

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

APRIL 5, 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
Vince DiBella
Tom Bottomley
Robert Burgheimer
Tim Nielsen

MEMBERS ABSENT

Dave Richins (unexcused)

OTHERS PRESENT

Kim Steadman	Jae Cho
Lesley Davis	Dan Saleet
Debbie Archuleta	Bill Stevenson
Mia Lozano Helland	Mark Irby
John Wesley	Randy Carter
Krissa Hargis	Dorothy Shupe
Jennifer Gniffke	Nicole Posten
Veronica Gonzalez	Eric Williams
Michael Bell	Jeff Pipkin
Michael Jorgensen	Matt Huss
Roger Jones	Kevin Kerpan
Vince Dalke	Others

1. Work Session:

CASE: Alta Mesa Villas
5750 E Main

REQUEST: Approval of a multi-residential project

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Parking
- A units seem to have identifiable entries but the 3-story units do not
- Better defined entries

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Additional color
- Staggering helps but needs more
- The street side needs stone
- Liked the arch on the A units in the photos

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Better define the entries
- Use stone on the columns and A units
- Looks like a standard stucco apartment
- Use more of the stone and masonry
- Pre-cast pieces would look nice
- Elevations need to be shaded
- Use pre-cast concrete canaly not metal scuppers
- Muttons in colors like green maybe
- If using scuppers show them

CASE: KBAD22
5250 E Southern

REQUEST: Approval of an office building

DISCUSSION:

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Concerned with roof
- Gable roof element should come back farther/ or vary the height of the straight roof section

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Wants the green awning used, not the revised color used on the existing building
- Since the existing building did not use the green approved with the DR case, revise the green to more of a sage
- Preferred the colors on the elevation to the color board

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- More stone at entry
- Additional color

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Very stucco, use more stone
- Provide decorative/elegant light fixtures

CASE: TCF Bank
W of NWC Greenfield & Juanita

REQUEST: Approval of a bank

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Doesn't look like a bank
- Tower is too thin and tall looks like a top hat
- Needs more variation/interest
- Materials and colors are fine
- Pull down the eave line
- Buttress looks medieval; maybe a rusticated base
- Proportions should be $\frac{1}{3}$ $\frac{2}{3}$ not $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ or $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{4}$
- The glass at the top of the tower is awkward

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Could roofline at building be lower?
- Continue the score lines around the building

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Why does everything stop at the eave line?

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Fascia too thin
- Needs mass
- Looks like roof will fly off
- A lot of stone, don't need so much

CASE: Alliance Bank
1110 E Baseline

REQUEST: Approval of a bank

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Concerned with east corner of south elevation
- Plant palette should tie in with other building

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- A lot of south facing glass. Is it shaded?

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- EIFS is too white. The EIFS color in the rendering is more harmonious with the other materials.
- Likes the way the roof steps on the drive-thru side of the south elevation; wants to see more of that

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Would prefer EIFS to stucco, to provide cleaner detailing
- Parapet top should be an EIFS detail, not a metal cap

CASE: Colts Neck M.O.B.
SWC Val Vista & McDowell

REQUEST: Approval of a medical office building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Collision of styles
- Flat parapet and cornice then sloped roof?
- Choose a style continue it all the way around
- Too many window styles
- Could windows be joined so there is a different rhythm?

Chair Pete Berzins:

- The center element of the rear elevation should be different
- Windows should vary
- A lot of glass for a medical office

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Would prefer peaked elements on the rear of the building
- Rear elevation looks like the back side of a building
- Very concerned with the mechanical wells; he understands they are driven by function; however, they are not attractive
- The round element on the east elevation is too high

CASE: Odyssey Professional Park
2149 S Vineyard

REQUEST: Approval of a professional park

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Interesting use of color
- Nice to see something different
- Concerned with the brightness of the yellow and pink
- Be very carefully with the details such as; roof drains and vents; A/C units; etc.
- Doesn't like the roof color; would prefer galvanized with anodized aluminum frames

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Use decorative light fixtures

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Concerned with how signs will actually work; they can ruin a project
- Yellow is very difficult to maintain

