

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
SEPTEMBER 5, 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

Tim Nielsen - Chair
Wendy LeSueur – Vice Chair
Tom Bottomley
Robert Burgheimer
Vince DiBella
Craig Bottomley

MEMBERS ABSENT

Delight Clark (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

Lesley Davis
Mia Lozano Helland
Debbie Archuleta
Monique Spivey
Dennis Newcombe
Trent Jones
Michael Monroe
Glenn Smith
Voyka Potulic
Doug Himmelberger
Others

1. Work Session:

CASE: Crismon Gateway
NWC Crismon and Baseline

REQUEST: Review of multi-use office retail project

DISCUSSION:

The Board was very pleased with the design, and thought it was creative.

CASE: TCF Bank
Southern and Signal Butte

REQUEST: Review of a bank

DISCUSSION:

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- They have done a flat roof in Tempe
- Concerned with prototypes
- Materials need to complement center
- Maybe the signs could be slightly smaller
- Tower is backlit

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Glass is very dark

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Sign looks crammed in on the side
- Trim piece is very close to the adjacent ridge line
- Underground the pneumatic tube
- Recessed windows are better
- Likes the colors
- They will lose the impact of the mullions against the dark glass

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Need to respond to the area you are developing in
- The glass is very dark and not customer friendly; may want to look at a lighter glass color
- The glass color could be a security issue
- Proportion of tower is tall and spindly to the rest of their prototype banks

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- The landscape plan is OK

CASE: TCF Bank
NWC McKellips & Recker

REQUEST: Review of a bank

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- Wanted better renderings with the follow-up submittal
- Improve the colors on the follow-up submittal

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Any future submittals for TCF will need to have more changes, especially the roof
- Need diversity

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- The roof needs to be shorter than 34' to be a better proportion to the building
- They could revise the tower element

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Pneumatic tubes are OK when they are clear; however, they are bad when they get old and yellow
- Maybe a metal roof would be better
- The roof material needs to be similar to what is around it. Maybe the office to the north

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Do not paint the tubes
- Any change of paint color needs to have a screed line. No paint lines

CASE: Centurian Stone
1608 N Greenfield

REQUEST: Review of a pre-engineered metal building for an office

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Could they turn the building so it is less visible

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Why are they doing so much to a temporary building
- They could dig the piers so they are not visible
- There needs to be an architect
- Provide the flood plane lines

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The building is not well designed
- The building could be there for many years
- Why is the block wall 3'?
- The way the materials are applied is not good
- Design the building

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Transition of materials is badly done
- This looks temporary
- This is a product sign
- Materials look slapped on
- Modular buildings can be done with flat roofs

Staffmember Kim Steadman:

- At Longbow there are metal buildings, but they are cleverly done
- Maybe use free standing elements

CASE: Brown Evans Fuel Facility
3353 N Greenfield

REQUEST: Review of an unattended cardlock fuel sales facility

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- Canopies are very high, could they be 15'6"?

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Could they use integral block?
- Try to mimic the site wall at the transit facility across Greenfield

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Confirmed that the columns are tube metal

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- The landscape is nice

CASE: General Aviation
2425 N Greenfield

REQUEST: Review of an aircraft hangar

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- The yellow is pretty loud
- Why can't they do simple geometric forms?
- Why the tacked on arches?
- Tone down the colors
- Bay doors are very close to Greenfield
- Do something with the north elevation

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- The colors are pretty loud
- Need understory plantings

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Tie into the confederate building

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Confederate building speaks to aviation
- Agree with using geometric shapes

CASE: Springhill Suites
10309 E Hampton

REQUEST: Review of a hotel

DISCUSSION:

No one was present to represent the case

CASE: Chesters Harley Davidson Dealership

REQUEST: Review of an addition to an existing motorcycle dealership

DISCUSSION:

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Internalize the rain gutters
- Four-sided architecture
- Maybe factory architecture

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Too flat
- It should look like an event area, not a loading dock

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Don't match the existing building
- The building along the west is not acceptable
- Look at DC Ranch style
- This looks like a warehouse
- Architectural elements can exceed the 30' height limit
- Take the tile off and go with metal
- Try to create something better with these buildings
- Too much stucco
- The architecture should promote the client
- Different materials
- More metal
- Tectonic

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- The building at the rear will be visible
- Agree they should design to attract Harley customers

