

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MAY 2, 2007

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Lower Level of the Council Chambers 57 East First Street, at 2:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

MEMBERS ABSENT

Vince DiBella

OTHERS PRESENT

Kim Steadman	Blair Leach
Lesley Davis	Andy Sarat
Debbie Archuleta	Kevin Paige
Mia Lozano Helland	Rob Scrivo
Monique Spivey	Steve Hendera
John Wesley	Tyler Wright
Joseph Holasek	Sean Wood
Al Capello	Fred Woods
Scott Nye	Brent Almquist
Ward Hollon	Doug Himmelberger
Jeff Welker	David Bender
Don Marjher	Michelle Watanabe
Tony Cooper	
Ryan kennel	
Mike Larson	
Dennis Sadler	
Geoff Cox	
Liz Gaston	
Chuck Nixon	
Boyd Thacker	
Matt Sargent	
Joe Diemer	
Stephen Weyenberg	
Richard Ibach	
Trish Flower	
David Smith	
Sherry Anderson	
Carl Lawson	
Gary Snapp	
David Udall	
Michael Jorgensen	
Mike Elmore	

1. Work Session:

CASE: Arco AM/PM
SWC University & Lindsay

REQUEST: Review of a gas station, convenience store, and car wash

DISCUSSION:

Dave Richins:

- Brick veneer helps
- Rear elevation too plain

Tim Nielsen:

- Stronger cap
- Stronger reveal screeds
- Planters along the front

Wendy LeSueur:

- Cerews would be good plant for foundation
- Need more color variation
- Darker at the base

Rob Burgheimer:

- Concerned with the look of the gas canopy
- Canopy should be broken up

Tom Bottomley:

- Maybe planters extending 1/3 of each side from the glass
- Beef up screen

CASE: Circle K
NWC Power & Brown

REQUEST: Review of a gas station and convenience store

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Too much red stripe
- Too tall
- Roof too heavy
- 28' is close to 2-story height
- Don't use 50/50 proportions
- Make the canopy nicer

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Concern stripes are signage
- Entrance is stubby
- Maybe scored stucco instead of stripes
- Concerned with antique penny color, it is very dark
- Colors clash

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Unsupported overhang looks heavy

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Columns on site plan don't appear on the elevations
- Overhang appears heavy from the side

CASE: Fry's Fuel Center
1221 E McKellips

REQUEST: Review of a gas canopy and kiosk

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Use stone on the columns to match the Fry's and soften the column
- Can't they use something else besides bollards; like planters box or pots

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Concrete pots would be great instead of bollards

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Use stone on columns
- The canopy needs something to give a shadow line

CASE: Sandstone Industrial
465 S Robson

REQUEST: Review of an industrial office

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Worried about distance from parking to a lot of the suites
- Windows look very residential
- Use commercial windows

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The walkway in front of the suites is too narrow, it isn't safe
- This case should come back as a work session case

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Need more movement
- Don't like Alamo looking elements
- The two elements are at odds with each other
- Too flat
- 4" not enough movement
- The :: accents are too random above the two bay doors
- Along the alley should be exit only, the entrances need to be from the private drive

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Wants a CEPTED review of the project
- You need doors from the private drive, not the narrow walkway

CASE: GarageTown USA
3309 S Power

REQUEST: Review of a mini-storage facility

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Facades need to have returns

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Concerned 60' may not be enough room to maneuver large motor coaches
- Stone is only at entry then all stud and stucco

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Fan palms at entrance would prefer Date Palms, they are more stately

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Should have more stone or masonry along the Power frontage
- Why not tilt-up
- There are a lot of things you can do with tilt like exposed aggregate

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Concerned the stucco will not hold up well
- Maybe just at certain places

CASE: Chatham MOB
221 S Power

REQUEST: Review of a medical office building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Likes the clerestory windows

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Could center of rear elevation come up a little
- Likes the windows

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Masonry at center of rear should come up higher
- Rusty red color might go better with the stone, just look at it

CASE: Odyssey Medical
Crismon & Baseline

REQUEST: Review of a medical office complex

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Nice looking buildings
- It's fun
- The sawtooth element distracts, could it be a larger cut out
- The windows with the purple element look a little ordinary
- Look at a different material for the accents, maybe metal

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Likes the colors, they are subtle

CASE: Goodyear Tire
Crismon north of Baseline

REQUEST: Review of a tire store

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Likes the triangle shaped landscape island

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Show the reveal screeds on the follow-up submittal

