

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

February 7, 2007

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Lower Level of the Council Chambers 57 East First Street, at 3:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

MEMBERS ABSENT

Pete Berzins – Chair (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

Kim Steadman	Cindy Carpenter
Lesley Davis	Morgan Coyne
Debbie Archuleta	Vince Dalke
Mia Lozano Helland	Curtis Cleckly
Monique Spivey	Tim Lambson
John Wesley	Alisa Petterson-Dangelo
Jim Hash	Justin Hay
Krissa Lucas	Matt Hutchings
Ryan Matthews	Doug Himmelberger
Jeff McVay	Barry Dennis
Michael Quattrone	Fred Woods
Robert Pizorno	Scott Scharff
Steve Buckles	Sean Miller
Ryan Peterson	Others
Jeff Looker	
Laurie Buckels	

1. Work Session:

CASE: Ellsworth Crossing
9135 E Guadalupe

REQUEST: Approval of a shopping center

DISCUSSION: The applicant stated the project will be revised on the follow-up submittal, to have less shops square footage and two possibly three pad buildings.

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- No spandrel glass

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Liked the open roof element

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Provide shadow lines and screen lines on the follow-up submittal

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Curved element looks a little alien with the pitched roof elements
- Could there be a few more curved elements
- The towers seem too small in comparison to the curved element

CASE: Tutor Time
NWC Crismon & Baseline

REQUEST: Approval of a day care facility

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Very tall next to residential
- It's the height of a 2-story building

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Looks top heavy
- Why 22' ceilings for small children

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Trellis helps with scale
- Maybe use the trellis on the front

Boardmember Robert Burgheimer:

- Looks like an LA Fitness
- Very large building for a day care facility
- Out of scale for children
- A 35' tall single story building?
- Cornices are too large for the scale of the building
- Parapets could be lowered 3' to 4'

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Too tall

CASE: Hewson Greenfield Business Center
SWC Greenfield & Presidio

REQUEST: Approval of an office warehouse building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Elegant
- Confirmed not straight office

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Very nice way to break up a tilt building

CASE: Lowe's
Country Club & Kiowa

REQUEST: Approval of a home improvement store

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Work on the entry
- Panels should be textured
- Tower element on right elevation is too small
- More mass

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Spandrel glass looks fake
- Would rather see some other element used
- Could portions of the building be pulled down in scale
- Too busy
- Break up the form
- More movement
- It looks very large
- Could some parapets come down in height and only have AC units in the taller areas
- Could it look like three smaller buildings
- Higher in front, lower in the rear
- Can't be a prototype Lowe's
- Needs to address the issue of breaking down the scale
- Need to really address the outdoor garden area

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Too much blue
- More mass
- Garden center seem tacked on
- A lot of small fussy details on some areas and then long blank areas
- Some of the elements compete with the entry and signage

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Questioned the main street theme on a Lowe's
- Needs a human scale
- You need to go even further than the Lowe's on Ellsworth
- Hierarchy of the building to address neighbors letter to make it softer and campus

like

- Trees will soften the building and add to a campus feel

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Thought main street theme could work
- Covers for roof drain scuppers should not look like Lowe's logo
- Don't go halfway with detailing carry it down the building
- Work on loading dock near neighbors

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Could the entry shape be different?
- Incorporate trees at the building foundation base to soften the building

CASE: Mesa Ridge
2661, 2701, 2725 N Ogden

REQUEST: Approval of three office warehouse buildings

DISCUSSION: Vince Dahlke stated they would match the mullions on the adjacent project; however, the did not want to do the stepped columns

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- The columns are awkward
- The proportions are not right

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Need to break the line of the building
- Decorative scuppers
- The building is too boxy

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Adjacent project looks richer
- Needs more glazing
- Too plain
- The only glass is at the corner
- More shade and shadow

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Agreed it needed more windows

CASE: Shops A
344 S Power

REQUEST: Approval of a retail pad building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Nice scale
- It should be a nice asset to the corner

CASE: Starbucks
2750 E University

REQUEST: Approval of a retail building and a starbucks drive-thru

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Could they have one large building to eliminate the tunnel effect?