CASE: AZ Bank & Trust
10025 E Southern

REQUEST: Review of a bank

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Different styles that are colliding; modern styles and space frame with classical building
- Very reflective, shiny black and copper
- Take off the cornice
- Looks really tall for a bank
- The scale and proportion are not good
- The light fixtures are very classical
- Why paint the space frame black, against a black building?
- Either the space frame or the building should be light
- Should be square columns
- Look at the lights
- Maybe rusticated base to columns
- Don't use painted copper with real copper
- Do one or the other
- Too retail looking for a bank

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Looks very retail
- Glass is very dark, not customer friendly
- Should be more approachable
- Should be able to see the mullions against the glass
- Maybe lighten the glass color
- Not so much dark on dark on dark
- Likes the light color of the columns, but agrees the forms could change
- Wants kinar finish, not paint
- Wants copper sealed so it won't patina
- Space frame on tower looks artificial
- The space frame below is fine

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- The black makes a statement, but is it the right statement?
- Is it customer friendly and inviting?
- Choose one style
- You could clean it up and make it very modern

CASE: Tract F2 Riverview
8th Street & Dobson

REQUEST: Review of a retail building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Could the loading be along 8th Street, not Decatur?

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Liked the different cornice fascia details in the “entertainment district”, that would be nice on this building

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The white space is very large for the sign area
- The building looks like it belongs there

CASE: Bergeron Engineering
1559 N Country Club

REQUEST: Review of an office

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- There need to be 6' walls to screen the site
- Concerned with storage of boats

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- The element above the bay doors will protrude 8" to 12"

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- May want to use masonry at the base, stucco will get damaged

CASE: Plaza Tapatia
603 and 619 E Broadway

REQUEST: Review of a commercial building and the remodel of an existing building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- The orange and green band is too big

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- The size of the pattern might be OK if the colors were subdued
- Likes the horizontal stripes. Could they be screed lines?

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Maybe the larger diamond pattern could be the same proportions as the smaller ones

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Why are the orange and green so strong?
- It's very processed looking
- They should be ceramic tile
- The bright green is the problem

CASE: Mesa Supportive Housing
1137 E Broadway

REQUEST: Review of an 18 unit HUD Section 711 housing project

DISCUSSION:

No one was present to represent the case.

CASE: Burdette Cabinets
3941 N Higley

REQUEST: Review of an addition to an existing building

DISCUSSION:

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Hopes that one day there will be a nice elevation for the front of the building

CASE: Heritage Village Assisted Living
8035 E Brown

REQUEST: Review of an assisted living development

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Look at varying colors for different buildings
- Could the buildings be connected so you change the setback requirement and provide nicer outdoor areas?
- Vary the site plan so it doesn't look so rigid
- 13' won't accommodate mechanical units
- Move the stone at the base to one whole element, like under the gable
- You can't run tile that low

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Vary the planes so it's not so flat
- More articulation
- Vary the roof heights

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Need to see details of the screen walls
- More residential character

2. Call to Order:

Chair called the meeting to order at 6:45 p.m.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the August 1, and August 15, 2007 Meetings:

On a motion by Tom Bottomley seconded by Vince DiBella the Board unanimously approved the minutes as revised.

4. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-100 Mt. Vista Marketplace FLMS

LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC of Southern & Signal Butte
REQUEST: Approval of a Freeway Landmark Monument Sign
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Signal Butte 114, LLC
APPLICANT: Paul E. Gilbert, Beus Gilbert, PLLC.
ARCHITECT: Chris Neenan, Gardner Sign Co.
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of a 65' tall Freeway Landmark Monument Sign

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda. Dennis Newcombe represented the case.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer just wanted to make sure the sign related to the shopping center. He confirmed the shopping center is in final plan review and the center is regional commercial. Mr. Newcombe explained this sign would be farther away from the freeway and the off-ramp than the one for Superstition Gateway. Boardmember Burgheimer was concerned with the cornice on the bottom section of the sign.

Chair Tim Nielsen confirmed the sign would be about at the point where the on-ramp ends. He questioned whether anyone would be able to actually see the landscaping at the base of the sign. Mr. Newcombe stated he should be visible to people from the on and off ramps.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley confirmed the Mt. Vista portion of the sign would be backlit, and the remainder of the sign would be internally illuminated with routed copy.

Boardmember Craig Boswell confirmed the plant palette would be taken from the shopping center. Mr. Newcombe stated a ground cover that flowers and probably something with thorns would be incorporated and it would match the center.

