sanguini Pasta**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**            6230 East Main  
**REQUEST:**                        Approval of a 8,621 sq. ft. restaurant, deli, grocery store  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**            District 5  
**OWNER:**                         Tom Sanguini  
**APPLICANT:**                    Palmer Architects, LTD  
**ARCHITECT:**                     Palmer Architects, LTD

**REQUEST:**            Approval of a 8,621 sq. ft. restaurant/deli with outdoor seating

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

**MOTION:**            It was moved by John O'Hara and seconded by Randy Carter that DR02-63 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. 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.
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.
8. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 14' height at the perimeter.
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    7 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The development as proposed with conditions is

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta  
Planning Assistant

da