

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 3, 2010 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MARCH 3, 2010

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in Room 170 of the Mesa City Plaza, 20 East Main, at 5:10 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Tim Nielsen - Chair
Wendy LeSueur – Vice Chair
Craig Boswell
Greg Lambright
Dan Maldonado

MEMBERS ABSENT

Tom Bottomley
Delight Clark

OTHERS PRESENT

Lesley Davis
Debbie Archuleta
Angelica Guevara
John Wesley
Tom Ellsworth
Christine Zielonka
Natalie Lewis
Jeffry Gordon
Doug Atkins
Russell Youngs
Christine Wilkes
Others

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 3, 2010 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Work Session:

CASE: Freeway Landmark Sign for Mesa Pavilions
1455 South Power Road

REQUEST: Review of a 98' tall Freeway Landmark Monument Sign

DISCUSSION: Doug Atkins and Russell Youngs

The applicant stated they were open to modifying the design changing the colors. He stated they had gone with very neutral colors because there were so many colors in the shopping center. He stated the reasons for the 98' height were the depressed freeway and the existing, mature tree line adjacent to the freeway. He also stated the 98' was measured from the elevation of the curb line not the bottom of the basin.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Liked the angle
- The current design doesn't identify the center
- The stacking of the signs needs a dark element
- Maybe run Mesa pavilions up the side
- Look at signs east of this location and along the 101 freeway
- This looks like a transformer
- Look at adding a base
- Colors are too light, needs more color contrast
- No cohesiveness in the existing architectural design of the center
- Do something elegant
- The shopping center logo is weak, so is the font, do something new that can provide guidance for future design
- Add more width and interest
- Add more layering as opposed to stacking

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Looks like it's on two sticks
- Very flat
- Needs interplay of volumes
- Too bland add spark
- Colors are bland
- As some previous freeway signs have weathered over time they warp and don't age well, what gauge metal are you going to use, so this won't warp?
- Add colors and volumes
- Freeway landmark signs were supposed to be a landmark, but the tenants have same size area as the centers, Mesa pavilions should be dominant

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 3, 2010 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- The Mesa Pavilions portion of the sign should be fun
- It is difficult to tie the design to the center

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- With such a narrow space along the sides how will they do the structure?

Boardmember Dan Maldonado:

- Some accent lighting could be good
- Needs extra texture
- Maybe the reveals could flow
- Add depth and dimension
- It's very linear
- Needs some play
- Maybe wrap the columns with another material to anchor it in design
- Maybe this is the time for the center to change/upgrade their signage
- It needs more mass at the base, it looks like it's on stilts

Staffmember Angelica Guevara then confirmed the main issues were:

- No cohesive design in the center
- Add color
- Emphasis to base of sign
- Add layering
- Add interest to side of sign
- It looks top heavy
- Maybe "Mesa Pavilions" could go down the side
- Look at signs along the 101 on the reservation for examples of signs with more color and contrast
- Add more volume
- Current design is a little vanilla
- Add color and make the design more sculptural
- Want to know more details of the proposed materials
- It shouldn't look like it's on stilts
- Study the narrow space along sides of the sign panel – ensure it won't conflict with the structural design
- Mesa Pavilions should be dominant area of the sign

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 3, 2010 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

A. Call to Order:

Chair Tim Nielsen called the meeting to order at 5:10 p.m.

B. Approval of the Minutes of the February 3, and February 16, 2010 Meetings:

On a motion by Craig Boswell seconded by Dan Maldonado the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 3, 2010 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

C. Other business:

1. Presentation by Natalie Lewis regarding Council Strategic Initiatives

This presentation was continued to a future meeting

1. Design Guideline Discussion

Staffmember Laura Hyneman reviewed the revisions to the Landscape requirements in the new Zoning Ordinance. She explained that last fall staff met with several local landscape architects at a forum at the Mesa Arts Center. She stated the design guidelines for landscaping were written based on feedback from that forum. New design objectives were added.

Chair Nielsen confirmed the biggest change from the 2002 requirements was a 50% reduction in tree counts along arterial streets. The guidelines still encourage clustering, especially between similar uses. Another change was that foundation base widths can now be averaged to accommodate variation in building footprints.

The Boardmembers all agreed that Alternative Landscape Plans should be reviewed by the Design Review Board.

Chair Nielsen questioned whether the standards for City right-of-way landscaping would be improved. He confirmed with Ms. Hyneman that appropriate maintenance meant not trimming shrubs into little shoe boxes or pill boxes, but rather allowing them to grow naturally. Chair Nielsen agreed he would like to see that, but wasn't sure how to get there.

Boardmember Boswell thought the reference to air pollution should be revised to say dust control. He thought item 11-22-2 needed a graphic to explain the requirement. He stated there needed to be a separation between entries and landscaping, so the landscape area doesn't become an ashtray. He suggested using hardscape at the entries. He stated a problem with current requirements for landscaping in retention basins is that without dry-wells the polluted water-run just sits for days and kills off the landscape material.

Boardmember LeSueur stated the street tree choices need to be well thought out. She agreed there should not be too many tree species along streets, there should be continuity. She thought there should be view corridors to address the issue of blocking signage in commercial development.

Boardmember Maldonado agreed there should be continuity of trees along street frontages rather than changing trees in front of every project. He suggested the Alternative Landscape Plan could be used to address the issue of signage. He stated the problem with signage is usually the foundation base. He stated the problem is that the landscaping is installed long before the signage location is addressed. He thought the Sign Code should have a requirement that the signage not conflict with the landscaping.

Boardmember Lambright thought that under purpose section staff should add "by encouraging unique designs to be allowed for unique circumstances". He thought the Code should encourage unique design. He thought the concept of landscaping that complements the architecture should be added to the Purpose Statements and Alternative Landscaping Plan Design Principals.

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 3, 2010 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

D. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 6:11

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da