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Second floor is a mezzanine

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Likes the rural farm feel

CASE: Falcon Industrial
Lots 12, 13, 14 & 15 Ingram & Higley

REQUEST: Approval of an industrial park

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Needs more variation
- Additional color
- Make entry feature more prominent
- Blocking of color
- Would prefer integral
- Light fixtures could provide color

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Needs 3 or even 4 colors
- A lot of brown
- Seems massive and too heavy

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Prefers the color board

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- If using downspouts, show them on the elevations

CASE: Power Mall Remodel
2500 S Roslyn

REQUEST: Approval of the remodel of an existing outlet mall

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Likes the covered parking

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Be careful how the corners and edges are treated

CASE: Dana Park Village Square 3
1700 S Val Vista

REQUEST: Approval of Phase III of Dana Park Village Square

DISCUSSION:

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Concerned with rear elevations along the freeway

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Colors should match the rest of the center
- The exaggerated curved element is strange

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Liked the 3' recess of the curved glass element

CASE: Aquila Superstition
96 Street & Southern

REQUEST: Approval of 204 residential units and a 65,000 sq. ft. office building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Too massive
- Not a residential scale project
- Residential looks nice
- Office looks like a hotel
- Residential west of office is bad

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Your access to the office is from the residential?
- Your entire building mass doesn't have to be visible to the freeway
- Only two materials and two colors for a building this size won't work
- There needs to be variety

2. Call to Order:

Chair Pete Berzins called the meeting to order at 5:17 p.m.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the February 17, and March 1, 2006 Meetings:

On a motion by Tim Nielsen seconded by Vince DiBella the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

4. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-10 **Wireless Toyz**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 344 S. Power Rd.
REQUEST: Approval of a 6,720 retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Wireless Toyz
APPLICANT: Mark Bowker
ARCHITECT: Kristjan Sigurdsson

REQUEST: The applicant is withdrawing the case

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR06-10 be withdrawn

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The applicant requested the case be withdrawn

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-22 Hampton Mesa

LOCATION/ADDRESS: The 7400 block of East Hampton Avenue
REQUEST: Approval of two industrial shell buildings totaling 86,167 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: John Secco
APPLICANT: Rick Schuh
ARCHITECT: Cawley Architects

REQUEST: Approval of two industrial buildings totaling 86,167 sq. ft.

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR06-22 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. Approval of any proposed monument signs by Design Review staff.
 - b. Compliance with all landscaping requirements, as outlined in Section 11-15-3 of the Zoning Ordinance.
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. Compliance with all conditions of approval for zoning case, Z06-013.
6. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
8. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project as revised and conditioned should

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

be a nice addition to the area.

CASE #: DR06-24 Val Vista Groves Office

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 3549 E. Brown Road, 118 & 1130 N. Val Vista Drive
REQUEST: Approval for three buildings totaling 12,384 s. f.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: Tam Holdings
APPLICANT: Greg Hitchens
ARCHITECT: Greg Hitchens

REQUEST: Approval of three office buildings totaling 12,384 sq. ft.

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Randy Carter spoke regarding the case. Mr. Carter stated the buildings were plain rectangular boxes next to very nice homes.

Greg Hitchens represented the case.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought there was too much roof on the corner building. He thought the roofline should be broken up; the elevation with the long gable end needed more attention, and the span was too long. He thought more should be done with the window recesses; the corner building needed to be broken up; and have more articulation. He thought the recessed windows were too simple and too repetitive. He suggested columns next to the windows. He thought the buildings were too horizontal.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed the applicant was no longer proposing a 2-story building at the corner. He understood they were trying to tie in with the buildings to the west and make this a continuous project. He agreed the corner building could be nicer, but could support this design.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen was glad the applicant was no longer proposing a 2-story building.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer understood they were trying to tie in with the buildings to the west. He suggested they add a cornice and reveals to break up the mass of the EIFS into panels. He suggested they raise the arch under the smaller gable on the corner of the building; separate the ridges more on the west elevation of building; provide a thicker fascia; and revise the light fixtures by placing them in recesses, or centering them on a reveal line.