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Mondel pines and Mesquite don't work together, delete the pines
- No room for plants at the trellis, so use ornamental iron
- Provide sample or detail of the iron with the follow-up submittal

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Choose a common field color from the adjacent Odyssey project

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- The rust color is very bold
- Pick up some color from the adjacent office project
- Don't match all of their colors

CASE: Red Mountain Promenade
6663, 6715, 6747 E McDowell

REQUEST: Review of two restaurants and a retail building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The rest of the shopping center is a little too much
- Doesn't want this to match exactly

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Looks very retail
- Make the recessed areas less retail

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Should the new buildings simplify the architecture of the center?
- Maybe more stone and fewer colors

CASE: Mammoth Equities Retail and Office
S of SEC Power & McDowell

REQUEST: Review of retail buildings and an office complex

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Ficus are very susceptible to frost
- Palm trees look like a row of phone poles
- Use stone at some key places
- Simplify the plantings
- Could the columns break the stone?
- Likes the green glass

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Looks like 1980's Scottsdale
- Tile could be at columns

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Entrance should be taller
- Columns seem spindly
- The end units look hokey
- Too Taos
- Medallions look too predictable

CASE: SanTan Crossing Office Condos
NWC Guadalupe & Loop 202

REQUEST: Review of an office complex

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Likes the recessed windows
- Use reveals at paint changes

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- No pink oleanders
- Evergreen Elm doesn't work with Palo Verde
- Bring in sculptural plants

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Likes the recessed windows

CASE: SanTan Crossing at LeSueur Estates
W of NWC Guadalupe & Loop 202

REQUEST: Review of a retail center

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Cornices need to be 4-sided

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- No pink oleanders
- Evergreen Elms don't work with Palo Verde
- Too many sage bushes in the islands

CASE: Goodwill Power Center
14207 S Power

REQUEST: Review of a retail store

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Glad they are not using wood

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Likes it
- Center the signage

CASE: Mesa Center Point Plaza
NEC Signal Butte & Guadalupe

REQUEST: Review of a retail center

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Columns should go to the bottom
- Finish the returns of the cornices

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Do some berming in the landscaping
- Plants need to be more fluid
- Landscaping is too spotty
- Sculpt the plantings
- Provide more texture
- Buildings too tall, reduce the height

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The beige area on the columns should be recessed
- The colors are not consistent
- The way they some elements are colors and others are not looks haphazard
- Paint is not consistent
- Looks like they forget to paint some sections
- The spandrel glass doesn't work

CASE: Mesa Country Club Shops
Baseline & Country Club

REQUEST: Review of a retail building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- The unsupported arches look wrong

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Use integral block
- Don't they need to screen the loading area?

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Replace the oleanders
- Use smaller shrubs in the parking lot islands and don't overcrowd them

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Don't paint the block
- The building doesn't have to totally match Wal-Mart
- More distance between the lower parapets and raised areas so cornices don't look like they are setting on them

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Seems flat
- Likes the corners but the middle portion is not dynamic
- Proportions are too predictable

CASE: Retail Building & Panda Express
342 W Baseline

REQUEST: Review of a retail building and a fast food pad with drive-thru

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Site walls need to match
- Use integral block

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Could the Panda Express be more Asian and the retail building be these colors?

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Lose the cornice and go more block
- Could they use a taupe color for the main body and use Asian colors for accents?

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Could they revise the colors
- This doesn't look Asian
- The 45° cornice they described sounds better
- The glass arches should be raised; not the element, just the glass
- The columns need to be larger/wider

CASE: Retail Center
NWC Stapley & Southern

REQUEST: Review of a shopping center with a grocery store

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer

- Doesn't like the mission piece next to the Mayan looking piece
- Doesn't like T1 eleven
- Fusion of styles
- The arched elements on the prototype are the problem
- Use the two styles but the rest of the center needs to be one or the other
- Be really careful with materials; hand painted tiles don't work with EIFS
- Round the corners and soften the edges
- You can't just use concrete tile
- Be careful with the detailing
- Could the Curacao have more color?

