

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
OCTOBER 1, 2003

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

MEMBERS PRESENT

Carie Allen - Chair
John Poulsen - Vice Chair
Robert Burgheimer
Randy Carter
Vince DiBella

MEMBERS ABSENT

Pete Berzins (excused)
Jillian Hagen (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

Lesley Davis
Charlie Scully
Debbie Archuleta
Craig Cote
Charles Stock
Sean Lake
Pennington Carter
Cassie Carter

Dick Presto
Denise Burton
Glen Walling
David Kincaid
Marty Fifer
Kathy Schimack
Pat Keiler
Others

1. Call to Order:

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

2. Approval of the Minutes of the September 3, 2003 Meeting:

On a motion by Randy Carter seconded by Rob Burgheimer the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

3. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-39 **Higley Retail**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 3450 N Higley
REQUEST: Approval of 9,981 sq. ft. multi-tenant retail shops
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: 3450 N Higley L.L.C.
APPLICANT: Dick Presto, Pasternack and Associates
ARCHITECT: Pasternack and Associates

REQUEST: Approval of 9,981 sq. ft. multi-tenant retail shops

SUMMARY: Dick Presto represented the case.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was concerned with the height of the building. Mr. Presto stated that the height allowed signage on the tower elements so they would be visible behind the office building. Boardmember Burgheimer did not want signage placed on the towers. He stated the proposed building would be almost twice the height of the office; it did not need to be that tall. He suggested removing the cornice piece and lowering the height of the towers.

Boardmember Vince DiBella agreed the towers were too tall. He felt the stair stepping of the building footprint did enough for the building. He suggested the towers have flat parapet roofs.

Boardmember John Poulsen didn't mind the towers but he did not want them to have signage. He agreed with the suggestion that the towers have a parapet roof.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt the building should relate better to the surrounding area and not be so obviously retail. He wanted the gabled rear walls brought down. He agreed the towers were too tall and should not have signage. He confirmed they were proposing glass block on the towers.

Boardmember John Poulsen suggested that the curved elements on the rear of the building be brought down and parapeted.

Chair Carie Allen agreed the towers were out of proportion. She also agreed the towers should not have signage.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR03-39 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

4. Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened by a parapet wall equal to or exceeding the height of the mechanical units. To the extent permitted by law, satellite dishes shall be fully screened by a parapet wall. Ground mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened from public view by a combination of a decorative wall and dense landscaping. The screen wall shall be equal to or exceed the height of the mechanical units.
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. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
7. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 20' height at the perimeter. Light standards shall be a maximum height of 14' within 50' of the property line when adjacent to residential property.
8. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
9. Provide two half size color elevations, two full size and two 8-1/2 X 11 sets of revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.
10. **All landscape plants shall be in conformance with the Desert Uplands plant list and be compatible with the existing desert landscaping for this site.**
11. **The existing office building shall be painted to match the new building with colors as approved by the Design Review Board.**
12. **New screen walls along Higley Road shall be similar in style and color to the existing screen walls for this development.**
13. **Lower the gables on the west elevation to 26' and paint them a complementary color. As an approved alternative, they can be flattened.**
14. **Lower the towers on the east elevation by 2' to 3'.**
15. **No signage is to be allowed on the towers.**

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side A & B)

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-58 **Coyote Landing Apartments**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: Northeast of NEC of Southern & Crismon
REQUEST: Approval of a 308 unit apartment complex
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Quail Run Apartments
APPLICANT: Broadbent & Associates
ARCHITECT: Tom O'Neill

REQUEST: Approval of a 308 unit apartment complex

SUMMARY: Denise Burton, Glen Walling, and David Kincaid represented the case. Mr. Kincaid stated they had revised the retention basin design. They were now providing 5 building types; the three-color schemes were bolder; they had added architectural elements to the buildings; and they had gated both entrances. Mr. Walling stated the eaves had been changed to rolled stucco fascias.

Boardmember John Poulsen confirmed that the recreation building would be the same as previously proposed with the exception of the rolled stucco fascia and the new colors.

Denise Burton explained that they had not had time to get landscape plans drawn once they had finalized the revised site plan. She explained that they had worked with the landscape architect regarding the sidewalks and amenities. Mr. Kincaid stated that the landscaping palette and densities would not change.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt the new site plan was much better than the previous design. He felt the buildings were much nicer. He was pleased that they were providing 5 building types.

Boardmember John Poulsen felt the revisions were a great improvement. He was concerned that the building closest to the entry at Southern was proposed to be 3-story he wanted it switched with the 2-story to the northwest. He appreciated their efforts.

Boardmember Vince DiBella agreed that the revised site plan is much nicer than the first. He was concerned with the building to the north of the drive aisle at Crismon. He was also concerned that the buildings along the south side of the same drive aisle were in a straight line.

Denise Burton stated that the flag area was very challenging to work with because of the 30-foot setback. She stated they had placed 16 one-bedroom units on the north side of the drive aisle.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer suggested moving the one bedroom building to the east of the largest retention area. After discussion with the applicants he understood why that building was placed where it was. The applicants felt that it was important to have parking as close to the units as possible and they could not switch the retention because the northwest end of the site was the high ground.

Chair Carie Allen liked the idea of having one side of the retention area open.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Randy Carter was not as concerned with the location of that one building. He felt that they had addressed everything else the Board had discussed at the previous meetings.