Mr. Hitchens stated he would break up the roof if he had to, and was willing to work with staff to make some of the changes.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-24 be approved with the following conditions:

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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, if any, 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. **Revise the proportions of the roof to the body of the building.**
 - b. **Thicken the fascia.**
 - c. **Provide detailing of score lines to break up the building.**
 - d. **Revise the rooflines to create differentiation of height.**
 - e. **Integrate the light fixtures into the building; or provide decorative light fixtures.**
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 (also, 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 4 – 1 (Boardmember Bottomley voting nay)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: A majority of the Board thought the buildings worked well with the existing buildings to the west. Boardmember Bottomley thought the case needed additional design and should have been continued.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-25 Sossaman Guadalupe Daycare & Retail
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC Sossaman & Guadalupe
REQUEST: Approval of a 28,900 sq. ft. shopping center
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Great American Capital
APPLICANT: Kevin Kerpan
ARCHITECT: Harvey Unti

REQUEST: Approval of a 28,000 sq. ft. shopping center

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Chris Epps represented the case.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought the building was too regular. There was no hierarchy; the building was repetitive; and there was not enough change in the parapet heights.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer agreed the design was not unique or innovative, but thought it passed the approval threshold of many other projects that had been approved in the past.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR06-25 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 elevations that indicate the colors and materials.
 - b. Revise site and landscape plans to provide adequate foundation base landscaping at Shops 'B'.
 - c. Provide plans that demonstrate compliance with standards for retention basins, per §11-15-3(D)
 - d. Provide revised drawings to demonstrate compliance with the screening standards noted below in "Site Standards".
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.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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 4 – 1 Boardmember Bottomley voting nay

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project substantially complies with the design standard of the Zoning Ordinance.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-26 MARC Center
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 924 N Country Club
REQUEST: Approval of a 34,374 sq. ft. training facility
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: MARC Center
APPLICANT: Saemisch DiBella
ARCHITECT: Bob Saemisch

REQUEST: Approval of a 34,374 sq. ft. training facility

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda because Boardmember DiBella had a conflict of interest.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR06-26 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Compliance with the conditions of approval for Z06-10
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 4 – 0 – 1 (Boardmember DiBella declared a conflict of interest)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project meets the design standards of the Zoning Ordinance

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-27 M & I Bank

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1510 W Southern
REQUEST: Approval of a 5,010 sq. ft. bank
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: M & I Bank
APPLICANT: Kevin Bollinger
ARCHITECT: Kevin Bollinger

REQUEST: Approval of a 5,010 sq. ft. bank

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR06-27 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.
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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is well designed, and will greatly improve the site.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-28 Fiesta Towers

LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC of W Grove and South Westwood
REQUEST: Design Review approval for
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: TR Alma Partners, LLC
APPLICANT: TR Alma Partners, LLC
ARCHITECT: Fujikawa Johnson Gobel

REQUEST: Approval of a 540 unit condo building with 9,850 sq. ft. of retail

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda. The Board watched the same presentation shown to the Planning and Zoning Board.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was concerned the applicants had never addressed the Board's comments. He was concerned with how the project will look if only one building is ever built.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR06-28 be approved with the following conditions:

VOTE: Passed 3 – 1 – 1 (Boardmember Burgheimer voting nay) (Boardmember DiBella abstaining)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: If developed as proposed, the project should be a catalyst for redevelopment in the Fiesta Mall area.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-29 Gateway Commons

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 5114 E Southern

REQUEST: Approval of two office buildings totaling 23,800 sq. ft.

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6

OWNER: Champion Partners

APPLICANT: FM Group

ARCHITECT: FM Group

REQUEST: Approval of two office buildings totaling 23,800 sq. ft.

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Jeff Pipkin represented the case.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer questioned what had changed since the work session.

Mr. Pipkin stated they had broken up the building with expansion joints as vertical elements; and they had flattened the barrel roof.

Boardmember Burgheimer thought the building needed something to break up the long horizontal elevations of the rear of the building. He suggested they use color or texture change to break up the elevation.

