

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
SEPTEMBER 3, 2003

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

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

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman	David Kincaid
Lesley Davis	Glen Walling
Charlie Scully	Denise Burton
Dick Milligan	Steven Wilson
Janie Thom	Cameron Miles
Dorothy Chimel	Jere Planck
Stephen Krager	Marty Fifer
David Schusaski	
Gina Hids	
Ken Mietzner	
Roberta Cullen	
Carol Sheperd	
Charles Stock	

MEMBERS ABSENT

Pete Berzins (excused)

1. Call to Order:

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

2. Presentation by Dick Mulligan, Economic Development Director

Dick Mulligan, City of Mesa Economic Development Director spoke to the Board and showed them a Power-Point presentation compiled by a Retail Development Task Force regarding retail development. He stated the City was looking at how competitive the City of Mesa is with neighboring cities. Mr. Mulligan stated that the report was presented to a group of retailers and developers in February and one of the comments was that the report needed to be presented to the various Boards, and City staff.

Randy Carter asked what the growth potential was for Mesa. Dick Mulligan stated that Mesa will add 200,000 people before we are at residential build out. The projected population is approximately 636,000. The annual income of the demographics for the area north of Brown and east of Stapley exceed \$70,000. He stated that this fact is not known to retailers.

Randy Carter asked if the Boards work in trying to ensure better looking buildings helped the City.

Dick Mulligan stated that the development community wants the process to be fast and easy. The challenge is how to get the attractive development that other communities may be getting without driving businesses away. There needs to be the right balance.

Randy Carter stated he was thinking of the difference between Scottsdale, Mesa and Phoenix. Do companies come because a City is easier to deal with or do they look at the quality of what exists? Mr. Mulligan felt that would depend on the retailers. Mr. Carter asked Mr. Mulligan what his advice would be for the Board. Mr. Mulligan answered that the Design Review Board should be sensitive to market conditions that are out there. To make sure that although we are trying to get good quality development, we need to make sure our demands are reasonable. He felt that did not mean the Board needed to give away the store and do anything the client wants, because that is not successful over time. If the quality goes down you wind up in a situation where you only attract lower end retailers and not the higher end retailers you want to have. You need to have a balance of retail types.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the August 6, 2003 Meeting:

On a motion by seconded by the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

4. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-38 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 the Preliminary Development Impact Summary Comments.
3. Compliance with the conditions of the Administrative Approval letter dated April 14, 2003 to Daniel Bonow of QuikTrip Corporation, from Dorothy Chimel, Acting Planning Director regarding the Site Plan Modification for this site.
4. **Provide a revised landscape plan that incorporates an additional plant material in the foundation base landscaping across the front elevation of the building. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.**
5. **All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be fully screened and shall be painted to match the primary building color and they must be incorporated into the landscape plan. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.**
6. **Provide a 6' wrought iron fence around the north retention area plus surveillance cameras. This allows surveillance of the rear yard.**
7. **Provide textured concrete within both driveways, signs installed at both driveways alerting drivers to heavy pedestrian traffic, and two inward-facing flashing lights positioned as warning signs which flash during school hours to warn vehicles of the potential of pedestrian traffic (one for each driveway).**
8. **The canopy over the front entrances be widened 16" to 24" on either side.**
9. **The split face pilasters on either side of the canopy over the front entrance be widened to 16" to 24".**
10. **Delete the artificial stone from the project.**
11. **Provide a split face, single score 8 X 8 planter, either side of the entrance to the first pilaster or all the way to the end of the building.**
12. **Delete the raised planters on the east and west ends of the building.**
13. 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.
14. 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.
15. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with the Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
16. 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.
17. Screen all parking areas and vehicular circulation aisles adjacent to the public right of way. The screen walls along the street frontage should be varied in alignment, broken up with naturally contoured berming and staggered dense shrubs to achieve a continuous screen of no less than 36 inches above the highest adjacent grade.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

18. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
19. Provide 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.

Discussion: Boardmember Rob Burgheimer did not agree with the use of split face for the base of the building. He suggested Superstone or a different color. To be worked out with staff.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is an improvement to the corner.

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

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-39 **Higley Retail Shops**
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: This case be tabled.