CASE: Dana Park Freeway Landmark Monument Sign
Val Vista & US 60

REQUEST: Approval of an FLMS

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Thought FLMS should be for the destination, not individual tenants
- This is a piece of architecture

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Would be a great office space
- Lighting inside would be very nice
- Likes that it is attached
- Ties in very well with the center
- The proportions on the black line elevation are good, the proportion on the color elevation look too thin

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Dana Park is a place, and this sign is very nice and anchors the center
- The sign fits the center
- The “legs” on the color elevation seem spindly
- Doesn’t feel monumental
- Could the element be considered a building with a height exception rather than a FLMS?
- This is integrated into the shopping center, not detached and separate

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- This is what FLMS should be like

CASE: Reilly Aviation
SEC McDowell & Greenfield

REQUEST: Approval of airplane hangars

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Look at the T-hangars approved at Williams Gateway

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- These are bone stock hangars
- There has to be more design

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Could they do a nice screen wall

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- The Board asks for more design for mini-storage facilities
- Why can't they have landscaping, there is landscaping along Greenfield?
- These are too plain

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- It's awful
- The sides of the buildings that can be seen from streets need to be improved
- Provide interesting metal; glass; cmu; something
- Needs color, texture, better material
- They should be working with the other developer

CASE: Coco's Neon
SEC Power & Hampton

REQUEST: Approval of neon addition to an existing restaurant

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- All the way around at the cornice

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Life of product is 12 years

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Snugged up at the lip of the fascia

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- It will have a purple shade
- Provide a detail of the trim with the follow-up submittal
- It ties into the architectural features rather than fighting them

2. Call to Order:

Vice-Chair Dave Richins called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the January 3, 2007, January 10, 2007, and January 24, 2007 Meetings:

On a motion by Tim Nielsen seconded by Wendy LeSueur the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

4. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-13 Monolith Storage and Retail

LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Southern Avenue and Ellsworth Road
REQUEST: Approval of a retail building and a self-storage facility
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Tony Ardizzone
APPLICANT: Don A. Andrews
ARCHITECT: Don A. Andrews Jr., AIA

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,500 sq. ft. retail building and a 91,964 sq. ft. self-storage facility

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR07-13 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. **Provide 25% plant materials in 2' foundation base along east exterior wall of retail building.**
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 FEBRUARY 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-14 Sanctuary on Higley
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Enid & Higley
REQUEST: Approval of a 26 lot townhome project
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: RSB Partners
APPLICANT: Woods Associates
ARCHITECT: Fred Woods

REQUEST: Approval of a 26 lot townhome project

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 DR07-14 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Provide exterior light fixture cut sheets. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.
 - b. Provide a building elevation with the patio walls. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff. Wall design to be as shown in the partial elevation "Forge Avenue Pedestrian Gate" on Sheet A-0.2.
 - c. Provide a colored ramada elevation with material/color information. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.
 - d. Provide a clear and complete landscape plan that provides specific plant locations and sizes. This landscape plan must be in conformance with the minimum landscape requirements established in Chapter 15 of the City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance.
 - e. Fully recess the SES in an appropriate location and paint to match the building. Staff to review and approve.
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 conditions of approval for zoning case, Z06-79.
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations.
6. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
8. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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 Tim Nielsen abstained)

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-15 California Pizza Kitchen
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1850 S Val Vista
REQUEST: Approval of a 6,022 sq. ft. restaurant
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: Mike Clements
APPLICANT: Moni Dosanjh
ARCHITECT: James Lencioni

REQUEST: Approval of a 6,022 sq. ft. restaurant

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-15 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Compliance with the Dana Ranch Village Square Design Guidelines (Z98-79).
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

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

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-16 Danny's Carwash
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 809 N Dobson
REQUEST: Approval of a 14,412 sq. ft. car wash
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: De Rito/Kimco
APPLICANT: Danny's Riverview
ARCHITECT: Edward Wimmer

REQUEST: Approval of a 14,412 sq. ft. car wash

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-16 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 street side drying canopy elevation to eliminate the raised parapet with the decorative cornice, painted "Walden's Pond" so that the design is consistent on all four sides of the canopy.
 - b. Provide elevations for the detail canopy between the carwash and the c-store buildings. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.
 - c. Revise the site plan to match the landscape plan, eliminating the sidewalk that leads from Dobson Road and continues along Mesa Riverview Drive.
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 Comprehensive Sign Plan for Mesa Riverview.
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Board of Adjustment (ZA07-009)
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.