Boardmember Vince DiBella thought the metal band should not be broken by the struts. He thought the windows on the south elevation needed to be protected.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought the color was a little monolithic. He suggested the north elevation be disrupted.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-29 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 material/finish information for metal awnings, revised column color, metal grilles, glass color, and any wall-mounted light fixtures.
 - b. Work with staff to revise the various arches, for consistency between the drawings.
 - c. Revise color elevations to add vertical scoring to bldg. "B".
 - d. Provide updated landscape plan. Staff to review and approve. Provide Planting strip, not pavement, at head-in parking, east side of lot (Bldg "B").
 - e. Demonstrate that Service Entrance Sections for both buildings are fully recessed, that there will be a screening wall along Southern, and that the

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

north and west property lines will have screening walls. Staff to review and approve.

- f. Revise the pedestrian network so landscape islands do not interrupt paths (Bldg "B"). Connect new path with existing near dumpster (Bldg "B").
 - g. **Work with staff to revise the west elevation on the smaller building and the north and south elevations of the larger building.**
 - h. **Provide a new material or a texture change.**
 - i. **Provide shade for the south windows.**
 - j. **Adjust the location of the struts; or pull down to be the same as the others.**
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 4 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project, as stipulated, will be a well-designed addition to the center.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-30 McDonald's
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2130 W. Southern Ave.
REQUEST: Approval of a 4,100 sq. ft. fast food restaurant
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: McDonald's Corp.
APPLICANT: John Smales
ARCHITECT: John Smales

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,100 sq. ft. fast food restaurant

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR06-30 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Incentive Permit (BA06-006).
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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: This is a well-designed replacement of an existing McDonalds. It will be a great improvement.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-31 Hawes Office Condos

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 8401 E. Baseline Rd.
REQUEST: Approval of 6 office buildings totaling 49,018 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Castelain Development
APPLICANT: Archicon, L.C.
ARCHITECT: Vincent Dalke

REQUEST: Approval of six office buildings totaling 49,018 sq. ft.

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR06-31 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 variation in the placement of color on Building F and Building C to provide additional interest and variety.
 - b. Compliance with all landscaping and retention design requirements as defined in Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance.
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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project meets the design standards of the Zoning Ordinance.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-32 Del Taco

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1842 S Signal Butte Rd.
REQUEST: Approval of a 2,168 sq. ft. fast food restaurant
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Del Taco of Arizona
APPLICANT: Mark Irby
ARCHITECT: Mark Irby

REQUEST: Approval of a 2,168 sq. ft. fast food restaurant

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR06-32 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 color/material specifications for the 'Waves' and color specifications for the light fixtures. Details to be approved by Design Review staff.
 - b. Provide the correct paint chip for "Downing Straw" SW#2813. The paint chip on the color/material board is incorrect and much brighter than the real color.
 - c. Provide details on the wrought iron fence surrounding the outdoor seating. Details to be approved by Design Review staff.
 - d. The red and green metal waves across the top of the building are corporate colors and are therefore considered signage. Revise total signage to allowable amounts. Staff to review and approve elevations showing revised signage.
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

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project did not require significant revisions to the design.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-33 Aquila Superstition

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 96 Street & Southern

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,940 sq. ft. residential & 65,000 sq. ft. commercial project

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6

OWNER: Pacific Ventures

APPLICANT: Martin Hazine

ARCHITECT: George Tibshraeny

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,940 sq. ft. residential & 65,000 sq. ft. commercial project

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR06-33 be continued

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project has grading and drainage issues that must be resolved prior to being heard by the Planning and Zoning and Design Review Boards

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06- 34 University & Meridian Retail

LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC University & Meridian
REQUEST: Approval of a 7,400 sq. ft. retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: UPP LLC
APPLICANT: Saemisch DiBella Architects
ARCHITECT: Vince DiBella

REQUEST: Approval of a 7,400 sq. ft. retail building

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda because Boardmember DiBella had a conflict of interest.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR06-34 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.
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 to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 4 – 0 – 1 (Boardmember Vince DiBella abstained)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is consistent with the design of the existing retail for the site.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-35 **Office Building for Brown Falcon**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: Brown Road west of Ellsworth Road
REQUEST: Approval of two office buildings
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Brown Falcon, LLC
APPLICANT: Brock, Craig and Thacker Architects, Ltd.
ARCHITECT: Dan Brock

REQUEST: Approval of two office buildings totaling 11,080 sq. ft.