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Look at Fry's Electronics on I - 17
- The siding is cheap it won't hold up
- Celebrate what they are trying to do
- There should be a lot of columns
- Be sensitive to neighbors

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- A lot of flat areas
- Do some berming
- The groupings of plants are too even
- Landscaping should be designed and simplified
- Too many large shrubs along the foundation base
- Suggest raised planters
- Islands have too many large shrubs
- Use berming to replace of the screen walls along Southern
- Use more sculptural plants

CASE: Las Casitas Assisted Living
S of Baseline @ Hawes & Desert Lane

REQUEST: Review of an assisted living complex

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Give the residents an outdoor patio

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Why use the stone as a wainscot and then hide it with shrubs?
- Use the stone as a vertical element so it can be seen
- Eliminate the pines and use sissou instead

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Could they vary some of the windows?
- Look at providing another color as an accent

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- There is a lot of roof
- May 5 12 instead of 6 12
- Provide porches on the rear

CASE: Retail J at Riverview
Dobson & Loop 202

REQUEST: Review of a 24-hour fitness center

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Cornices need to wrap all the way around

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Could they have a secondary entry facing east?

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Use shrubs that get to 6' to 8' to screen the trash

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Finish the back of the parapet

2. Call to Order:

Vice-Chair Dave Richins called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the April 4, 2007 Meeting:

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

4. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-45 Tesco Fresh & Easy
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2009 N Stapley
REQUEST: Approval of a 25,949 sq. ft. grocery store
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Paul Dietsch
APPLICANT: Kurt Reed
ARCHITECT: KDRA
STAFF PLANNER: Kim Steadman

REQUEST: Approval of a 25,949 sq. ft. grocery store

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR07-45 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 pop-out element beyond along the east elevation (Shops) to reflect "Butternut Squash" Benjamin Moore 1090.
 - b. The applicant shall work with staff in selecting appropriate glass material for the buildings. The final and approved glass sample will be provided to staff for filing.
 - c. The applicant shall apply for a Variance to allow deviations from the 10' foundation base requirement and 30' x 30' entry plaza requirement. If the Variance cannot be granted, the applicant shall revise the plans to meet code by reducing the size of the building to accommodate the site layout.
 - d. Placement of date palms along the northeast corner radius shall be consistent with the approved landscape plan for (DR07-05), which is the adjacent property located on the northwest corner of Stapley Drive and McKellips Road.
 - e. The grading and drainage and landscape plans shall clearly illustrate proposed retention areas, as well as provide a symbol and notation on legend. All retention areas shall comply with Chapter 15 of the Mesa City Code.
 - f. The applicant shall provide drip irrigated decorative pots with plants as depicted in the colored elevations fronting the South Elevation (Shops). Pots shall be a minimum of 24" inches in height.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-46 Mulberry Business Park
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 260 S Mulberry
REQUEST: Approval of three industrial buildings totaling 37,129 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: Troy Valentine
APPLICANT: Fred Woods
ARCHITECT: Fred Woods
STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of three industrial buildings totaling 37,129 sq. ft.

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR07-46 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 employee break area that includes landscaping and shade.**
 - b. **Provide reveals on building elevations at all changes of color.**
 - c. **Roof mounted equipment to be screened by parapet walls. Provide roof plan or dashed on building elevations**
 - d. **Indicate proposed site wall on revised fully dimensioned site plan.**
 - e. **Buildings #1 & #2 must be reduced in GFA to resolve a deficiency of two (2) parking spaces.**
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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 47 Office/Warehouse Shell Building

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 7131 S 89 Place
REQUEST: Approval of a 13,102 sq. ft. industrial shell building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: SKS Investments & Development
APPLICANT: Hunt Architects
ARCHITECT: Hunt Architects
STAFF PLANNER: Monique Spivey

REQUEST: Approval of a 13,102 sq. ft. industrial shell building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR07-47 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. The applicant shall work with staff in selecting a building color that provides more contrast with the Superlite Block "Tierra Brown".
 - b. Revise landscape plan to use smaller plants rather than trimming large plants. The landscape plan shall be revised to reflect matching landscape plan and plant material legend information.
 - c. The applicant shall submit revised colored elevations that more accurately represent the final building elevations.
 - d. The applicant shall coordinate trash pick up through the Solid Waste Division. The location of the trash enclosures shall remain as proposed in DR07-47 presented on May 2, 2007 to the Design Review Board.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-48 Durga Gateway Lot 8
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 7222 S Atwood
REQUEST: Approval of a 15,607 sq. ft. industrial building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Durga Development LLC
APPLICANT: Hunt Architects
ARCHITECT: Hunt Architects
STAFF PLANNER: Monique Spivey

REQUEST: Approval of a 15,607 sq. ft. industrial building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR07-48 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. A cross-access easement shall be recorded between Lot 7 and 8.
 - b. Retention basins must be designed in accordance with §11-15-3-D.
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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 49 Durga Gateway Lot 7
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 7250 S Atwood
REQUEST: Approval of a 15,607 sq. ft. industrial building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Durga Development LLC
APPLICANT: Hunt Architects
ARCHITECT: Hunt Architects
STAFF PLANNER: Monique Spivey

