

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MARCH 7, 2007

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Community Room of the Mesa Utility Building, 640 North Mesa Drive, at 3:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Dave Richins- Vice Chair
Vince DiBella
Tom Bottomley
Robert Burgheimer
Tim Nielsen

MEMBERS ABSENT

Pete Berzins (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

Kim Steadman	Paul Devers
Lesley Davis	Bill Osborne
Debbie Archuleta	Nick Nevel
Mia Lozano Helland	Al Cappello
Monique Spivey	Susan Demmit
Jim Hash	Craig Capponis
Jeff McVay	Scott Kwaryin
Krissa Lucas	Peter Blied
Paul Pietsch	Brent Kendle
Ko Yu	Scott Wahtula
Steven Nevala	Paul Gilbert
Robert Gomez	Chris Vickers
Tom Everett	Fred Woods
Dennis Price	Troy Valentine
Susan Stewart	Rick Redpath
Michael Kinion	Russ Naylor
Edmir Dzudza	Brent Topping
Lisa Foreman	Paul Mullins
Crystal Miller	Lesley Partch
William Goetz	Wayne Douglas
Ed VanKirk	Larry Ryerson
M. Krentz	Steve Head
David Smith	Vergie McDavid
Yana Markov	Michelle Watanabe
Marge Kinder	Morgan Coyne
Andrea Silkey	Sean Coyne
Mark Kaester	Others

1. Work Session:

CASE: Tutor Time
NWC Crismon & Baseline

REQUEST: Review of changes to a day care application

DISCUSSION: Michael Kinion represented the case and stated they had lowered the parapets 2', and reduced the tower on the rear below the roof line.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- the proportions are better.

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Finish the rears of the towers and parapets
- Return the cornices

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Still concerned with height elevation for the neighbors
- 34' is still very tall for a single story building

CASE: Plaza del Sol

REQUEST: Review of a shopping center

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Concern with the drive on Mesa Drive
- Wrap the architecture around the rear elevations

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Suggest the windows wrap the southwest corner of the building to provide an area for outdoor seating
- Vertical elements pop-out 8", that may not work where they crash into the roof
- Maybe the columns should be lowered and put decorative light fixtures above the columns

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Concern with the placement of signage
- The sign area may need to be enlarged so it won't look crowded
- The scale is good
- Could use a little more color; may be at the store fronts or the lighting
- Could use a trim color

CASE: Shops at Legacy House Phase II
5747 E McKellips

REQUEST: Review of a shopping center

DISCUSSION: Susan Stewart represented the case and stated they were planning to move the trash enclosure away from the outdoor seating. She also stated they would be reducing the height of the buildings.

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- On sheet A4.1 the north elevation seems very separated. Could the columns not be stone?
- Why wrap the stone around the top at the roof?

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The scale is very tall
- Could stone on A4.1 not be on the columns and end areas but used on the center portion instead?
- Look at removing the mansard on the restaurant

CASE: Coury Offices
1750 S Mesa Dr. or 308 W Coury

REQUEST: Review of an office project

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Parapet should be deeper, it looks thin from the side

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Looks nicer than the original building
- Why does the glass go all the way down?
- Wainscot could look classical and would save money
- Could they add a cornice?
- Liked the trellis idea for the courtyard

CASE: Broadway Condominiums
1757 E Broadway

REQUEST: Review of a condominium project

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Access to site is controlled and there are roll up gates

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Likes modern buildings, but neighborhood may not
- The trellis over the door on the east and west elevations is awkward
- Doesn't like the colors
- The colors should be bolder
- Windows should be recessed as much as possible
- The bedroom windows may be too small to comply with exiting requirements

CASE: Retail Pad building at MacFrugals Plaza
1230 S Mesa Dr.

REQUEST: Review of a restaurant/shops building

DISCUSSION: The applicant stated they plan to remodel the center in about two years.
They plan to mimic this architecture for the remodel.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Concern with placement of signage
- Make sure ladder system can work with retail use

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- It's a nice building

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Nice building.
- Looks like an office
- Wants to see proposed signage on follow-up submittal

CASE: Office Plaza
4437 E Southern

REQUEST: Review of an office plaza

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Liked the glass elements

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Liked the corrugated metal
- Like the color but not the stone
- Why stone on a modern building?
- Look at using ground face instead of the split face cmu

Tom Bottomley:

- Could the courtyard be an employee area
- Concerned with the color choices
- Agrees the stone fights the architecture

CASE: Fresh and Easy Grocery (Tesco)
2009 N Stapley

REQUEST: Review of a grocery and bank

DISCUSSION: Don McDown and Ann Bauers of Summit Shadows spoke and stated the project should tie in with the project proposed on the west side of Stapley.

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Could the canopy span to Shops A?
- Could they move the driveway to line up with the project to the west?