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

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-17 Altier Credit Union

LOCATION/ADDRESS: Lot H Gateway Norte, Warner & Power
REQUEST: Approval of a 2,890 sq. ft. financial institution
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Harry Mateer, Altier Credit Union
APPLICANT: Chip Nix, KDA Holdings
ARCHITECT:

REQUEST: Approval of a 2,890 sq. ft. financial institution

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR07-17 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 FEBRUARY 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 18 Purrfect Auto

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 10559 E Main
REQUEST: Approval of a 7,072 sq. ft. auto repair and retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: AMG Development
APPLICANT: Jeff Looker
ARCHITECT: Jeff Looker

REQUEST: Approval of a 7,072 sq. ft. auto repair and retail building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR07-18 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Provide documentation of cross-access agreement with adjacent property to the west.
 - b. Pedestrian Connections to the existing center need to be in compliance with §11-15-5A(4) the states "the all connections must be made with the use of a durable surface material such as pavers, brick and/or concrete.
 - c. Heritage Live Oak tree that is proposed for directly north of the trash enclosure will impede trash service due to the encroachment with the enclosure.
 - d. Drive aisle on the east side of the building adjacent to the front of the must be a minimum of 24 feet (ft) per §11-16-2F.
 - e. Parking configuration on east side of the proposed building shall be changed to provide angled parking on the west side of the parking aisle in lieu of the head in parking that is proposed
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.

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

7. Subject to approval of a Substantial Conformance Incentive Permit (SCIP).
8. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-19 Southern Crismon Retail

LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Southern & Crismon
REQUEST: Approval of two retail buildings totaling 43,287 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: VJ Crismon
APPLICANT: Saemisch DiBella Architects
ARCHITECT: Vince DiBella

REQUEST: Approval of a two retail buildings totaling 43,287 sq. ft.

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-19 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Provide a reveal with a tonal shade difference around the base of the building with a wainscot height consistent with the height of the mullions. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.
 - b. Provide foundation base landscaping on the south side of building "C" per §11-15-3(C)2.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

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

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 20 Mt. Vista Marketplace Center

LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC Signal Butte & Southern

REQUEST: Approval of **Anchor A, Retail A, B, C, D, E (north side of Hampton)**; Retail F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, and O (south side of Hampton); as well as Shops A, B, C1, C2, D, and E (both sides of Hampton); within the Mountain Vista Marketplace shopping center.

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6

OWNER: US Real Estate LP

APPLICANT: Paul Gilbert

ARCHITECT: Sake Reindersma

REQUEST: Approval of a Anchor A, Retail A, B, C, D, E,; Retail F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, and O; and Shops A, B, C1, C2, D, and E

SUMMARY: Cindy Carpenter and Sake Reindersma represented the case, and presented revised plans.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought there should be more red stone. He confirmed they were planning to use the mesh screenwork on the rear elevations of the shops. He asked Mr. Reindersma to explain the depths of the changes in plane. He stated the elevations read like there is a pedestrian area customers can walk through; however there is not. He thought there should be more depth, especially at the trellis areas. He thought the center would be very nice. He stated he was still very unhappy with the City's requirements for Hampton. He wanted the changes in plane to be 3' to 5' so there would be actual walkways, where people can walk behind the elements.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought there was a lot of richness on the front elevations. He appreciated the additional texture being provided on the rear elevation.

Boardmember Dave Richins thought the project was very nice. He confirmed that the material changes on the east and west elevations of shops A would turn the corners.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur suggested they use architectural pots in front of the shops and retail buildings at key areas. She also suggested they use small raised planters for the foundation base landscaping so it won't be trampled.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley liked the idea of staggering the landscaping at the building. He wanted to see the paint changes on the arches recessed 1" to 2". He thought there should be a variety of landscape areas; some planters, some pots, some at grade.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed there would be score lines and also some pop-outs on shops A & B.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer liked the idea of using planters and providing areas people could walk through. He thought the trellis elements should come out 5'. He appreciated the variety of landscape material, and commended the Landscape Architect on the richness of the palette.