REQUEST: Approval of a 15,607 sq. ft. industrial building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR07-49 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. A cross-access easement shall be recorded between Lot 7 and 8.
 - b. Retention basins must be designed in accordance with §11-15-3-D.
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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-50 In N Out Burger

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1859 S Signal Butte
REQUEST: Approval of a 3,265 sq. ft. fast food restaurant with drive-thru
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: CTW Superstition Gateway East – Diversified Partners
APPLICANT: Dennis Price
ARCHITECT: Leo Laure & Assoc.
STAFF PLANNER: Monique Spivey

REQUEST: Approval of a 3,265 sq. ft. fast food restaurant with drive-thru

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR07-50 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. The applicant shall work with staff in providing decorative lighting on all four sides of the exterior building elevations.
 - c. As depicted in the colored elevations the applicant shall provide drip irrigated landscape pots along the southeast elevation.
 - d. All proposed retention areas must comply with §11-15-3-D.
 - e. SES must be internal.
 - f. Provide two-foot (2') foundation base along exterior building where adjacent to drive-thru lane (Northwest Elevation facing Signal Butte).
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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-51 Marvel Building & Masonry Supply

LOCATION/ADDRESS: NEC Pecos & 222 Street
REQUEST: Approval of a 27,474 sq. ft. showroom and storage building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Van Co Properties
APPLICANT: J. Joseph Diemer
ARCHITECT: J. Joseph Diemer
STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of a 27,474 sq. ft. showroom and storage building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR07-51 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 employee break area that includes outdoor seating, landscaping and shade.
 - b. Submit a revised color and materials board that list the use of integral CMU including the manufacturer name and color information.
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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-52 **Aquila Superstition Springs Medical Office Park**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 96th Street & Hampton
REQUEST: Approval of 2 medical office buildings totaling 100,000 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: George Tibshreany
APPLICANT: Martin Hazine
ARCHITECT: George Tibshreany
STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of two medical office buildings totaling 100,000 sq. ft.

SUMMARY: Martin Hazine represented the case. Boardmember Rob Burgheimer liked the building and thought the glass would make the project. He did not like the sign package and wanted the signage to be revised and come back to the Board for future review and approval.

Boardmember Dave Richins thought the project should have stayed in the work session if staff did not think it was ready. He stated the applicant needed to use real sandstone as shown on the color/material board, not synthetic.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen agreed the Board needed to review the revised sign package. He stated the project will be as good as the detailing.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought the design was highly innovative. He liked the contrast of the heavy sandstone against the fragile glass. He stated the thinness of the steel elements was very important, he did not want them to become thicker.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur agreed the Board needs to see the revised sign package.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR07-52 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. Approval of the rezoning and Site Plan Review with a BIZ overlay request by City Council and compliance with all conditions of that approval.
 - b. Provide a cross-access and reciprocal parking agreement between this property and the property adjacent to the east.
 - c. Revise the median landscape strips, removing trees that are in conflict with the parking canopies.
 - d. Provide the total number of office spaces or suites for each medical office building.
 - e. Provide materials and color details for parking canopies, trash enclosures, parking screen and/or perimeter walls.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- f. Provide the details as requested for the following areas:
 - Roof mounted equipment: Provide details of screening methods.
 - Service Entrance Section: Indicate locations and screening methods.
 - g. **Use real stone, not synthetic.**
 - h. **Revise the sign package and bring the revised sign package back to the Board for approval.**
 - i. **If anything changes as they develop the construction drawings bring them to the Board with the revised sign package for Board review and approval.**
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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-53 Comerica Bank
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 925 N Dobson
REQUEST: Approval of a 3,310 sq. ft. bank
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Comerica Bank
APPLICANT: Sherry Anderson, DWL Architects
ARCHITECT: Jeremy Jones
STAFF PLANNER: Monique Spivey