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Could they tie in better with the colors of the project to the west?
- Could they match the three colors that are so similar and then use the green to be original and different?
- Shouldn't the loading dock be 50' from the property line?

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Liked the architecture
- The bank drive-thru looks tacked on
- Likes the battered walls and reveals
- Doesn't want stone on the west elevation of Tesco
- Look at a different way to break up the west elevation

CASE: Falcon View Lot 10 Shops
McKellips & June

REQUEST: Review of a shops building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- The cornice needs to return

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- How visible will the arch be?

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The building steps down a lot
- It will be very visible and needs to be seen
- Not a triple step
- Look at the “eye lids”

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Why is the awning so wide?
- Maybe the awning needs more presence

CASE: Mid Mesa Medical
3155 E Southern

REQUEST: Review of a medical office building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Could the windows be recessed further back?
- Show the stucco screeds

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Could overhangs be extended a little?

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Doesn't like the curved arches with the design of the roof
- Maybe not curved
- Maybe a flat arch that engages the shorter columns
- Suggest the proportions be shifted to be 2/3 and 1/3
- Looks top heavy
- Likes the green glass

CASE: Mulberry Industrial
200 block of South Mulberry

REQUEST: Review of three industrial buildings

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Need reveals, not just paint lines

CASE: Juanita Medical Campus
SEC Juanita & Vineyard

REQUEST: Review of a medical campus

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Be careful with glass color
- Bring a sample to the next meeting
- Likes integral masonry

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Nice composition
- Be careful with how they do the reveals on the fin
- It needs to be thick
- Maybe break it up

CASE: Ellsworth Crossing
Ellsworth and Guadalupe

REQUEST: Review of a shopping center

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- There need to be changes in plane at the health club

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- The more it steps, the less it will look like a movie set

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- The stone next to the health club seems awkward

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- There are so many vertical elements, but no real massing

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The elevations look highly articulated but the site plan show a flat plane
- Show on the elevations how much they step out
- Needs to move and step at least 6" and then step different amounts
- The color changes need to be a $\frac{3}{4}$ " reveal, not a paint line

2. Call to Order:

Vice Chair Dave Richins called the meeting to order at 5:45 p.m.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the February 7, 2007 Meeting:

On a motion by Rob Burgheimer seconded by Tim Nielsen the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

4. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-25 Hewson Greenfield Business Center
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC Greenfield & Presidio
REQUEST: Approval of a 97,510 sq. ft. office/industrial building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: The Hewson Company
APPLICANT: David Dobrowski
ARCHITECT: Will Architects

REQUEST: Approval of a 97,510 sq. ft. office/industrial building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR07-25 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:
 - a. Compliance with the established Design Guidelines for Dover Industrial Park and approval by the Development Control Committee for Dover Industrial Park.
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 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 26 Shops A

LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC Power & Broadway
REQUEST: Approval of a 4,500 sq. ft. retail/restaurant
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Sky Development Group
APPLICANT: Kevin Kerpan
ARCHITECT: Harvey Unti

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,500 sq. ft. retail/restaurant

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR07-26 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:
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 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-27 Starbucks

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2750 E University Dr.
REQUEST: Approval of a 1,960 sq. ft. drive-thru restaurant and a 2,800 sq. ft. retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: Neil Kleinman
APPLICANT: Rob Burgheimer
ARCHITECT: Rob Burgheimer

REQUEST: Approval of a 1,960 sq. ft. drive-thru restaurant and a 2,800 sq. ft. retail building

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda due to a conflict by one of the Boardmembers.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR07-27 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 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. Revise the landscape plan and any other applicable drawings to correspond with the revised site plan, dated February 14, 2007.
 - b. Relocate the no entry sign in on the southeast side of the proposed retail building so that it does not block the sidewalk.
 - c. Extend the sidewalk along the west side of the retail building to the north extending to the edge of the curb.
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 the Administrative Approval from John Wesley, Planning Director, dated February 23, 2007.
5. The Design Review approval is contingent upon the approval of a Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit (ZA07-024) and all conditions of that approval.
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.

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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 5 – 0 – 1 (Boardmember Burgheimer abstained)

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-28 Dana Park Village FLMS
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1744 S Val Vista
REQUEST: Review and Recommendation on a Council Use Permit for an 85-foot high Freeway Landmark Monument Sign
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: Village Square Dana Park, LLC/Mike Clements
APPLICANT: Village Square Dana Park, LLC/Mike Clements
ARCHITECT: Vince DiBella/Saemich DiBella Architects, Inc.

REQUEST: Review and recommendation on a Council Use Permit for an 85-foot high Freeway Landmark Monument Sign

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda by the applicant.

