

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

JULY 10, 2002

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Lower Level of the Council Chambers 57 East First Street, at 3:35 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Carie Allen - Chair
Jillian Hagen
Robert Burgheimer (arrived at 3:45)
John Poulsen
Ann Schwaderer

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman
Lesley Davis
Debbie Archuleta
Charlie Scully
Wayne Rockwood
Marcus Tork

Frank Scarpati
James Larson
Fred Himovitz
Paul Reaeder
Richard Dyer
Others

MEMBERS ABSENT

John O'Hara - Vice Chair (excused)
Randy Carter (excused)

1. Call to Order:

Chair Carie Allen called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the June 5, 2002 Meeting:

On a motion by Ann Schwaderer seconded by Jillian Hagen the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

3. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE JULY 10, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR02-37 **EVAC Transitional Redevelopment Center**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 560 South Bellview
REQUEST: Approval of treatment center
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: East Valley Addiction Council
APPLICANT: East Valley Addiction Council
ARCHITECT: Robert Saemisch

REQUEST: Approval of a 19,676 sq. ft. treatment and detox facility

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

MOTION: It was moved by Jillian Hagen and seconded by John Poulsen that DR02-37 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 the Preliminary Plan Review Team comments.
3. Compliance with all conditions of the Zoning Administrator, case ZA02-51.
4. Approval subject to approval by the City Council of a Council Use Permit.
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 shielded to limit the emission of light beyond the property line per Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance and shall comply with the Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control".
8. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
9. Provide 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 4 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions will be an attractive and compatible addition to the neighborhood.

Recorded on Tape No.: 139 – 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE JULY 10, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR02-40 **Watermill Express**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 525 East Southern
REQUEST: Approval of a water vending station
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 4
OWNER: Olive Tree Plaza Investors
APPLICANT: Marcus Tork
ARCHITECT: Richard Elstermeyer

REQUEST: Approval of a 50 sq. ft. water vending station

SUMMARY: Marcus Tork and Tom Tease represented the case. They presented the Board photos representing their structure with the proposed landscaping. Mr. Tork stated that they were willing to change as much as they could but the franchiser will not allow them to change the roof.

Chair Carie Allen confirmed that the bollards would remain along with the proposed landscaping.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen felt that since the structure had no staff and was coin operated, it was a vending machine. She didn't see how they could tie it into the shopping enter architecturally if they did not change the roof. It seemed more like a sign or vending machine than a pad building.

Boardmember Ann Schwaderer agreed it was a vending machine. She did feel that the proposed landscaping would help, but basically, it was a vending machine.

Boardmember John Poulsen confirmed that there were 82 of these around the valley. He confirmed that there were three in Mesa, one at Main and Stapley, one at 5th Street and Country Club, and one at Mesa Drive and University. He also confirmed that they do not have any in Scottsdale, Tempe, and Gilbert. There is one in Chandler, at Arizona Avenue and Ray.

He then confirmed that the foundation is poured in place and then the structure is pre-cast concrete that is put in place and fastened to the foundation, then the roof is constructed on top of that. Boardmember Poulsen stated one of his concerns is what would happen to the structure if they were to go out of business. This is not like a building that someone else could reuse. If they were to go out of business the property owner may not have the money to remove the structure and foundation. Another concern was the fact that in many shopping centers there are already recycle bins and charitable donation bins, and now you add these structures to parking lots, and where are we going in the long run? The Design Review Board has already been discussing raising the standards for charitable donation bins. He understood that the applicants were doing the best they could with what they had, but basically these structures are windmills without the fans.

Mr. Tease then stated that their "standard lease" has a deposit with the owners so that at the end of the lease the deposit money would pay for the removal. He felt that in terms of other kiosks, this company has a daily service regimen that is required by the franchiser out of Colorado. The structures are cleaned, sanitized and serviced internally, so someone is there every day, so that if there were graffiti or someone left a water bottle, or there is trash left at

MINUTES OF THE JULY 10, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

the site it would be cleaned on a daily basis. Mr. Tork stated that the reason they did not want to be in line with the stores is that they felt they would not get enough visibility. He also stated that many of their customers come with 3 or 5 gallon bottles, and this way the customers can park next to the structure.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer agreed with all of the previous comments. He was also concerned whether this is a building at all, or is it a vending machine? It doesn't quite fit the mold either way. He was also concerned with what happens when they go out of business. He felt that the design of the structure was intended to be as a sign, so that it was very visible.

He felt that this was a precedent setting issue here. What other type of vending machine would be next? He felt that the Board's job was to keep a high quality standard for the City and placing these in prominent locations did not do that. Boardmember Burgheimer confirmed with staff that in 2000 the City Council directed staff to re-write the Design Guidelines in order to improve the quality of development in the City. This is the first such structure to come through since that time.

Mr. Tease then stated that they felt the structure was a building because they are required to get a building permit, and because a service technician services the structure within an enclosed area. There is a water tank up above that holds about 550 gallons. The structure is a mini-water processing plant. The reason for the holding capacity in the roof is so that they can supply a market with purified drinking water. Their market is people who can't necessarily afford to buy bottled water. He felt that because the building comes in two pieces it would be easy to remove.

Chair Carie Allen confirmed that removal of the structure would include removing the pad, the landscaping, and restoring the site to the original condition. She was concerned that the applicants had stated that on some of their sites they are required to pay a deposit toward removal. She was concerned that this site may not have that lease condition. The applicant was willing to stipulate to removing the structure. She was also concerned that this structure does not enhance the center; it is basically a sign. Because it is called Watermill Express it's a windmill.

Mr. Tork did not feel that the structure was a sign because the roof was terra cotta colored.

Chair Carie Allen and Boardmember Jillian Hagen felt that the shape of the building made it a sign, and was not required for the functionality of the building.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Ann Schwaderer that DR02-40 be denied

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The Board felt that the structure as proposed did not enhance the shopping center nor meet the intent of the City's Design Guidelines.

Recorded on Tape No.: 139 – 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE JULY 10, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR02-42 **Cimarron XV**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 6355 South Sossaman
REQUEST: Approval of a 20,000 sq. ft. office and hangar complex
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 6
OWNER: Himovitz Properties
APPLICANT: Fred Himovitz
ARCHITECT: Wayne Rockwood

REQUEST: Approval of a 19,380 sq. ft. office and hangar complex

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

MOTION: It was moved by Jillian Hagen and seconded by John Poulsen that DR02-42 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 the Preliminary Development Impact Summary Comments dated 6/13/02.
3. Compliance with all requirements Williams Gateway Airport and all conditions of approval of case DRC 02-17.
4. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
5. Provide 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 4 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is an attractive addition to the Williams Gateway Airport environment.

Recorded on Tape No.: 139 – 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE JULY 10, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da