REQUEST: Approval of a 3,310 sq. ft. bank

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR07-53 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. The applicant shall work with staff in providing decorative light fixtures details that are more compatible and complimentary with the color and design of the building. Decorative wall lighting will be required on all four (4) sides of the building where appropriate.
 - b. The applicant shall work with staff to ensure lighting behind the (mesh) aluminum curtain wall system is provided.
 - c. Design Review approval is contingent upon final approval of an Administrative Site Plan Modification.
 - d. The applicant shall work with staff in final approval of plant materials selected. Provide a landscape plan with symbols to identify specific plants.
 - e. Show building heights on colored elevations.
 - f. Show colors and materials legend on black and white and colored elevations.
 - g. The applicant shall extend the foundation base fronting the mechanical equipment screen wall (Southeast Elevation) an additional 10' to the southwest, thereby elimination two (2) parking spaces. Additional landscaping shall be provided within this foundation base.
 - h. Trash enclosure should be designed consistent with existing trash enclosures within the retail center.
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.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-54 Walgreen's
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1130 W Southern
REQUEST: Approval of a 14,550 sq. ft. drug store
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: Kimco North Trust I
APPLICANT: Richard Starr, Evergreen Devco
ARCHITECT: Sheldon Shaw
STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of a 14,550 sq. ft. drug store

SUMMARY: This case was continued at the applicant's request. The case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR07-54 be continued to the June 6, 2007 meeting.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-55 Shops at Parkwood Ranch

LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC Southern & Signal Butte
REQUEST: Approval of a 14.99 acre shopping center
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Weingarten Investments
APPLICANT: Pew & Lake
ARCHITECT: Silvio Popovsky, KDRA
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of a 14.99 acre shopping center

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR07-55 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 details on the color/materials of the storefronts, glass and light fixtures. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.
 - b. Provide additional decorative pavement or colored concrete in the hardscape area between Shops B & C. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.
 - c. Compliance with all foundation base requirements as outlined in §11-15-3(C) of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - d. Compliance with all requirements parking lot design as outline din §11-15-5(B) of the Zoning Ordinance. A revised plan must be submitted to Design Review staff.
 - e. Compliance with §11-15-3(D), which requires retention basin layout to be irregular in shape, contoured and designed as an integral part of the landscape theme. A revised plan must be submitted to Design Review staff.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Planning and Zoning Board for the approval of the Site Plan.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
5. All future buildings within this shopping center, including Pads B, C, D, and E require Design Review Board approval.
6. The lighting behind any faux windows shall not me fluorescent, but soft in appearance.
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.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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 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 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-56 Riverview Point Phase I

LOCATION/ADDRESS: Bass Pro and Alma School
REQUEST: Approval of two office buildings totaling 166,000 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Riverview Park Partners
APPLICANT: Tom Martin
ARCHITECT: Todd Decker and Gary Silverman
STAFF PLANNER: Kim Steadman

REQUEST: Approval of two office buildings totaling 166,000 sq. ft.

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Tom Martin represented the case. Mr. Martin explained that they had increased the height and added 2' to 3' of depth; added colors and sheen; added accent stone; increased the size of the columns; revised the color of the sunshade; added additional fixtures and increased the panels from 8" to 10".

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur thought the entry should be more pronounced. She stated that she had driven through Riverview and the palm trees along Bass Pro did continue all the way through to the cinemark, contrary to what the Board had been told at the work session. Therefore she thought the palm trees needed to continue along Bass Pro all the way to Alma School.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thanked the applicants for the enhancements, and stated he liked the revised colors. He thought the entry still needed more enhancement. He agreed the palm trees needed to continue along Bass Pro.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the palm trees were an important element and they needed to continue throughout the project. He thought the project had gone baby steps forward and it needed to go further. He stated he was disappointed with the project and did not think it was what the Board or the citizens had expected.

Boardmember Dave Richins agreed the palms needed to continue. He thought the entry needed improvement. He stated he had expected more for this site.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Wendy LeSueur that DR07-56 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 revised, 8½ x 11 color/materials board.
 - b. Provide revised plans and elevations that reflect the current building design.
 - c. Provide a design for the view fence along the north property line to include

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- masonry piers between sections of view fence.
 - d. Revise plan to remove drive aisle / parking from 30' Alma School setback.
 - e. Revise plan to meet Foundation Base requirements. Provide 30' x 30' entry plazas at all entries. Provide 10' separation between parking and building. Provide 15' separation between parking and building along all entry walls.
 - f. Review dumpster layout to meet the requirements of the Solid Waste Division.
 - g. **Continue the palm theme throughout.**
 - h. **Strengthen the entries.**
2. Compliance with the requirements of the Planning & Zoning Board.
 3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
 4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
 5. 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.
 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 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: 2 - 2