Paul Gilbert represented the case and stated they objected to conditions 1a and 1b. Mr. Gilbert thought the requirement to provide an architectural break between the tenant signs would reduce the sign area to the point that the signs would not be useful. He stated the applicants felt the logo sign was appropriately sized.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed that staff's concern was that the structure show through, not just the tenant signs. Boardmember Burgheimer thought the tenant signs were appropriate and liked the logo.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed there would be tenant signage on two sides and the logo would be on only one side.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed the tenant sign panels would be recessed into the structure, not just applied.

Staffmember Kim Steadman confirmed the dimension of the logo would be 15' X 17'.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley confirmed the thickness of the "legs" would be the wider profile as drawn on the black and white drawings.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR07-28 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, 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 Federal Aviation Administration regarding the use of visibility warning lights.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations, including all requirements of the Building Safety Division with regards to the issuance of a sign permit.

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

3. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for a sign permit.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0 – 1 (Boardmember DiBella abstained)

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 29 Reilly Aviation
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Greenfield & McDowell
REQUEST: Approval of 75,914 sq. ft. of hangars
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: City of Mesa Falcon Field
APPLICANT: Joe Reilly
ARCHITECT: Paul Mullins

REQUEST: Approval of 75,914 sq. ft. of hangars

SUMMARY: Joe Reilly represented the case. He stated this was meant to be an internal lot and that was what it was. He agreed the existing hangars at Falcon Field bad and stated he was willing to change the colors and sheet metal of his building.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur stated the colors needed to be muted and not reflective.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought a logo with an aeronautical theme would be a benefit for them. He stated he did not understand why they were at the Design Review Board when there was no design to review. He thought they should seize the moment and pick up on the aeronautical theme. He stated they could do some really cool things without spending much more.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer did not like the project. He stated the project was not that far from the arterial corner and would be visible. These were bone stock Butler buildings. He thought the City wanted to improve Falcon Field. He stated the adjacent MD Helicopter building was constructed during a whole different era. He wanted to see a potential site plan for the surrounding property adjacent to the arterials.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed the lease was in progress for the 350' around this project; however, the Board does not know what will be in front to hide these buildings. There could still be view corridors. He stated Falcon Field is one large campus and wondered why the Board only sees very small individual pieces. He thought there needed to be an overall plan.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought that this lot would have high exposure. Whether they are hangars or not they need to have more. He did not think a cmu base and some trim was enough. He thought the Board was being asked to allow bad design because in the future there would be other buildings to hide it. He was concerned that this project could set the precedent for the future hangars.

Corinne Nystrom of Falcon Field stated the adjacent project would meet zoning requirements and design requirements. She stated the future project would be for larger 80' X 80' hangars and then 60' X 80" hangars with offices. She stated the other project would be comparable to Scottsdale Airpark. The Board was concerned the "future" project may not build out and then this project could be visible for a very long time.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed the Falcon Field plan was proposed to go to

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Planning and Zoning Board in March. He stated he understood there was a need for hangars.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur wondered why the future "high-end" project was not concerned with what this project will look like.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR07-29 be continued:

Mr. Reilly then stated he had alternatives and presented revised elevations to the Board. Mr. Reilly also showed the Board a possible site plan for the adjacent project.

Boardmember Burgheimer then rescinded his motion so the Board could review the revised drawing.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley wondered why Phase II is still being shown on the drawings. He thought the applicant was proposing to cover up an ugly hangar with a taller, larger hangar. He confirmed the proposed site plan would have view corridors so portions of this project would be seen from the arterials.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur still wanted the colors revised.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed the other project would be separated from this project by an 8' wall of cmu or wrought iron. He was concerned that this applicant had to eliminate his Phase II in order to make the other project viable. How is the airport planning the leases if they have unusable lease areas?

Boardmember Vince DiBella did not think the revised plan was any better. He thought this project needed to address the corner. He thought the two end pieces needed to be articulated.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer wanted the materials to break the plane. He wanted to know what they would look like. He wanted to see the revised colors and building materials at a future meeting.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen wanted the applicants to work with staff to enhance the plans.

Boardmember Dave Richins stated that a view fence would allow portions of this project be visible. It would be better if the wall were solid. He confirmed this project would have access from Greenfield.

MOTION: It was then moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Dave Richins that DR07-29 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:

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- a. Revise plans to reflect deletion of Building 6 and Building 7 of Area B (Phase II).
 - b. Provide landscape to meet code, unless approved by variance.
 - c. **Revise the revised elevations, presented by the applicant, to provide changes in plane between the panels.**
 - d. **Provide enhancements to the north and west elevations and wrap the corners.**
 - e. **Revise the trash enclosures.**
 - f. **Bring the case back to a future meeting as other business so the Board can see the revisions, including the building materials and revised color board.**
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 – 1 (Boardmember Tom Bottomley voting nay)

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-30 Higley Professional Plaza
LOCATION/ADDRESS: South of the SEC of Higley Rd. & Broadway Rd.
REQUEST: Approval of three medical office buildings
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Michael Hamberlin
APPLICANT: Les Partch
ARCHITECT: Les Partch

REQUEST: Approval of three medical office buildings

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR07-30 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.
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 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-31 Coco's Neon

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1411 S. Power Rd.