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

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR03-39 be tabled:

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project needs to receive a Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit (SCIP) prior to being heard by the Design Review Board.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-58 **Coyote Landing**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: Northeast of NEC of Southern & Crismon
REQUEST: Approval of a 256 unit apartment complex
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Quail Run Apartments
APPLICANT: Broadbent & Associates
ARCHITECT: Tom O'Neill

REQUEST: Approval of a 256 unit apartment complex

SUMMARY: David Kincaid, Glen Walling, and Denise Burton represented the case. David Kincaid stated that the amount of landscaping had been increased adjacent to the stadium. He also stated that the previously approved density for this project was 326 units; they were proposing 256.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated there are grade differences between the high school and the apartments. He confirmed the grade difference at the property line was less than 1'. He confirmed that between the building closest to the school and the bleachers there was less than 3' of vertical difference. He was concerned with the design quality of the project, he felt there had been very few changes made since the July meeting. The site plan issues did not appear to have been addressed, the one primary building elevation was almost identical to what was previously reviewed. He acknowledged that the recreational building had been changed. He wanted the case continued again so the original concerns could be addressed. He was concerned with the layout and orientation of the buildings; he felt they still looked like row housing. He wanted the layout varied. He was concerned with the lack of ingress egress to the project. He stated the issue was not the building materials but the design of the buildings.

Mr. Kincaid then spoke and stated they had taken into account the concerns addressed at the July meeting. He stated that the design considerations of the site plan were constrained by City of Mesa design considerations. The retention basin policy creates design constraints. He understood that they couldn't have additional driveways into the project. Fire Codes that require fire lanes to each building. These restrictions made designing this L-shaped property difficult. They wanted the buildings to be north-south orientation for energy efficiency. The coloration issues can be changed. He stated they were willing to provide concealed roof vents.

Chair Carie Allen then asked how the three-color schemes had been worked out.

Glen Walling then spoke and stated that he had given the design team the direction to do what ever was necessary to have everyone happy. Mr. Walling stated that the retention area was equal to 4 acres of land. He admitted the buildings looked like row housing. He stated he would prefer the buildings be less row like, however they were doing everything they could in order to not build three story buildings.

Boardmember Vince DiBella understood that they needed to have fire lanes; however, he still felt they could stagger the buildings, and have the parking along the school side of the project. Regarding the building elevations, he did not see much change from the July meeting.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember John Poulsen stated that he and Chair Carie Allen had recently toured some affordable housing projects in Phoenix, and one of those projects had five different building types within the complex. In this project there is one building type that is repeated throughout the entire project. He did not see much creativity or imagination in that. He felt the building itself looked like something that would have been approved in the 70's or 80's. He felt the buildings needed more creativity, more imagination and more interest.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen did not feel the changes that had been made to the site plan benefited them. The sport courts and tot lots were crammed into little corners that weren't functional, such as a tot lot next to parking lot, and a sport court that has been reduced in size and jammed in behind a building. She felt the amenities were better in the first site plan. She felt that they could improve the amenities if the buildings were clustered in groupings/pods with courtyards. She stated that what the Board wanted was not necessarily for the buildings to be at different angles. What they wanted the applicant to look at was how the buildings come together, what they are looking out on, how they can maximize the use of the space that is left. She agreed that one building design for such a large complex was not enough. There needed to be more variation, not just different colors. She agreed that some people don't like three story buildings, if they had a few three story buildings to get rid of the same massing throughout the project, it would provide different building elevations, and there would be more interest in the roof lines.

Boardmember Randy Carter was concerned that the elevations and the building sections did not match, especially the gables. He agreed with the previous comments regarding the site plan. Regarding the buildings he understood that they wanted the same elevations in order to keep the construction costs as low as possible; however he felt there were things that could be done that would not increase the costs substantially. He felt the building was very flat. He suggested using a double gable, as another entrance piece. There was a very long beam shown on the working drawing, and he was worried about deflection over time. Because there was such high density there did not appear to be the practical nuances of good construction techniques; providing citizens with a building that would stay attractive for a long period of time. He wanted the building redesigned. Regarding the color, he felt they needed to be changed and the way they were used on the various buildings needed to be carefully looked at. He also wanted more difference between the colors so they are not so monochromatic.

Mr. Walling then stated that this project is not low-income; it is a market rate project that has tax credits. Which means that those making \$40,000 or less have the opportunity to get reduced rents within the project.

Chair Carie Allen then stated that she had slips from four citizens who wished to speak regarding this case. She reminded everyone that the Design Review Board was there to look at site layout, elevations, landscaping and parking.

