

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
JANUARY 5, 2005

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Lower Level of the Council Chambers 57 East First Street, at 3:45 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Pete Berzins - Chair
Dave Richins- Vice Chair
Randy Carter
Jillian Hagen (arrived at 3:34)
Tim Nielsen
Vince DiBella (left at 5:00)
Robert Burgheimer (arrived at 3:36)

MEMBERS ABSENT

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman
Lesley Davis
Debbie Archuleta
Charlie Scully
John Wesley
Jorge Pierson
Mark Irby
Jerry Shockey
Todd Spenser
Madison Flynn
Dorothy Shupe
Maeve Johnson
Dan Brock
Michael Quattrone
Others

1. Call to Order:

Chair Pete Berzins called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the October 13, 2004 Meeting:

On a motion by Tim Nielsen seconded by Randy Carter the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the December 1, 2004 Meeting:

On a motion by Randy Carter seconded by Vince DiBella the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

4. Approval of the Minutes of the December 14, 2004 Meeting:

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

5. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-37 **Brown Practice**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2310 & 2320 E. Brown Rd. (NEC 23rd Street & Brown Road)
SUMMARY OF REQUEST: Two medical offices buildings to be developed in two phases.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Dr. Jerry R. Shockey
APPLICANT: Vince Dalke
ARCHITECT: Vince Dalke, Archicon

REQUEST: Approval of a screen wall for a previously approved medical office project.

SUMMARY: Jerry Shockey represented the case.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer did not have a problem with the wall.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed the reason for the solid masonry wall was cost and the owner's belief that it would look better than the previously approved view fence.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed a neighbor had spoken at the previous meeting.

Chair Pete Berzins confirmed the neighbor who spoke originally wanted the solid wall.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen wondered if the alley could be abandoned.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR04-37 be approved as presented.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: For the reasons stated on the record.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Appeals to Staff Decisions:

L & G Apache, L.L.C.
10749 East Main

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that staff had been able to work out a solution with the applicant, therefore the case had been withdrawn.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: **Hewson Industrial Center**
 NWC Quentin & Norwalk

REQUEST: Approval of a 122,881 sq. ft. industrial building

DISCUSSION: There was no one present to represent the case.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Recommended the applicant address the issue of people scale by adding steel detailing, like an awning over the windows.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Thought the building was very flat;
- Suggested more variation in the wall plane.

Boardmember Randy Carter:

- Suggested additional color to accent the concrete panels.

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Thought the building was OK, given the location.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: **JR Mark Industrial**
 1725 N Quail

REQUEST: Approval of two 24,213 sq. ft. industrial office condominium buildings

DISCUSSION: Todd Spencer represented the case.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Recommended the use of integral color block;
- Suggested the addition of a nice connection between the buildings;
- Questioned the color of the proposed glass;
- Recommended decorative downspouts;
- Recommended they look at the circulation drives to try to provide additional landscaping between the buildings.

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Agreed the building should include integral color block
- Recommended revising the site plan so the buildings are not mirrored.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Recommended applicant study the height of windows;
- If spandrel glass is used, the architect should be careful how the details are handled;
- Recommended the architect study the presentation of building to Quail;
- Recommended integral color block for at least some of the elements.

Boardmember Randy Carter:

- Questioned whether there would be enough parking if the building becomes offices.

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Was concerned that the depth of the entry off-set would go away with the new site plan.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE: Del Taco
2645 N Power**

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

DISCUSSION: Mark Irby represented the case. Mr. Irby explained that he thought the blank wall was a contrast to the wall with the sloped roof.

Boardmember Vince DiBella recused himself.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen:

- Confirmed that the rear of the building would face future commercial; and that the property to the south was zoned residential;
- Recommended awnings or something to enhance the rear of the building since traffic circulates around the rear;
- Thought the Lysoloma trees would work as a screening tree;

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Confirmed that there would be a menu board, a sidewalk for deliveries, the SES and the hot water heater in the rear of the building;
- Recommended raising the wainscot height at the rear to add interest to rear. He felt the changes could be paint.

Boardmember Randy Carter:

- Did not think the project looked like the bank or the surrounding shopping center except for the color;
- Recommended something to "hold up" the cantilevered roof elements;
- Recommended the building be enhanced.

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Agreed with Boardmember Randy Carter;
- Recommended the parapets be arched to match the Wells Fargo.