Denise Burton stated that they would like to replace the "Sonora Vista" roof tile originally proposed with "Ridgecrest" which they felt would blend better with the new color scheme. The Boardmembers agreed with that change.

Boardmember Burgheimer confirmed that on the color board the top color would be the main body color, the next color would be the accent body color, and the bottom color would be the trim.

He suggested going with a lighter body color and darker elements. He wanted to see which buildings within the project would be which color scheme. He agreed that the 3-story building needed to be moved off of Southern. He confirmed that where there are three 3-story buildings in a group they would be different colors. He suggested that they could switch the dark and light colors within the color schemes to provide more variety.

Chair Carie Allen thanked the applicants for all their efforts and for listening to the Board's comments.

At that time Chair Carie Allen invited the public to speak. Pat Keiler, a resident of Parkwood Ranch, felt the new color schemes would fit in better with the color schemes in Parkwood Ranch. He felt the revised site plan was much better. He was concerned with the drive on Crismon. The applicants reiterated that the entrance would be gated and the Crismon drive would be exit only.

Charles Stock felt the revisions were a major improvement. He was concerned with the building that was closest to Crismon, he felt it was too close to the traffic. He was concerned that there needed to be a review of the landscape plans.

Chair Carie Allen confirmed that the landscape architect was working on the landscape plan. She felt that the Board needed to review the landscape plan.

Boardmember Burgheimer wanted to see a plan that clearly depicted which buildings would be which color schemes.

Boardmember John Poulsen was concerned that on color scheme 3 there was not enough diversity in the colors. He wanted to see more contrast. He was concerned with the number of units along the northern "flag" portion along Crismon. He suggested having a 3-story building in that area to provide more open area.

Boardmember Burgheimer reminded the Board that there would be a 30' setback.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR03-58 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

4. Provide concealed roof vents or incorporate louvers into the design of the building elevations of both the clubhouse and the apartment buildings.
5. Provide 15' wide foundation base on the south side of the clubhouse.
6. Covered parking structures shall not be less than 20' from the face of the apartment building.
7. Change the location of two buildings adjacent to Southern so there are two 2-story buildings adjacent to Southern with the 3-story building located further from Southern. Site Plan to be approved by Design Review staff.
8. Revise the color palette on scheme 3 so there is more contrast between the field and accent colors.
9. The landscape plan to be reviewed by the Design Review Board at the November 5, 2003 meeting.
10. Provide a display that shows which color schemes will be on which buildings throughout the project.
11. 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.
12. Fire risers are to be located within the building.
13. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of revised site 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 development as proposed with conditions is reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.
8. **Ensure compliance with all conditions of approval for the Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit (SCIP) approved August 5, 2003. (ZA03-56)**
9. **All parking areas that are upgraded, remodeled or associated with the subject proposal must be developed according to City of Mesa site development standards, including requirements for installation of landscape islands as per Zoning Ordinance requirements.**
10. **Replace any non-conforming exterior lighting fixtures on the building and site to ensure compliance with City requirements.**
11. **Provide one trellis over the smaller windows.**
12. **Final colors to be approved by the Design Review Board at a future Design Review meeting.**

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B) and Tape No. 2 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-75 **Washington Mutual Teller Canopy**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2639 E Broadway
REQUEST: Approval of a 1,248 sq. ft. remote drive-thru teller
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: Pollack Investments
APPLICANT: Design Forum Architects
ARCHITECT: Don Rethman

REQUEST: Approval of a 1,248 sq. ft. remote drive-thru teller

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-75 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. **Incorporate at least three additional shrubs in front of the parking spaces along Broadway Road that are not screened by the screen wall or by existing landscaping. The type of shrub is to be selected from the proposed palette. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.**
5. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions should blend in well with the existing shopping center.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-76 **Mountain View Plaza Pad D**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1253 North Greenfield
REQUEST: Approval of a 4,986 sq. ft. retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Glenwood Development
APPLICANT: Kathy Schimack
ARCHITECT: Douglas Sperr

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,986 sq. ft. retail building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-76 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. **Relocate the S.E.S. panel; location and design to comply with the Zoning Ordinance.**
5. **Provide addition foundation base planters on the north side of the building, equal to 50% of the wall length.**
6. **Provide a shade tree, Chilean Mesquite, in the parking lot landscape island along the north side of the building.**
7. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
8. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
9. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of 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 development as proposed with conditions is well designed and should match the existing center.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-78 **Shops at Dana Landing – Towne Bank**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 3156 East Baseline
REQUEST: Approval of a 6,000 sq. ft. bank
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: D L Retail
APPLICANT: UTAZ Development
ARCHITECT: Architecture Plus

REQUEST: Approval of a 6,000 sq. ft. bank

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-78 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. 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.
5. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
6. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions will blend well with the existing center.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-79 **Greenfield Professional Village & Falcon Commerce Square**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1621 North Greenfield
REQUEST: Approval of 11 office buildings totaling 54,333 sq. ft. and 3
 office warehouse buildings totaling 22,036 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Mesa Land Partners
APPLICANT: UTAZ Development
ARCHITECT: Architecture Plus

REQUEST: Approval of 11 office buildings totaling 54,333 sq. ft. and 3 office warehouse
buildings totaling 22,036 sq. ft.

SUMMARY: This case could not be heard because Boardmembers Randy Carter and Rob
Burgheimer had to recuse themselves, which did not leave a quorum to hear and vote on the
case.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: Lack of quorum

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da