Carol Shepherd spoke and stated that she was the Vice President of the Crismon Crossing Homeowners Association. Her community was concerned with the elevations and the design of the project. The cookie cutter appearance, the colors of the project. She had visited one of this company's projects and felt it was very regimented and structured, and in her opinion, very ugly. What they wanted was for the project to be a successful, sustainable project that would blend with any commercial that develops on the adjacent property. They wanted it to be part

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

of the neighborhood. They want to see shops and the types of things mentioned in the presentation by Mr. Mulligan at the beginning of the meeting, but they want them done nicely. They want this project to be done nicely and be a pleasant place. They think it could be a village concept with the multi-levels, three story, two story, and one story. They were concerned about ingress and egress onto Crismon. They were concerned that with the high school driveway so close to the apartment driveway that it could become a convenient way to beat the light. They were also concerned that this driveway would like up with the driveway into their residential subdivision, which is gated. She suggested the apartment project driveway be gated also.

Charles Stock spoke as a homeowner and as a member of the Parkwood Ranch Homeowners Association. He stated that the buildings and landscaping presented to the homeowners at the meeting six months before were vastly different from what was presented at this meeting. He stated that they were shown a rendering of a building with very lush landscaping. He stated that Mr. Kincaid knew how difficult it would be to fit the project onto the site before they bought the land. He stated that the Homeowners Board felt Mr. Kincaid had grossly misled them. They were not opposed to apartments because they knew the property was zoned for apartments. He stated that his association represented 1,400 homes. He had listened to Mr. Mulligan speak about upscale neighborhoods and he did not feel this project was creating an upscale neighborhood. He agreed with the Board comments. He understood that the zoning allows for a maximum of 326 units, but maybe the way this site lays out 256 units is too many.

Ken Meitzner then spoke. He stated that his primary concern was the Crimson entrance. He thanked the Board for being conscientious about what the project would look like when built and into the future. He wanted to know what the buildings would actually look like constructed. He understood the term barracks construction; he stated they were four walls and a roof with no character. He wondered if the buildings presented would meet minimum standards. He was concerned this project would be "plain jane". Apartments will be standing long after many of these people are gone and too many apartments have no eye appeal at all. He wanted to see an attractive, pleasing, functional project to fit the neighborhood. He felt the noise from the high school, in particular, the band, would be a problem for future tenants. He was concerned that the school might be made to alter some of their activities due to complaints from future tenants. The school was there first. He was concerned with the entrance drive on Crismon. He stated that their homeowners already have a problem with traffic from the Post Office on Southern, and this will create a problem with their entrance onto Crismon.

Roberta Cullen stated that they knew there would be apartments at this location; however, they had hoped they would be attractive apartments. She did not think their use of land was good; there is a park two minutes away they could get rid of some of their "stuff". She liked the clustering idea. She was not opposed to some of the buildings being three stories so long as they were not all three story. She did not feel renters would want to stay and take pride in their home. She wanted the colors to match their homes and enhance the mountains. She wanted more landscaping. She was glad to hear the Board felt the same way the homeowners did.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated he had some concerns about the process. He stated that he did not want to send the message that the board is anti-development. He heard everyone say that they were in favor of apartments, so the issue was not apartments in

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

general. He was concerned that the applicants had stated they had been working through this process for nine months. He was also concerned with interdisciplinary problems within the City.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that Engineering would allow multiple basins; this project has two basins that are connected.

Denise Burton stated the Engineering Division had told them that three would be the maximum number of basins they could have and they had two. She stated that at one time they had a site plan that clustered the buildings but it was not acceptable, although she could not remember why. She stated that the buildings had been moved so that as you enter from Southern you would see landscaping and the recreation building.

Mr. Walling then stated that he knew that those buildings have six or seven extensions of walls out to the front of the main building, and when you build that in reality and go out there you don't have a barracks look. He knew it looked like barracks on the drawings but how do you draw in two dimensions that there are six or seven walls popping out from the building and there are balconies. He stated that these are a long way from what was built in the 70's. They were cracker boxes, he knows because his grandfather built them.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen stated that there is such a mass in there with the size of the building and the roof; that the predominant thing is going to be the same roof, the same façade marching along, and although there may be a small portion of wall that sticks out that won't make up for the mass of the building. She felt that the biggest thing that needed to be done was different elevations, and combinations of three and two story buildings.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer felt that the idea of three story buildings was a very good suggestion, if they were in the middle of the project. He did not understand why the transportation division would not allow additional driveways.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated the driveway guidelines address the width of the property. There was enough linear footage on Southern to allow two driveways.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that he felt the project fell short of the creative potential the Board wanted to see.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen stated that she wanted to see a village feel to the project.

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested looking into what the Fire Department distance requirements would be for the buildings were fire sprinkled. He felt the colors were too muted.