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Thought the drive-through aisle was too sharp a turn;
- Recommended the landscape island at the drive-through be moved back farther.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Agreed with Boardmember Carter. He thought this prototype looked like a set created for signage;

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- Agreed the rear elevation was shallow;
- Recommended a screen wall;
- Concerned with the look of the three peaks;

Boardmember Randy Carter:

- Recommended more verticality at the entrance and drive through window;
- Recommended pulling out the gable to create an entrance;
- Concerned that the roof should have a place to end;
- Recommended additional color;
- Recommended Sunbrella or metal awnings.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen:

- Agreed additional color could help but did not think the corporate colors were appropriate;
- Recommended the curbing for the drive-through median should remain even if the landscaping changed.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Thought the building looked like an old Taco Bell;
- Thought the building should have its own identity;
- Suggested the applicant's look at the approved plans for the center across the street;
- Suggested ceramic tile;
- Thought the tile roof was too heavy on this building.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE: HEC Engineering
4704 E Southern**

REQUEST: Approval of three office buildings totalling 23,049 sq. ft.

DISCUSSION: Dan Brock represented the case. Mr. Brock stated HEC Engineering would occupy the 2-story building and the other two building would be speculative. He also stated there would be a 35' setback along Southern. As agreed to with the neighbors each one-store building would be reduced by 5'.

Boardmember Randy Carter:

- Confirmed the wainscot would be tile;
- Concerned with stucco fascia, suggested metal or wood.

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Confirmed the neighbors were OK with the storage building;
- Confirmed the neighbors most concerned with location of west drive. Mr. Brock stated the owner was willing to have cross access with a future developer of property to the west.

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Confirmed the covered parking would be metal. The color would match the building;
- Liked the tile base on the buildings.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Thought the color choices would make or break the project;
- Thought the tile base was a very important element;
- Confirmed the building would be masonry not wood frame stucco.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen:

- Confirmed the trees along the east and north would be 36' box.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Concerned with the depth of the arcade;
- Recommended that the windows should be recessed;
- Recommended the roof over the pop-out on the east and west elevations of the 2-story building should be popped up similar to the one story building.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Fry's
SEC Stapley & McKellips

REQUEST: Approval of a 13,424 sq. ft. addition to an existing Fry's Market to replace the garden center; and a new 8,386 sq. ft. pad building

DISCUSSION: Marty Flood and Ryan Gass represented the case.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Thought this project would be an improvement to the existing shopping center.

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Confirmed the aluminum on the color board would match the existing storefront material.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Thought the additional landscaping would improve the center.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Riverwalk
5555 E Broadway

REQUEST: Approval of six multi-family 4-plex buildings

DISCUSSION: Dorothy Shupe represented the case. She stated they were hoping they could cluster the recycle barrels.

Boardmember Randy Carter recused himself.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Confirmed the four-plex buildings could be individually owned;
- Thought this type of project was not sustainable.
- Liked the turn around;
- Thought the colors were o.k., suggested one more color for the buildings;
- Confirmed the project was higher than the RWCD canal.

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Thought the number of parking spaces was a concern because these were 3-bedroom units and there was not anywhere else for people to park. No visitor parking;
- Liked the screen wall.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Did not like the site planning for the project;
- Thought the dead end parking was awkward;
- Recommended the center gable be taller;
- Suggested they apply for a variance to reduce the amount of parking;
- Agreed clustering the recycle barrels was a good idea.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen:

- Concerned with the proportions between the windows and the edge of the building;
- Recommended an additional color;
- Thought the colors were very monochromatic.

The Board agreed the recycle barrels would create problems: Where to keep them when not pick-up day. Where to place them for sanitation pick-up. Seniors would be trying to roll the barrels to the pick-up location.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: **Golden Corral**
 SWC Power & McKellips

REQUEST: Approval of a 11,616 sq. ft. restaurant

DISCUSSION: Jorge Pierson, Madison Flynn, and Mr. Nelson represented the case. Mr. Pierson stated this was a prototypical building they were only changing the color. He stated they could internalize the ladder and use decorative downspouts. He stated they did not want to design the building to look similar to the auto related uses on the site.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Confirmed the dormers were not functional;
- Thought the dormers were too small for the size of the roof;
- Stated wood siding does not work in Arizona.
- Simulated wood siding has too many joints that warp and twist;
- Thought the parapets were too tall and thin; not in proportion with the building;
- Concerned with the height of the rear parapet;
- Consider alternatives for the back of the building; soften the view for the neighbors
- Recommended using building materials appropriate for the desert.