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Wendy LeSueur that DR07-20 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 presented at the meeting, 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 elevations to modify the massing of some of the stone materials in more visible locations and to create more texture and interest throughout. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.
 - b. Replace myoporum in the plant palette with another species.
 - c. Compliance with all requirements of Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - d. Provide light fixtures cut sheets for the overall center. This includes the selected light fixtures for the parking areas. Light fixtures in the parking areas are to be consistent throughout the development. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.
 - e. **Work with Design Review staff to develop a detail of pedestrian areas in front of the buildings. Double the size of the trellis areas.**
 - f. **Provide movement in front of shops and retail buildings.**
 - g. **Provide additional landscaping and planters in front of buildings.**
 - h. **Revise the rear elevations to show the mesh material.**
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. Approval of the rezoning and Site Plan Review request by City Council and compliance with all conditions of that approval.
5. Approval of a Comprehensive Sign Plan for the Mountain Vista Marketplace development by the Board of Adjustment. Elevations of the signage to receive Design Review approval.
6. Future buildings/developments within Mountain Vista Marketplace are to have a design relationship with the theme for the overall development. Design Review Board approval is required for all buildings within Mountain Vista Marketplace.
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.
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 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 FEBRUARY 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-21 Target at Mt. Vista Marketplace

LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC Signal Butte & Southern

REQUEST: Approval of a Super Target retail store within the Mountain Vista Marketplace shopping center.

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6

OWNER: US Real Estate LP

APPLICANT: Paul Gilbert

ARCHITECT: Sake Reindersma

REQUEST: Approval of a Super Target within Mountain Vista Marketplace shopping center

SUMMARY: Sake Reindersma represented the case and stated the revised elevations show the stone wrapping the corners.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur confirmed they would be using the red "Target" balls, not bollards.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed the trellis and columns were the same as on the shops buildings.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed they would be providing the mesh staff requested.

Boardmember Dave Richins did not the bollards to be red.

Boardmember thought the pop-outs needed to be no les than 8".

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought they had made a large box interesting.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR07-21 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 presented at the meeting 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 elevations to modify the massing of some of the stone materials in more visible locations and to create more texture and interest throughout. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.
 - b. Detail pavement surfaces in front of the Target
 - c. Replace myoporum in the plant palette with another species.
 - d. Compliance with all requirements of Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - e. Provide light fixtures cut sheets for the overall center. This includes the selected light fixtures for the parking areas. Light fixtures in the parking

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

areas are to be consistent throughout the development. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.

- f. Identify the fencing material and provide a sample of the screening materials that will be used behind the fencing of the garden center. The fencing material should be a material that has the appearance of wrought iron. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.
 - g. **Provide mesh material on the rear elevations.**
 - h. **Changes in plane to be substantial. At least 8".**
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. Approval of the rezoning and Site Plan Review request by City Council and compliance with all conditions of that approval.
 5. Approval of a Comprehensive Sign Plan for the Mountain Vista Marketplace development by the Board of Adjustment. Elevations of the signage to receive Design Review 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.
 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 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 22 Apartments at Mt. Vista Marketplace

LOCATION/ADDRESS: West of the SWC Signal Butte & Southern

REQUEST: Approval of an 17 building apartment project with a clubhouse within the Mountain Vista Marketplace development

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6

OWNER: US Real Estate LP

APPLICANT: Paul Gilbert

ARCHITECT: Sake Reindersma

REQUEST: Approval of a 17 building apartment project with a clubhouse within the Mt. Vista Marketplace development

SUMMARY: Curtis Cleckly represented the case.

Boardmember Dave Richins thought the color palette was plain. He wanted to see two color palettes with three colors each.