Boardmember Hagen felt the front of the building was too large to have only two colors. She wanted to see at least three or four colors.

Boardmember Poulsen felt that the colors were so similar it would be very difficult to distinguish a difference in daylight.

Mr. Walling stated he was willing to change the orientation of the buildings at the northeast corner of the project, change the colors, and put gates on the entries. He stated that they had to have C of O's on these buildings by the end of 2004 to get the tax credits.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Carter confirmed Mr. Walling was willing to go to some three-story buildings.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated it would be helpful to have their architect at the meeting.

Boardmember Carter stated that they have not really talked about the changes that need to be made to the building: the massing, how the roof comes together, how the gables work, the colors placement, the size of the windows.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that there are projects in Scottsdale that are high end, but are the same construction materials as project in the east valley. The difference is that they took more time on the proportions, how they were oriented, where they used the materials. He wanted the applicants to understand that they are not saying they have to spend more money. He wanted to help the applicant through the process.

Boardmember Poulsen did not understand why they insisted on using only one building type. He stated that he had never seen a project of this size come through the process with only one building duplicated this many times. He understood that they had been going through the process for a long time, but felt they were proposing a concept that was never going to be acceptable.

Boardmember Carter asked if their architect was available.

Mr. Walling stated they would have one available one way or the other.

Boardmember Hagen stated that the Board does not want to design their project, picking the colors was not their responsibility. They should come prepared with good architecture and a good site plan.

Boardmember Carter suggested that maybe the Board could have a special meeting for this project.

Mr. Walling stated he wished he had been told they couldn't build just one building type.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated she had tried to talk to the applicants, she had shown them examples of successful projects. She had also told the applicants it was important to have the architect present at the meetings because the architect would understand what the Board was asking for.

Mr. Walling stated that not all architects perform well in front of Boards.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that if the Board were to have a special meeting he would suggest having representatives of the Engineering Division, and Streets and Transportation at the meeting. He stated that they were not anti-development. They were trying to help them through the process.

Boardmember Carter stated that everyone wants the project to be successful. The applicant wants to be able to rent the units. The homeowners live next to it, and it's important for them to have a nice looking project, next to their nice looking homes.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR03-58 be continued to the October 1, 2003 meeting, unless staff schedules an intermediate meeting.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that a few members of the Board could meet with the applicants to review the changes, in process, to help them along.

The applicants were concerned that they would need to go back through the Planning and Zoning process if they made significant changes to the project.

Acting Planning Director Dorothy Chimel stated that there could be changes to the site plan approved by the Design Review Board. Her recommendation to the City Council would be that they not approve the project until the Design Review Board was satisfied.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: To allow the applicant to redesign the project.

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

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-66 **Wilson Office**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 3960 East Broadway
REQUEST: Approval of a 3,416 sq. ft. office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Barry & Paulette Pietz
APPLICANT: Steven Wilson
ARCHITECT: Cameron Miles

REQUEST: Approval of a 3,416 sq. ft. office building

SUMMARY: Steven Wilson and Cameron Miles represented the case.

Boardmember Randy Carter stated the building design was better than the design presented in the previous meeting; however, he was concerned with the blue color selection in its context and how it related with the other colors. He also wanted the wainscot to continue around the building. He agreed with staff concerning the bronze colored glass block, he suggested using clear rippled surface block. Mr. Miles stated they had chosen the bronze to help with heat gain. Mr. Carter wanted the blue changed. He suggested choosing a color in the same tones as the other colors shown.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen confirmed that staff had concerns with the choice of light fixtures. She agreed the wainscot needed to continue around the rear of the building, and that the glass block color seemed foreign. She suggested the blue color be replaced with olive or sage. She also wanted the color of the light fixtures to go with the colors of the building. She understood they were trying to reduce the heat in the rear; however, the size of the windows was a concern. They seemed out of proportion.

Boardmember John Poulsen agreed with the previous comments. He felt the stucco fascia needed to be a different color. He felt the building materials were very inexpensive and asked for the wainscot to continue around the rear. He felt asking for the windows in the rear to be changed was not asking much. It was a very basic plain building.

Boardmember Vince DiBella was disappointed with the redesign. He had hoped they would use masonry, but the stucco was OK. He agreed the wainscot needed to continue around the rear. He suggested adding articulation to the wainscot with score lines to give it some detail and finesse as opposed to just a color change as proposed. He felt the west elevation needed score lines to break up the mass. He agreed the blue color was an issue.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer agreed with all the previous comments. He understood it was a modest building. He felt the blue was the wrong color and suggested green. He wanted the rear of the building broken up. He felt there were design opportunities for this building that were being missed. For example, the placement of the light fixtures and how they are being used. It would not cost more but could help the building.