Boardmember Randy Carter:

- Confirmed the substrate was wood frame;
- Stated wood siding won't last;
- Thought the proportions of the entry were very odd;
- Thought the parapet was too thin for its mass;
- Thought the façade was flat;
- Thought the north facing windows and vestibule needed protection from the sun and weather;
- Recommended the vents on the roof should be screened;
- Agreed the rear elevation should be studied;
- Agreed the dormers were too small;
- Suggested the dormers could be used for the venting;

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Liked the alternative rendering presented.

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Agreed dormers needed to be bigger;
- Also liked the alternative design presented;
- Likes the wood look but not at this location.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Thought the thickness of the edge conditions were weak;
- Agreed with Randy's comments;
- Thought the elements need to connect;
- Agreed dormers are too small, but thought the dormers needed to stay - they just should be larger and worked into the architecture;
- Concerned with location of trash because it was so close to the neighbors;
- Suggested using different colors, not so pink and orange, one color should match, the others could be different;
- Liked the roof and brick colors;
- Suggested more definition and depth at the windows;
- Concerned that the elevations were not coordinated with the landscape plan;
- Thought the restaurant equipment was too close to the residential neighbors;
- Rear elevation needs attention.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen:

- Thought the building was detailed like a large building so it comes across as a warehouse or supermarket;
- Recommended window treatments and shading;
- Recommended larger dormers;
- Recommended studying the proportions of the parapets;
- Thought the building should have more richness so it didn't appear industrial;
- Thought it did not need to match the existing building; suggested an additional color like olive green.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE: Wal-Mart
NEC Baseline & Country Club**

REQUEST: Approval of a 203,091 sq. ft. Wal-Mart Supercenter

DISCUSSION: Michael Quatrone represented the case:

Boardmember Jillian Hagen:

- Liked the “Main Street” approach. Thought it broke up the massing of the building;
- Thought the shadow lines were deceptive, wanted them to really occur;
- 8” difference won’t give much of a shadowline;
- Thought the rear elevation looked very flat;
- Recommended a change in roof height for the rear.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Wanted the street scene on the west facing Country Club also;
- Interplay of forms on the front should turn the corner;
- Recommended they develop the theme where there are major views.

Boardmember Randy Carter:

- Wanted to see larger scale drawings, 1/8” scale, showing the overhangs, offsets and ground plane;
- Thought there was an opportunity to create a pedestrian area;
- Concerned there was no place for the mansard to terminate;
- Recommended a colonnade;
- Rear elevation extremely flat;
- Recommended more in and out movement;
- If the front was meant to be flat he thought it should be simplified.

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Concerned that three sides of the building do not match the level of design on the front, creating a “Vegas casino” effect;
- Thought the fine detailing would not work if the whole building was 8” block;
- Recommended pedestrian connections between the buildings and the street;
- Confirmed the split faced block was painted;
- Suggested street furniture and grates around the trees;
- Suggested the mini stores within Wal Mart, food, optical, pharmacy, etc should be brought to the exterior.

Chair Pete Berzins:

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- Likes the “Main Street” approach;
- Agreed the west side needs more.
- Thought the back side was OK.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Likes the departure from previous big box buildings;
- Agreed with Boardmember Carter that they needed to see larger scale drawings;
- Concerned that the building should not look like a Hollywood set;
- Thought some forms were not appropriate;
- Recommended they choose forms that work better in Arizona than Main Street USA;
- Suggested the applicant look at photos of older buildings in Valley;
- Did not want a caricature of the old west like Old Tucson;
- Wanted the interior uses articulated on the exterior;
- Suggested the breaks could be more true to the interior;
- Wanted more interest on the east and west elevations.
- Thought there may be too much on the south elevation; they should distill the information.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Other Business:

Discussion of Board retreat agenda.

It was decided the retreat will be held Wednesday January 26, 2005, at 3:00 p.m. in the Planning Division Mizner Conference Room; 20 East Main, Suite 130.

The Board will discuss:

Authority and limitation of the Design Review Board:

- Are we encouraging good design, diversity?
- Where are we going as a City? What is our vision?

How can we improve the format of the meeting so that it is more of a forum for an exchange of information between the applicant/architect and the Design Review Board?

- Can Design Review Board comment on Planning & Zoning cases prior to Planning and Zoning meeting?

Discussion of Solid Waste issues:

Discuss where we are regarding review of religious buildings, and smaller apartments:

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da