Boardmember Vince DiBella thought there was a lot of row configuration, and a lot of sameness of units. He thought additional color would help that. The window sizes are all the same, the units are all the same.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur agreed there needed to be more color.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought the end elevations needed to be more interesting.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley agreed the end elevations on building types 1,2, 3 were too plain, even if there were interior buildings. He did not like the Honey Blush color. He suggested some type of decorative ironwork at the windows and stone for the porticos/ breezeways. He was concerned that the colors always go all the way from top to bottom. There are a lot of windows with the same proportions.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the color needed to be revised. He did not think the colors harmonized well with the surrounding center. He thought the colors were too peach. He stated the project was not bad; however, it was basically stucco buildings with some shutters. He wanted to see some stone, or block, something from the center. He thought there should be subtle variation of color changes. Maybe wrought iron. He asked if some of the windows could have transoms, or different sills for the first floor windows, to provide some variety. He suggested using an 8" pop-out and a color change to break up the end elevations. He confirmed there would be ground mounted mechanical equipment with screen walls.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Wendy LeSueur that DR07-22 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- a. Provide a minimum of 2 color palettes for the buildings that are compatible with the Mountain Vista Marketplace shopping center. Details to be approved by Design Review staff.
- b. Where the ends of the buildings are adjacent to a public street or in very visible locations, use the proposed end elevations with more design interest. The simpler end elevation is appropriate where buildings abut. Details to be approved by Design Review staff.
- c. Replace myoporum in the plant palette with another species.
- d. Compliance with all requirements of Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance.
- e. Provide light fixtures cut sheets for the overall center. This includes the selected light fixtures for the parking areas. Light fixtures in the parking areas are to be consistent throughout the development. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.
- f. Provide elevations of the screen wall and gates for the trash compactor. Details to be approved by Design Review staff.
- g. Provide a pedestrian path with a decorative surface that links all buildings within the development with one another and the central node of the complex. Details to be approved by Design Review staff.
- h. **Work with staff to revise the end elevations on building types 1, 2, and 3.**
- i. **Provide a change in plane where the color changes occur.**
- j. **Provide additional material at the lower sections and the entry breezeways.**
- k. **Provide additional paint colors and change the peach colors. Paint choices should integrate better with the shopping center.**
- l. **Look at changing the detailing of the windows.**
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. Approval of the rezoning and Site Plan Review request by City Council and compliance with all conditions of that approval.
5. Approval of a Comprehensive Sign Plan for the Mountain Vista Marketplace development by the Board of Adjustment. Elevations of the signage to receive Design Review 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.
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 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-23 Pecos Commerce Center

LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC Pecos + 80th Street (east of Sossaman)

REQUEST: Approval of two 26,731sf office/warehouse buildings
and four 42,232sf office/warehouse buildings

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6

OWNER: Pecos Commerce Center LLC

APPLICANT: Michael Hill

ARCHITECT: Robert Ball

REQUEST: Approval of two 26,731 sq. ft. office/warehouse buildings and four 42,232 sq. ft. office/warehouse buildings

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR07-23 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Provide full 15' foundation base width along entry elevations, including landscape area/planters.
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 FEBRUARY 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-24 Quick N Clean Carwash

LOCATION/ADDRESS: S of the SEC of Power and University
REQUEST: Approval of a car wash building and accessory shade canopies
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Richard Karle
APPLICANT: Richard Karle
ARCHITECT: JMS & Associates

REQUEST: Approval of a car wash building and accessory shade canopies

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur was concerned with the height of the tower element.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer agreed the tower was tall for its size. He wanted the whole thing dropped down.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley confirmed they would not be lowering only the EIFS but reducing the whole tower so it would be proportional.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR07-24 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Provide an exhibit with the roll-up doors down at each end of the car wash tunnel; Staff to review and approve.
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 FEBRUARY 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Other Business:

Staff to present approved elevations for Riverview Auto Mall projects:

Staffmember Kim Steadman explained the changes made to the River Auto Mall project.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated that although the revised colors were not what the Board had discussed at the meeting, he thought the color was better than the white originally proposed.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen was disappointed the applicants were so unwilling to make the change the Board had conditioned.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley agreed the gray was more palatable than the white.

The meeting adjourned at 7:18

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da