Chair Carie Allen agreed with the comments. She did feel they had made an improvement over the previous submittal. She would have liked to have seen block or some stone. She did not like the choice of blue.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR03-66 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. Revise at least one parking space adjacent to the two large tree islands in the parking lot to incorporate an extruded curb and a 16' stall depth rather than a concrete curb. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.
5. **Revise the building elevations to address the following concerns:**
 - a. **Incorporate decorative light fixtures in place of the black wall packs presented. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.**
 - b. **Utilize a color of glass block that matches the windows for the rest of the building.**
 - c. **Extend the wainscot detail around the entire building. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.**
6. A land split is required if the intent is to have separate ownership of the existing building and the proposed building. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
7. **Provide scoring lines on the building. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
8. **Provide awnings over the windows that don't have an arch on the front elevations. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
9. If freestanding signs are proposed for this site, Design Review Board approval of the sign design is required.
10. 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.
11. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
12. 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 6 – 0

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

Recorded on Tape No.: 2 (side B) Tape 3 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-72 **Bank One**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Guadalupe and Ellsworth
REQUEST: Approval of a 6,479 sq. ft. bank
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Bank One Corporation
APPLICANT: DPA Architects
ARCHITECT: John Szafran

REQUEST: Approval of a 6,479 sq. ft. bank

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

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR03-72 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 and compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations Technical Review requirements.
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 are to be located within the building.
6. . Provide two half-size color elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 7 - 0

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

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-69 **Medical Office AZ Health & Technology Park**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC Sunview and Baseline
REQUEST: Site Plan and Phase 1 consisting of five- 5,000 sq.ft. medical office buildings of a 17-building, 130,000 sq. ft. of office park.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Mesa Arizona Real Estate Investment (Denver, CO)
APPLICANT: Jere Planck, Archicon
ARCHITECT: Archicon, LC

REQUEST: Approval of five 5,000 sq. ft. medical office buildings and a 17 building 130,000 sq. ft. office park.

SUMMARY: Jere Planck represented the case. He explained the history of the overall project. He stated there are 40 acres to be developed within the AZ Health and Technology Park campus. This project is for development of 13.4 acres. He stated that what they were presenting was an overall site plan, but the owner wanted to phase the project. He was presenting four 5,000 sq. ft. buildings; the 8,000 sq. ft. building at the intersection was not part of the proposal. Additionally, south of the drive aisle was a 5,000 sq. ft. building and there would be a surgery center: they were not presenting the surgery center at this time.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen confirmed that Building A was the 5,000 sq. ft. building.

Mr. Planck stated the four buildings north of the intersection were the 5,000 sq. ft. buildings. Both entrances into the north piece would be in phase I, including the drive aisle connection out into Sunview Drive.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed they were reviewing five buildings.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen confirmed that the fifth building was out of the phase line. She also confirmed they were reviewing the entire site plan for approval.

Mr. Planck then stated the issue of patient drop-off zones had been brought up in the Planning and Zoning phase. He stated there was 110,000 sq. ft. of buildings presented in this site plan and there was an additional 30 acres to be developed in the park. He felt the chances of all of the campus being developed as medical to include drop off zones was economically unfeasible. There could not be 400,000 sq. ft. of medical uses. He felt it would be a mixture of office and medical buildings. Along Baseline, the original master plan designated some of that could possibly be retail, as long as it did not become retail of over 50,000 sq. ft. So he felt the office complexes would be a combination of medical or medical support office, non-patient seeing office. There were no tenants yet.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated it could be an HMO.

Mr. Planck stated that the issue was where patient drop-off should be. There was a fair amount of handicap parking on-site and there was a series of drive aisles. The site plan showed seven different patient drop-off locations; however, there was not one at every building. They were mainly where the crosswalks cross the drive aisles.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated that the surgical center when developed in the future would have licensing problems if there are not patient drop off zones.

Boardmember Vince DiBella asked if the five buildings they were reviewing, with similar footprints would be identical and if the larger buildings would be mirror images of each other.

Mr. Planck stated that the intent was that the design would be based on usage. The four speculative buildings would be developed, as tenants were located. In the design guidelines there was a series of types of windows proposed: from punched openings to windows at the entries, big chunks of windows or banded windows, and they will change in combination as they come through. The buildings would not be all the same. The first five would be the same color palette.