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Wendy LeSueur that DR07-56 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 revised, 8½ x 11 color/materials board.
 - b. Provide revised plans and elevations that reflect the current building design.
 - c. Provide a design for the view fence along the north property line to include masonry piers between sections of view fence.
 - d. Revise plan to remove drive aisle / parking from 30' Alma School setback.
 - e. Revise plan to meet Foundation Base requirements. Provide 30' x 30' entry plazas at all entries. Provide 10' separation between parking and building. Provide 15' separation between parking and building along all entry walls.
 - f. Review dumpster layout to meet the requirements of the Solid Waste Division.
 - g. **Continue the palm theme along Bass Pro to Alma School.**
 - h. **Work with staff to intensify the entry by increasing the massing.**

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- i. **Work with staff to provide higher-grade materials.**
 - j. **Provide shade canopies, window fenestrations at the end pieces of the buildings.**
 - k. **Provide palm trees along both sides of Bass Pro all the way to Alma School.**
2. Compliance with the requirements of the Planning & Zoning Board.
 3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
 4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
 5. 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.
 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 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.

There was a discussion regarding the palm trees along Bass Pro. The applicants did not want to provide the palm trees along Bass Pro. They wanted to use them at the transition nodes, then they offered to use smaller Date Palms. The applicants thought the palms should be their entry statement. Boardmember Wendy LeSueur thought the palm trees were what provided continuity and they were what tied this project to Riverview. She stated the understory would provide the entry statement. The applicant's did not want to provide palm trees every 10' or 20'. It was determined the existing palms trees are closer to every 50' or 60'. Boardmember Tim Nielsen suggested using another species to provide the entry statement, like Ocotillo. It was agreed the applicant could use the palms proposed at the nodes and use them along Bass Pro and use something else at the nodes.

VOTE: Passed 4 – 0 Boardmember Bottomley was not present for this vote

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 57 Stockwell 11 & 12

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 6945 S 89 Place and 7029 S 89 Place
REQUEST: Approval of 2 office warehouse buildings totaling 25,776 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Stockwell Capital
APPLICANT: Cawley Architects
ARCHITECT: Sherman Cawley
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of two office warehouse buildings totaling 25,776 sq. ft.

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR07-57 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 to Design Review staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-58 Costco

LOCATION/ADDRESS: WC Sossaman and Hampton
REQUEST: Approval of a 158,908 sq. ft. Costco and Costco fuel center; and three industrial buildings totaling 198,223
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Superstition Commerce Park LLC
APPLICANT: Steve Ybarra, Carter Burgess
ARCHITECT: Kenneth Lufkin
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of a 158,908 sq. ft. Costco and Costco fuel center; and three industrial buildings totaling 198,223

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the gas canopy as plain and the corrugated panel looked a little industrial. He suggested using a planter at the pumps rather than bollards. He thought there should be a design element between the pumps.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed the sign element was angled.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR07-58 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 screening in accordance with §11-15-4. Any proposed parking lot screen walls for the Costco Development will need to be reviewed and approved by Design Review Staff.
 - b. Provide revised color/material Boards for both the Industrial buildings and the Costco that reflect the most current building colors/materials.
 - c. Revise the stone selection to provide a more horizontal style. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.
 - d. Provide revised color elevations for the Superstition Commerce Park Industrial buildings that more closely identify the locations of the paint colors on the building. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.
 - e. Provide a method to screen the rooftop mechanical to comply with the requirements established in Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations including all Conditions of Approval for Z07-030.
3. Provide 8'-wide landscape islands as close as possible to the loading area of the Costco building, to allow no more than 36' of surplus parking east of the painted islands.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

4. Between Buildings 1 and 2 of the industrial portion of the development, provide landscape planters along the west sides of the walkway at the center four rows of parking.
5. Full compliance with all current Code requirements and regulations, except as amended through the PAD overlay.
6. Review and approval of a Special Use Permit by the Board of Adjustment for fuel pumps.
7. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
11. 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 4 – 0 (Boardmember Tom Bottomley was not present for this case)

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-59A Tesco – Fresh & Easy
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC Southern & Sossaman
REQUEST: Approval of two retail buildings totaling 25,649 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Superstition Springs Investors Ltd. partnership
APPLICANT: Shelly McTee
ARCHITECT: Robert Kubicek
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of a Fresh & Easy grocery store