REQUEST: Approval of repaint and LED illumination of an existing restaurant

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6

OWNER: Granite Peak/Victoria Land Partners

APPLICANT: Capital Sion & Design

REQUEST: Approval of repaint and LED illumination of an existing restaurant

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR07-31 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 exterior elevations and photographs provided.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-32 Choice Bank
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 612 W Baseline Rd.
REQUEST: Approval of a 2-story bank building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: Bill Robert
APPLICANT: Swan Architects
ARCHITECT: Jeffrey Swan

REQUEST: Approval of a 2-story bank

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR07-32 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. Choose one light for the utility lighting, but provide another one for the decorative fixtures. Details to be approved by Design Review staff.
 - b. The elevations of any proposed monument signs require Design Review approval.
 - c. This project is required to meet all site standards as outlined in Chapter 15 of the City of Mesa 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 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Appeals:

Structures Inc. (DR01-58)

Lon Palmer represented the case and explained that the building had been changed in the field. He was at the meeting to work with the Board to enhance the building. He suggested using additional landscaping in front of the building.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed there had been a material change, a color change, and a detail change. He suggested using an awning or trim piece over the windows. He stated the Board wanted to come up with a practical solution that would not interfere with the existing sign.

Boardmember Vince DiBella thought the Board could have approved the building as it was built, if that were what was presented.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur did not feel landscaping would really help. She suggested enhancing the windows.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen suggested shading the windows at the second floor.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that the appeal of Structures Inc. be approved with the following conditions:

1. Provide awnings or a design element to enhance the windows. Design Review staff to review and approve.

VOTE: Passed 6 - 0

Jiffy Lube (DR05-86)

Russ Naylor represented the appeal and explained the color elevations presented to the Board at the original meeting were incorrect. He stated he realized it was his offices fault. The glass as shown on the color elevations was impractical because there were vending machines behind one area of glass, and restrooms behind a portion of the other area.

Boardmember Dave Richins questioned why they were showing an awning over a windowless area Mr. Naylor stated it was never intended to be glass.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley suggested that since the area was recessed, they could use grill work.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen suggested clearstory windows.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated he was not as concerned with the south elevation

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

because it would not be visible from the street.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Wendy LeSueur that the appeal of the Jiffy Lube be approved with the following conditions:

1. Put a wainscot of stone on the north elevation to match the south. Added stone is to be "fingered" onto the existing stone to obscure the line between existing and new stone.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

Purrfect Auto (DR06-108)

Al Cappello represented the appeal and stated that as they worked with the owner on the interior space it became necessary to remove three panels of windows and replace them with EIFS and a metal grill pattern.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought they should use the "Rosewood" color for the new EIFS.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tom Bottomley that the appeal of the Purrfect Auto be approved with the following conditions:

1. Approved as presented with the grill work.
2. The EIFS to be painted Rosewood.
3. The grill work to match the bronze storefront.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Other Business:

Results of Falcon 7 Executive Hangar appeal to Council (DR06-113)

Staffmember Kim Steadman explained what was approved by City Council. He explained that Council had asked staff to come up with conditions that would address the concerns of the Board. He stated Council agreed the project needed to be revised, and that they wanted the corner building built up. He explained the applicant would revise the building and bring the landscaping back for staff review. He stated the applicant would be providing art work at the corner.

Santa Fe Square architecture discussion:

Staffmember Lesley Davis explained the owners of Santa Fe Square are trying to get new tenants for the center. One of the possible future tenants is a small grocery store with a very strong architecture and color scheme. The question was how to incorporate dramatic changes into such a strong architecturally themed center.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen suggested using the strong geometry on the interior of the store.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer did not think the geometry and color could work in this center. He stated they could propose something very creative to blend with the existing architecture, but they would have to significantly revise their prototype.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley stated the prototype was very strong architecture and corporate identity. They will have to make changes.

Homestead/Sanctuary cases for SunValley and Center:

Fred Woods explained the applicants thought the SunValley and Center Street projects had a design level equivalent to the project approved on Higley. He stated the SunValley project was mostly four-plexes; however, the Center Street project would be longer buildings.

Boardmember Dave Richins stated there needed to be changes in plane wherever there were changes in color. The Board wanted the gables to break the roofline. He said it seemed there had been a lot of bait and switch with these projects.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated what they had before was better, but what they were presenting was good enough.

Boardmember Richins stated the project was becoming a prototype and three was enough. They would need to submit a different product in the future.

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 7, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da