Boardmember DiBella stated that that idea speaks directly to adding more colors. If the buildings are going to be individually designed adding more colors doesn't do much because the building design will dictate what materials you use and how much color you use.

Boardmember Hagen stated she did not understand, whether they were approving all the buildings at this time, with the understanding that they would all be built differently?

Mr. Planck stated that the Board was reviewing five 5,000 sq. ft. buildings and the other buildings would come back in the future.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated that on the color issue he could see where there could be pairs of colors. Maybe the building by the future surgery center would be different tones of the color palette. He did not want it to look like Disneyland.

Mr. Planck stated that where the four colors came from was that the school was built before the design guidelines were approved, so the colors were taken from the school. Mr. Planck stated they had no problem adding more colors. What they would like to do is add tones on either side of the palette to give more variety to choose from so the different buildings would complement color wise but could be in a tone difference up or down.

Boardmember Randy Carter questioned whether for the rest of the development were they talking about taking these architectural elements, and redistributing them on the different buildings, or are they talking about significantly different design?

Mr. Planck stated they were talking about redistributing the elements on different buildings. He stated on the one story building the center element at the entry has a big glass pane. This detail is taken from the school. When it is used on a two-story building it becomes substantially larger; a two-story large glass element. So it is essentially the same element on two different sized buildings.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that he considered color to be the issue. He did not have a problem with the building. He was concerned about the site plan issue because Buildings 13 and 14 could end up being one large building.

Mr. Planck stated that if that were to occur they would come back through with a revised site plan with the elevations for the new building.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Burgheimer was uncomfortable approving a fairly large site plan that could easily change.

Boardmember Hagen felt the Board should only be looking at Phase I. She confirmed that the surgical center would now be in Phase II.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated he would prefer to approve the Phase I site plan only with the agreement that a surgical center would be located in the corner. There were too many changes that may occur with the remainder of the complex.

Boardmember Hagen was concerned with the location of the patient drop-off areas. She understood that they did not know which tenants would be medical, but obviously some of them would be and how were they going to accommodate that. She stated she could not find any drop-off locations on the site plan.

Mr. Planck stated there were five locations where the crosswalks crossing the parking lot served as drop off zones. He stated that when they design a master site plan they look at the grading on the site and the master site plan. He was concerned that if the Board approved phase I the owner would not know what he could build on the site, because the approval eliminated over half the site; the owner doesn't know what he has.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that this site plan is currently going through the Planning and Zoning process with a recommendation of approval by the Planning and Zoning Board. The developer will know what he has when it is approved by City Council.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that the Board's concerns regarding approval of Phase II was that they did not want to lock themselves in down the road. He felt the approval could work for the owner and it could work against him. They did not want to give the owner carte blanche.

Boardmember Hagen did not know how this Board could approve a site plan without knowing what the buildings would look like.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that they did not even know the size or footprint of the Phase II buildings.

Mr. Planck stated that as long as the client knew that he could get 110,000 sq. ft. of buildable space his client would be satisfied. He understood that Phase II would have to come through the Design Review Board.

There was discussion regarding patient drop off zones. It was agreed that if they were not required at this time it would be very difficult to have them added in the future. Mr. Planck felt that drop-off zones were unnecessary because handicap spaces are already at the front of the buildings. Boardmember Hagen stated that not everyone who needs to be dropped-off is handicapped. Many people only need temporary help. The project only has 4 parking spaces more than the minimum required for medical uses. Boardmember Hagen was concerned that if all the buildings did become medical they would not be able to add the drop-off zones because they don't have any room for them. Mr. Planck stated that if they design them now they will be under parked and then they would lose square footage for their buildings. Boardmember Hagen stated that the applicant would not be able to have all medical uses

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

because they would lose parking spaces to accommodate the drop-off zones which then would not allow enough parking for all of the buildings to be medical. Boardmember Carter felt that there were places where additional parking could be added.

Boardmember Carter was concerned with some of the parking stalls and the ability for vehicles to back out safely.

Boardmember Vince DiBella wanted a stipulation that with Phase II the issue of drop-off zones must be resolved.

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested that the buildings now shown as 15, 16 and 17 be two-story which would allow more space for drop-off zones and additional parking.

Mr. Planck stated that this owner has designed one-story buildings for phase I.