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR06-35 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. Monument signs require Design Review approval prior to submittal for a sign permit.
 - b. Parking canopies shall be painted to match the jumbo brick used in the perimeter 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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is in compliance with the design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-36 Sam's Club Gas Facility

LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC McKellips & 46th Street
REQUEST: Approval of a gas fueling station with a car wash
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Wal-Mart Stores Inc.
APPLICANT: Sean Lake
ARCHITECT: Harrison French

REQUEST: Approval of a gas fueling station with a car wash

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR06-36 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 Site Plan, Landscape Plan and Grading and Drainage Plan that revises the bumped out screen wall along the north boundary of the gas facility that was designed to accommodate a trash enclosure that has been relocated. Also, provide a landscape plan that shows the entire site per the limits of construction, which extends to the drive aisle on the east. The landscaping and design of the screen walls needs to be in accordance with Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance and with the previously approved Sam's Club. Details to be approved by staff.
 - b. Provide foundation base landscaping for the kiosk and for the car wash building in accordance with §11-15-3(C). Details to be approved by staff.
 - c. Provide landscape material within the curbed area south of the kiosk building that houses a transformer. Details to be approved by staff.
 - d. Provide landscape plant material on the interior side of the screen walls. Details to be approved by staff.
 - e. Identify the material/color specification for the base of the columns on the canopy, for light fixtures on the canopy and car wash and for the windows and bay doors on the car wash building. Provide revised elevations with this information. Details to be approved by staff.
 - f. Finish the backside of all parapets to match the front when they project above the lowest roof height.
 - g. Provide an irrigation plan that includes the planters at the gas pumps.
 - h. Revise the car wash elevations to correctly label the directions East, West, North and South.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

(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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The design has been revised to meet the concerns of the Board, and is in compliance with the design standards of the Zoning Ordinance.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-37 Williams Gateway Self-Storage

LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Pecos & 88th Street
REQUEST: Approval of office warehouse and mini-storage buildings
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Bill Stevens & Keith Makrej
APPLICANT: Dream Catchers Planning and Design, LLC
ARCHITECT: Randy Carter

REQUEST: Approval of office warehouse and mini-storage buildings

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda because Boardmember Bottomley had a conflict of interest.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-37 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. Relocate pole-mounted light fixtures outside of any landscape islands.
 - b. Provide lighting cut-sheets and finish specifications for the building mounted wall sconces.
 - c. The fire lane sign post shall be painted DE6126 "Stockhorse" (Sheet SD02, Detail E5) to match the color of the accessible parking sign post (Detail E13). Revise Sheet SD02 to show corrected color.
 - d. Monument signs require Design Review approval prior to submittal for a sign permit.
 - e. Revise Landscape plans to show compliance with the City Code. Specifically in regard to perimeter landscaping:
 - i. A 15' wide landscape setback is required along the north side of the private access drive leading from the parking lot of Building B east to Gateway Airport Commerce Park.
 - ii. Provide nineteen (19) trees in the front landscape setback of the retail lot (Building C).
 - iii. Provide 16 (16) trees along the west property line of the retail lot (Building C).
 - iv. Provide 16 (16) trees along the east property line of the self-storage portion of the project, adjacent to retail.
 - v. Provide nine (9) trees along the north property line of the office/warehouse lot for Building A.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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 4 – 0 – 1 (Tom Bottomley abstained)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is well-designed and attractive

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-38 **Chili's**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Loop 202 & Dobson
REQUEST: Approval of a 6,766 sq. ft. Chili's Bar and Grill within
 Riverview at Dobson, Tract C, Pad #27
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Mike Stults, Brinker
APPLICANT: Eric Williams, Olsson Associates
ARCHITECT: Kevin Henrichson, GHA Architecture Development

REQUEST: Approval of a 6,766 sq. ft. Chili's restaurant

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR06-38 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 material and color specifications for decorative Chili Band Canopy at Front Entrance.
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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project meets the design standards of the Zoning Ordinance and of the Riverview at Dobson development.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-39 John Wright Building

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 231 North Alma School Road
REQUEST: Approval of a 4,200 sq. ft. office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Larry John Wright
APPLICANT: Robert D. Fronske & Assoc., LTD.
ARCHITECT: Robert D. Fronske & Assoc., LTD.