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR07-59A 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. The applicant has not specified the color for the light fixtures or glass. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review Staff.
 - b. Additional trees and shrubs are required along the street frontages in accordance with Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - c. Provide a landscape design for the corner of Hampton and Sossaman that is cohesive with the proposed retail development on the south side of Hampton.
 - d. Eliminate the Pine and Swan Hill Olive trees from the landscape palette and replace them with an appropriate tree. Work with Design Review staff to select appropriate replacements.
 - e. Retail B- Submit a revised design that provides weather protection over all public entrances. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.
 - f. Retail B- Provide revised elevations and floor plans that match the approved building footprint of 194'8" x 60' and have been approved by the Design Review Board.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Rezoning and Site Plan Approval (Z07-034).
5. 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.
6. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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 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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-59B Retail shops building
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC Southern & Sossaman
REQUEST: Approval of two retail buildings totaling 25,649 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Superstition Springs Investors Ltd. partnership
APPLICANT: Shelly McTee
ARCHITECT: Robert Kubicek
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of a retail shops buildings

SUMMARY: Staff member Lesley Davis explained the applicant's had submitted revised drawings that addressed staff's concerns; however, they were submitted after the packet was delivered.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Wendy LeSueur that DR07-59B 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. The applicant has not specified the color for the light fixtures or glass. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review Staff.
 - b. Additional trees and shrubs are required along the street frontages in accordance with Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - c. Provide a landscape design for the corner of Hampton and Sossaman that is cohesive with the proposed retail development on the south side of Hampton.
 - d. Eliminate the Pine and Swan Hill Olive trees from the landscape palette and replace them with an appropriate tree. Work with Design Review staff to select appropriate replacements.
 - e. Retail B- Submit a revised design that provides weather protection over all public entrances. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.
 - f. Retail B- Provide revised elevations and floor plans that match the approved building footprint of 194'8" x 60' and have been approved by the Design Review Board.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Rezoning and Site Plan Approval (Z07-034).
5. 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.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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 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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 60 Hyatt Place Mesa Riverview

LOCATION/ADDRESS: Bass Pro Drive
REQUEST: Approval of a four story hotel/restaurant
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Wolf Urban Development
APPLICANT: Jim Larson
ARCHITECT: Brian Braganza
STAFF PLANNER: Kim Steadman

REQUEST: Approval of a four story hotel/restaurant

SUMMARY: David Strong represented the case. Mr. Strong stated he did not want to provide palm trees along Bass Pro. He thought they were repetitious. Staffmember Kim Steadman stated the application included LED which the Board would be approving with this case.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur confirmed the glass element would be glass on both sides as shown on the 24 X 36 plans not stucco on one side as shown on the 11 X 17 plans.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley was OK with the LED. He confirmed the sign was mounted on the glass on sat on the roof. He thought the sign looked tacked on. He was concerned with the thickness of the faux atrium. He suggested a trapezoidal shape.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer suggested the glass be a wedge so its thick at one side and then thinner at the other.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought the building needed solar shading on the west side.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR07-60 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. Submit landscaping and perimeter wall plans for the north side of Cinemark Dr. as a separate Design Review case. Install this landscaping and wall with the hotel project.
 - b. Provide the east-elevation pilasters on all elevations.
 - c. Bring date palms into the landscape design at the two quadrants of the roundabout that are adjacent to the hotel.
 - d. Revise the rooftop sign to comply with the Zoning Ordinance.
 - e. **Provide palm trees along Bass Pro in the same cadence as the rest of the center.**
 - f. **Work with staff to review glass wedge to significantly expand the**

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

thickness.

- g. **The LED is approved as shown.**
 - h. **If the applicant chooses to go to 6 stories this Board is in favor of the height.**
 - i. **They can change the palm trees at the building to another species.**
 - j. **Work with staff on solar control of the west windows.**
 - k. **Work with staff to revise the signage.**
2. Full compliance with the recommendations of the Planning & Zoning Board.
 3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
 4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
 5. 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.
 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 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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-61 Force Capital Office Building
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NEC Raftriver & Thomas
REQUEST: Approval of a 12,229 sq. ft. office
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Martin Maslonka
APPLICANT: Michelle Watanabe
ARCHITECT: Rob Burgheimer
STAFF PLANNER: Kim Steadman

REQUEST: Approval of a 12,229 sq. ft. office

SUMMARY: Boardmember Rob Burgheimer abstained. Michelle Watanabe represented the case. The following neighbors spoke in opposition:

Dave Bender stated he did not like the clock tower on Power, the Zahara office project, or the project across Thomas, and he did not want this project built. He stated Red Mountain Ranch is residential. The neighbors thought the property was zoned for condos. Mr. Bender stated he wanted this building to be more compatible with surrounding housing. He did not want any driveway on Raftriver. He wanted the applicant to widen Raftriver. He did not want a two-story building. He did not like the design layout. He stated the driveway did not like up with Sierra Moreno. He thought people would cut through this site so they would not have to wait to turn left at Raftriver. He stated the project should be compatible with other uses; should be one story; and should have stone.