Boardmember Burgheimer understood that due to the size of these buildings; however for the larger buildings two-story could easily work. He understood that this site had been maxed out.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR03-69 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, **for the 5,000 sq. ft. buildings and Phase I only, with conceptual approval for Phase II**, 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. 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. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
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 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. **Allow the applicant the option of at least two additional color palette variations consisting of related groups of colors to be applied to the different size medical office buildings. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
9. **The applicant to work with staff to resolve the issue of parking spaces.**
10. **Patient drop off areas are to be reviewed with the Phase II submittal.**

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0 (Boardmember Poulsen left prior to this case)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is consistent with the Design Guidelines approved for AZ Health & Technology Park.

Recorded on Tape No.: 3 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

as mechanical shafts and exit stairs along the walls that prevented them from putting the windows closer together. They were trying to work with the existing conditions. Boardmember Hagen then suggested varying the window shapes and sizes.

Boardmember Burgheimer agreed that they could use a double unit pane in the tighter areas instead of trying to scrunch two of the same size units together or maybe go with a single larger unit. In other areas windows could be smaller, and maybe sill heights could be compressed.

Boardmember Hagen agreed and felt that would make it look office eclectic rather than like a motel.

Boardmember Randy Carter agreed that the colors were too bright. He was concerned with the shape of the entrance.

Mr. Fifer presented the Board with a rendering of the entrance.

Boardmember Randy Carter was concerned with the main entry, he was concerned that it looked planted on and the roof structure did not seem compatible with the remainder of the building. He suggested a parapet or a bowstring: something more design oriented. He was concerned with the dimension of the side panels and how that works together. He agreed it looked like a motel.

Boardmember Burgheimer felt there was an opportunity to make this non-descript center a really nice project. He felt they were close to pulling that off and they wanted to help him do that. He wanted the applicant to look at the windows and their interior function as they relate to the adjacent buildings; he wondered what view the person in the office would have if they are across from another building, so maybe the window could be taller so it brings in light. Changes like that would help the building not look like a motel. He liked the center section piece.

Boardmember Carter suggested moving that piece around to the side and then changed so that the grand entry was into the main reception area.

Mr. Fifer stated he was trying to change the entry area so that it would no longer look like a movie theatre. He also felt the gable gave it a residential look.

Boardmember Carter felt they went the wrong direction. He felt they should have gone to a commercial style look.

Boardmember Hagen agreed, it was a very large building and the gable was not going to make it look residential.

Boardmember Carter felt that if they wanted to make the building not look like a movie theatre they should have taken elements from the medical building within the center. He felt the north elevation was well done. He felt that if the entry were redone they would have a stronger building that would be good for the entire center and would fit in with the neighborhood. And the colors need to change.

Chair Carie Allen agreed with the suggestion to change the window sizes, and the entry

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

feature.

Discussion ensued regarding how the colors needed to change. It was suggested the colors be toned down to a more gray/brown look so the colors are not so bright. The field color was too strong and the red color would appear very red on that large a building. It was suggested they choose two colors they like and tone down the other two, having all four colors so strong was too much. There was a concern that these colors would not work on the remainder of the center, and they worried what would happen if the colors for the center were changed, how would they work with these colors. It was suggested the color palette needed a complement, they needed a cool color. The complement for the gold would be blue and the complement to red is green, and blue and green don't work together.

Boardmember DiBella cautioned that two thirds of this building was behind and around something so you won't see it from the street. He was concerned that if the colors were muted too much they would lose some of the impact.

There was concern that the building would be very orange to the residents behind the center. A majority of the Board stated they would not want to look at those colors from their backyards.

Boardmember Carter was concerned that they were adding stucco to a masonry building. If wondered if they should add a thicker wainscot or score lines. He was also concerned that the site plan did not match the elevations.

Boardmember DiBella was not comfortable stipulating the types of changes the Board was asking for. He felt the Board needed to see the changes.

Mr. Fifer confirmed that the Board wanted changes to the height and width of the windows. The windows needed to take on a different character, maybe a different shape or size. At the two-story space there could be two small windows with one big window, or glazing. Or the awnings could change. The building does not look symmetrical so try to make things look unique.