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,200 sq. ft. office building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR06-39 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Compliance with the requirements of Development Incentive Permit (ZA06-026).
 - b. Compliance with the conditions of approval of an Administrative Site Plan modification letter dated 2/23/2006.
 - c. Document decorative window grilles on the elevations drawing; sheet A-2 to agree with sheet A-2a.
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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The design meets the design standards of the Zoning Ordinance, and blends well with the existing building.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-40 Restaurant Depot

LOCATION/ADDRESS: NEC Baseline & Extension
REQUEST: Approval of a 54,375 sq. ft. wholesale/warehouse
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: Dave Haren
APPLICANT: Dan Saleet
ARCHITECT: Robert Acciarelli

REQUEST: Approval of a 54,375 sq. ft. wholesale/warehouse

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR06-40 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Specify colors for the proposed stucco, and provide CMU samples to confirm the colors are similar to the rendered elevations. Staff to review and approve.
 - b. Provide revised elevations, both color and black & white to document the change of materials for the pilasters from CMU to stucco. Staff to review and approve.
 - c. Provide planting throughout retention basins.
 - d. Provide screening to comply with §11-15-4.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project meets the design standards of the Zoning Ordinance

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-41 Office Complex for DFFM Yukon
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 3635 E Inverness
REQUEST: Approval of a 2 Building Office Complex (Total 10,327 SF)
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Fran Marotta, DFFM Yukon LLC
APPLICANT: Fran Marotta, DFFM Yukon LLC
ARCHITECT: David L. Schmitt

REQUEST: Approval of two office buildings totaling 10,327 sq. ft.

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda by an adjacent neighbor.

Roger Jones, a neighbor to the east of the project, spoke. Mr. Jones wanted the applicant to eliminate the north building and add the square footage from that building into the south building. He stated the building was beautiful; however, the north building would block his view. He stated the building would be a 25' prison wall 4" away from his property.

Francis Moratta and David Schmit represented the case.

Chair Pete Berzins confirmed the distance from the property line to the north building was actually 20'.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer questioned what view Mr. Jones had. Mr. Jones provided photos taken from his back yard. Boardmember Burgheimer measured the height of the parapet roof on the north building and stated it would 17'-9" which was a modest height for an office. He suggested providing a denser tree rather than a Sissoo in a 36" box size.

Staffmember Lesley Davis stated that the Planning and Zoning Board had made that suggestion and Mr. Jones had not felt that was an adequate solution.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed there had been a neighborhood meeting prior to the Planning and Zoning Board meeting and no one was present from the neighborhood. He also confirmed Mr. Jones had spoken to Mr. Moratta on the phone. Mr. Moratta felt that nothing he did short of eliminating the building would be acceptable to Mr. Jones. Mr. Morrata was willing to provide additional landscaping. Boardmember Nielsen asked why the applicants had designed the project the way they did. Mr. Schmit stated he had tried to keep the parking away from the neighbors to buffer the neighborhood. The buildings were single story offices even though the property is zoned C-2. They had a cross-access agreement with the bank, which is located at the southwest portion of their property. Boardmember Nielsen stated that if the project could be designed with the buildings along the south, there would probably be cars and trash enclosures next to Mr. Jones.

Boardmember Vince DiBella thought the project was well designed. He stated that a 2-story house would block Mr. Jones view more than this kind of development.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR06-41 be approved with the following conditions:

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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. Confirm that grade differences at the property line are in compliance with the Ordinance. Staff to review and approve.
 - b. Provide screening of ground-mounted equipment per code.
 - c. Provide paint color of covered parking structure/ canopy.
 - d. Provide manufacturer details and finish materials/ colors.
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 4 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project meets the design standards of the Zoning Ordinance.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da