Gary Snap stated there was already too much vacant office space at Power and Thomas. The school district would be against the project unless the gates are locked from 8 until 3. It needs to blend with the neighborhood. He stated there was not use they would want with two access points.

Blair Leech did not like the intersection of Raftriver and Thomas as it exists. He wanted right-of-way from this project to address the existing problem. He thought the building design belonged in Orange County. He stated he did not mind variation, but this design would not work in this context.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed the glass would be Low E blue tint, not high mirrored. He confirmed the Transportation Department was looking at the existing conditions at Raftriver and Thomas but any change would not affect the building setback for this project. He confirmed the owner was willing to work with the school on timing of gating the access. He stated this was a very contemporary building with a lot of glass rather than solid mass. He thought the building would be nice because it would reflect the scenery around it. The building was more see through, and did not have a lot of roof. He stated the building had a lot of architectural style and very rich material.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed the building would be owner occupied and they were proposing less than 30 employees for the entire building. He stated the QuikTrip at Extension and University had worked with the school district to come up with design solutions for the driveway along Extension that could be incorporated into this project. He agreed the building did not blend in; however, he thought it would be an interesting

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

addition.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley appreciated the input from the neighbors; however, the property owner has a right to use his property and anything built will affect views. He stated that anything would generate traffic, even condos. He thought the driveway on Rafriver was necessary so there would not be a dead end that would not work for fire and sanitation. He thought office and commercial uses should be a variety of architecture. He stated the building material would be long lasting and durable. He thought the building would reflect the surrounding landscaping.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur thought it was important to address traffic for the school. She stated this was a progression of architecture and could work well.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR07-61 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. Delete parking from the Thomas Rd. setback.
 - b. 13 trees are required along Thomas Rd. Add 3.
 - c. Revise the landscape plan to show the screened mechanical area.
 - d. Remove 6'-tall site wall and gate from the 20'-wide Rafriver setback, or reduce the height to 3'-6" maximum.
2. Full compliance with the recommendations of the Planning & Zoning Board.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
5. 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.
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 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 4 – 0 – 1 (Boardmember Burgheimer abstained)

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-62 **Carl's Jr.**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC Greenfield & Juanita
REQUEST: Approval of a 2,800 sq. ft. fast food restaurant
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: MJKL Enterprises
APPLICANT: Manuel Aquirre
ARCHITECT: Manuel Aquirre
STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of a 2,800 sq. ft. fast food restaurant

SUMMARY: Staff member Kim Steadman explained that staff had concerns with the use of hardipanel. Staff was concerned the hardipanel would not be durable enough for a fast food building. He thought traditional stucco would be a more durable choice.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer questioned why they were proposing hardipanel, which is unproven in Arizona. He understood staff's concerns.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley was concerned with how the metal siding would be sealed off. He thought it should be welded and ground. He did not think 22 gauge would be durable enough, especially at the bottom of the building where it could be kicked or have bicycles fall against it or run into it. He thought the metal needed to be 16 or 14.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen stated how the details are handled would affect the whole project. He did not want them to use corner trim.

MOTION: It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR07-62 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations.
 - a. **Approval of an Administrative Site Plan Modification.**
 - b. **Increase the thickness of the siding on the bottom portion of the building to a minimum of 22 gauge.**
 - c. **Look at using stucco instead of hardipanel.**
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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

5. Appeals of Administrative Design Review

None

6. Other Business:

Review of Cheesecake Factory at Superstition Mall

Boardmember Tim Nielsen wondered what the view would be for the outdoor dining area.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur wanted to see a detail of the trellis. The dg needs to match rest of the mall. She stated the Acacia would be very gray she suggested another tree. She did not want them to use Mexican Fan Palms.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought this project would be a good addition to the mall. He stated he had seen this building in California and it was very nice.

Review of CMC Steel at Meridian and Germann

Boardmember Dave Richins wanted a fence and landscape detail. He thought they should celebrate the metal. He stated his main concerns would be with the 10,0000 sq. ft. building along Germann, view lines into the site and the screening.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen wanted to know how old the existing chain link fence was and what condition it was in. He stated the applicants had a chance to be creative and sell their company.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur stated the 4' berm needed undulation. She thought the entry gate could be a good place to use their metal.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought they could use a heavy industrial design. He thought the project should be a great place for the employees.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed they were a rolling steel and melting steel plant. He thought the building could look really cool. He stated there needed to be architecture, color, forms, panels. He told the applicants to be creative.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da