It was suggested the applicant make the changes and submit them to staff then some Boardmembers would go to the staff office and review the submittal and make comments. If there is a general consensus that the changes are good they could go forward; however, if the Boardmembers do not like the changes or there are differing opinions the case would be reviewed at the October 1st meeting.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR03-70 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. 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

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- ownership. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
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 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. **The applicant to come back to a future Design Review Board meeting with a revised/muted color palette. Include photos of the adjacent center so that the Board can assess the use of color on the rest of the center. To be approved by the Design Review Board.**
 12. **Redesign the side entry/gabled areas. To be approved by an ad hoc committee of Boardmembers.**
 13. **Redesign the window placement and sizes. To be approved by an ad hoc committee of Boardmembers.**

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0 (Boardmember Poulsen left prior to this case)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is

Recorded on Tape No.: (side A)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-71 **Greenfield Court Lot 5 office building**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: North of NWC Greenfield & Southern
REQUEST: Approval of two 3,600 sq. ft. office buildings
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Greenfield Court
APPLICANT: Woods Associates Architects
ARCHITECT: Fred Woods

REQUEST: Approval of two 3,600 sq. ft. office buildings

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

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR03-71 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. 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. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
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 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. **Provide fully screened masonry wall enclosures with gates for solid waste barrels.**
9. **All mechanical equipment, including SES panels, to be fully screened from view by a combination of masonry screen walls and landscaping.**

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The design and scale of the development as proposed with conditions addresses the intent of the zoning to provide a transition between the commercial uses and the residential uses.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-73 **Mountain View Plaza II**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1347 North Greenfield Road
REQUEST: Approval of 14,448 sq. ft. of office
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Glenwood Development
APPLICANT: Kathy Schimack
ARCHITECT: Douglas Sperr

REQUEST: Approval of a 14,448 sq. ft. office building

SUMMARY: During the study session the applicants agreed to add an employee area. This case was added to the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually.

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR03-73 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. **Provide an employee break area.**
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 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 7 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is compatible with the commercial center and the adjacent residential development.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-74 **Gateway Norte**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 4303 South Power
REQUEST: Approval of 24,610 sq. ft. of office/warehouse
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Trudy Licano, Northgate, LLC
APPLICANT: Michele Lorance
ARCHITECT: Robert Ball

REQUEST: Approval of 24,610 sq. ft. of office/warehouse

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

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR03-74 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. **Review and approval of parcel D-2 by the Design Review Board.**
5. **Any revisions to the design of the building elevations will require review and approval by the Planning Director.**
6. **Provide concrete or painted asphalt crosswalks between neighboring buildings.**
7. 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. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
8. 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.
9. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
10. 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.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is consistent with the architectural character established with the zoning case for the Gateway Norte subdivision.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Other Business:

Comments by the Board of a remodel of an existing shopping center at the northeast corner of Main and Power.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman showed the Board photos of the existing center and explained the proposed changes, which include additional landscaping and foundation planters, and repainting the center with more contemporary colors. The project was being reviewed as an administrative approval. The reason staff was bringing to the Board for comments was that the architect was proposing the use of wood trellises. Staff was concerned with the long-term durability of wood.

Boardmember Randy Carter wondered why the applicant didn't use metal.

The applicant stated he wanted to bring in more natural materials. He stated that if done properly wood could last as long as any other product. He stated that natural wood is being used in North Scottsdale, and the photos of other projects with wood were from the valley; however he also stated they were relatively new projects.

Boardmember Rob Burghiemer stated that the problem with wood long-term, and the projects in Scottsdale are using timbers or other large pieces of wood, which tend to hold up better than smaller pieces of wood.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen asked how thin the trellis pieces would be. The applicant stated they would be an awning structure that could be taken down to be maintained.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated he might be able to approve wood on the north elevation but not the south or west elevations.

Boardmember Carter stated that it is going to be natural wood it should stay natural wood and not be painted.

The applicant stated they were proposing to stain and seal the wood not paint it.

Boardmember Hagen stated that the Board needs to look at long-term maintenance and what may occur in the future if the project is under other management. She was concerned with the thinness of the members.

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested a compromise. A metal frame with wood slat members that could be removed and replaced with new members. That way the whole thing is not wood, and the individual members could be replaced. He wanted to see a detail of what they were proposing in a scale larger than 1/16.

The applicant stated it would be a lattice, a square stock material.

Boardmember Carter stated that 2" X 2"s wave and pop and break, just from the sun. If they were talking about a 2" X 6" or higher that would stand up better. He would not feel comfortable with a lattice.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Hagen was concerned that vines would grow up on it and then it would never be fixed.

The applicant stated he did want to overpower it with really heavy members.

Boardmember Hagen felt that the building was large enough that it didn't need to be very delicate.

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested the frame be robust wood pieces and the slats be something else.

Boardmember Carter suggested a bracket.

Then Boardmember Burgheimer stated there could be grillwork.

MOTION: It was moved by and Rob Burgheimer seconded by Randy Carter that the wood be approved with the following condition:

The applicant provide details to staff incorporating the Boards suggestions and E-mail them to Staffmember Laura Hyneman.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da