

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
SPECIAL MEETING
JANUARY 10, 2007

A special meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Room 170 of the City Hall Building, 20 East Main at 11:30 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Pete Berzins - Chair
Dave Richins- Vice Chair
Tom Bottomley
Robert Burgheimer
Tim Nielsen

MEMBERS ABSENT

Vince DiBella (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

Kim Steadman
Lesley Davis
Debbie Archuleta
Mia Lozano Helland
John Wesley
Dorothy Chimel
Scot Rigby
Trent Jones
Jeff Fisher
Bob Stump
Doug Himmelberger
Dave Udall

1. Call to Order:

Chair Pete Berzins called the meeting to order at 11:40 p.m.

2. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 10, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW SPECIAL MEETING

CASE #: DR07-01 **Toyota at Riverview**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC of Dobson & 202
REQUEST: Approval of Toyota at Riverview
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Miller Family Real Estate
APPLICANT: Trenton Jones
ARCHITECT: Jeffrey Fisher

REQUEST: Approval of a new car dealership

SUMMARY: Trent Jones and Jeff Fisher represented the case. Mr. Jones gave a powerpoint presentation that showed design elements from the Riverview project across Dobson; which included awnings, pilasters, cornices, parapet height variations, gates, site furniture, site walls, planters, and paving.

The applicants stated the colors are corporate identity and cannot change. The changes being proposed were changes in the parapet heights on the rear elevations, varied pilaster heights, and changes to the awnings. The awning changes were to use canvas style awnings on the Toyota, flat awnings on the Nissan, and barrel vault awnings on the Honda.

Chair Pete Berzins understood they were showing the details from across the street that they were using on this project; but they seemed to be the same things the Board saw at the January 3rd meeting. He wanted to know what they had changed since then.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought they were still showing very small details that won't be visible to most people and won't be seen from the roadways. What the public sees at Riverview is red brick and brown colors, the white is used very little at Riverview. The Riverview massing and color ranges are not in the auto mall. He stated they recognize these buildings will be modern and they can't use the cornice elements. He stated the Board was trying to create a place. Mr. Fisher stated the small elements people see up close are what make the place.

Boardmember Dave Richins stated that because the project was across Dobson he was OK with using a different color and only using small details. He confirmed each building would be between 40,000 and 80,000 sq. ft. He stated his neighbors just want to see the buildings built.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley agreed the small details proposed by the applicants won't be noticed by the public. Matching the small details was OK as a beginning. He was not in favor of white buildings. He confirmed the front and sides could not be changed. He did not think the buildings had to be red brick, but they did need to use a color, tan, ochre, something besides an entirely white building.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur thought the use of white at the front was fine, but thought the other elevations needed to use colors taken from Riverview.

Chair Pete Berzins stated there was no difference between this Toyota dealership and the one under construction in Gilbert. This is a prototype. He thought Riverview was going to be unique. He had no problem with the idea of zones. He did not understand why all three

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 10, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW SPECIAL MEETING

dealerships needed to look the same. It looked like one large white mass.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed that the front elevations wrapping around both sides could not be changed, which would be 30% to 40% of the buildings. He agreed the three dealerships looked alike. Even across the street the restaurants have kept some elements of Riverview but they kept their corporate images and all look unique. The Board is asking the same of these dealerships.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated that at the very beginning of the Riverview project the public and this Board were told this would be a destination, a unique, cohesive center.

Mr. Jones stated he thought the buildings would look schizophrenic if they did what the Board asked.

Chair Pete Berzins polled the Board to see if they could approve the drawings presented at the meeting.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur appreciated their efforts, but wanted the auto mall to mesh better with Riverview on the east side of Dobson. She did not understand why the sides and rear could not use darker colors.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer agreed the rear areas needed to be red, or brown, or tan, or taupe. He understood why the front elevations could not change. He agreed the buildings may look schizophrenic, but thought that was because they were unwilling to make changes. He confirmed the pedestrian connections would be red brick.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought the ultimate goal was that Riverview would be unique. He thought the high tech look was fine, but would like the colors to blend with Riverview. He understood the front elevations, he appreciated the little details, but thought the sides and rears could be different.

Boardmember Dave Richins never had a problem with zones. He thought changes at the pedestrian level were enough. He did not want the Board to stop this development. He would rather be criticized for approving buildings that were not what was envisioned than be criticized for having a vacant site there because the dealerships can't get what they need, to do business in Mesa. He stated he would not support a continuance, the Board has to either approve the case or deny it. He was worried about the front elevations clashing with other elevations.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley agreed with Boardmember Nielsen. The small details they were willing to change were not enough on such large buildings. He didn't want a lot of bric-a-brac used to tie the projects together. He thought the sides and rear needed to be a different color. He thought the stark white was cold and uninviting. He was very unhappy that they were being allowed to do whatever they want. He did not think this Board should be political. He thought the Board should guard and assess design based on its merit. Not to rubber stamp, not to get political, but to assess it on its merits; does it meet the intent, or are they just saying whatever.

Chair Pete Berzins stated it was his impression they could continue the case or they needed to either work on the small things the applicant was willing to change or deny the case.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 10, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW SPECIAL MEETING

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was against denying the case. He did not want to send the message that the Board could not come to an agreement. He did not think the Board was impossible. The Board was holding firm on what they had asked for. He did not want to throw it into the political arena.

Boardmember Dave Richins stated the Board was appointed by the Mayor and approved by Council. The Board was not apolitical. They had to always remember that. Politics plays into that.

Bob Stump of Toyota stated they will not change anywhere in the nation.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur thought the discussion needed to be distilled down to what the Board could live with and what the applicant can and cannot do. She stated it was not about cornices but about warm colors.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated the rear elevations needed to be a different color. He thought that what they were asking for would cost less. Maybe they could do the changes in a different form, such as a series of solids with no banding and striping, but a series of masses of colors in large areas. He stated they can't change the building, or the roof elements, they were only asking for a color change. Would they really refuse to build because they had to revise the color of the rear of the building?

Boardmember Tom Bottomley stated he likes modern design, but they need to marry their design with what existed across Dobson. The Board has been very consistent over the years in holding every applicant to designing to the center, or neighborhood they are in, and to this same idea of changing prototypes.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley stated the Cinemark was a tilt building, and color was the only way it could be tied in with the rest of the project. He stated the Board was compromising a lot from what they would require of any other applicant.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Wendy LeSueur that DR07-01 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations presented at the January 10, 2007 meeting with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Compliance with the criteria established in the Riverview at Dobson Design Guidelines approved by City Council on November 1, 2004. This includes landscape, hardscape, site furnishings, entry features, and lighting.
 - b. Coordinate the entrance site wall design with the revised site walls approved administratively on September 29, 2006.
 - c. Compliance with conditions of approval for Z06-098.
 - d. Service Entrance Sections to be internal or recessed and painted to match the building.
 - e. Provide manufacturer and color specifications for the CMU. Details to

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 10, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW SPECIAL MEETING

be approved by Design Review staff.

- f. **Revise the back portions of three sides of the service areas, to match the predominant surfaces of Riverview. The red brick, the taupes, the ochres. They can change the stripes and go to massing of colors.**
2. Elevations for freestanding monument signs must receive Design Review Board approval.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Compliance with the Comprehensive Sign Plan for Riverview
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
9. 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

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 10, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW SPECIAL MEETING