MOTION: It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Vince DiBella that Board recommend approval of DR07-100 with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the basic development of the Freeway Landmark Monument as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan and elevations except as noted below.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Design Review Board.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Building Safety Division with regards to the issuance of building and sign permits.
5. Provide two half-size color elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-82 **Guadalupe Professional Center**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 430 W. Guadalupe Road
REQUEST: Approval of a 25,818 sq. ft. office
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: Guadalupe Professional Plaza
APPLICANT: Ryan E. Grover

REQUEST: Approval of a 25,818 sq. ft. office

SUMMARY: Voyka Potulic and Glenn Smith represented the case. Staffmember Mia Lozano-Helland explained that the applicants had revised elevations for this meeting that addressed conditions B, C, and D, from the staff report. Mr. Potulic stated they had received approval from SRP for their project. Mr. Smith stated the parapets would screen the mechanical units.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur confirmed the foundation landscape areas were shown on the site plan. They need to be shown on the landscape plan.

Boardmember Vince DiBella stated the project had come a long way.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated it had taken a while to get to this point, but agreed it had come a long way.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought what was presented at the meeting was a lot better than what they had seen at previous meetings.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR07-82 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 comprehensive landscape plan that includes foundation base and site/parking lot landscaping.
 - b. Revise the color building elevations to accurately depict the storefront and window frames color in black as noted on sheet A.6.
 - c. Provide the material and color of the arched roof element.
 - d. Revise the color schedule on sheet A.6 to accurately detail the three (3) building colors that will be used.
 - e. Provide color of glass in windows and storefronts.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted green.

5. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
6. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of 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 SEPTEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-98 ATSU Student Housing

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 5850 E Still Cir.

REQUEST: Approval of a building within the existing campus for A.T. Still University to accommodate assisted living and student housing. A total of 193,232 s.f. will be dedicated for assisted living with 119,428 s.f. for student housing with 116 apartments.

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6

OWNER: A.T. Still University

APPLICANT: Realm Design LLC

ARCHITECT: Jacques LeBlanc

REQUEST: Approval of a 193,232 sq. ft. assisted living building and 116 unit student housing facility

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Craig Boswell that DR07-98 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. Approval of a Special Use Permit for the assisted living facility, and compliance with all requirements of the Board of Adjustment.
6. Site Plan Review through the public hearing process of future development plans per Z07-088.
7. Full compliance with all current Code requirements and regulations, except as amended through the PAD overlay (Z07-088).
8. Provide color specification for the railings, glass and light fixtures for the building. Color choices are to be compatible with the proposed color palette.
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 green.
10. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
11. Provide two half-size color elevations to Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-99 **ATSU YMCA**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 5850 E Still Cir.
REQUEST: Approval of 20,000 s.f. YMCA building on the existing campus of
A.T. Still University
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: A.T. Still University
APPLICANT: John Kane
ARCHITECT: John Kane

REQUEST: Approval of a 20,000 sq. ft. YMCA 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 Craig Boswell that DR07-99 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. Decorative pavement surfaces, parking screen walls, trash enclosures, gates and parking canopies are to match what has been installed within the development.
6. Provide a decorative, textured pavement surface for the curved drive aisle and parking area closest to the building at the southwest side. This surface is to be consistent with pavement surfaces and textures provided throughout the development.
7. Compliance with all conditions of approval for Z07-088.
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 green.
9. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
10. Provide two half-size color elevations for this case to Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 101 6932 E Via Northgate

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 6932 E. Via Northgate
REQUEST: Approval of a 11,500 square foot warehouse/office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Trudy Licano
APPLICANT: JD Berryman, K&I Architects
ARCHITECT: Kristjan Sigurdsson, K&I Architects

REQUEST: Approval of a 11,500 sq. ft. warehouse/office 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 Craig Boswell that DR07-101 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 north elevation foundation base must meet the minimum standard of 10' feet as per §11-15-3(C) of the Zoning Ordinance.
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 green.
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 SEPTEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-102 Southern Avenue Retail

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 9107 E. Southern Ave. – Located west of the southwest corner of Ellsworth and Southern Ave.
REQUEST: Approval of a 16,000 sq. ft. retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Scott Anderson
APPLICANT: Michael Monroe
ARCHITECT: Jere Planck

REQUEST: Approval of a 16,000 sq. ft. retail building

SUMMARY: Michael Monroe represented the case. Mr. Monroe stated they had added a color, adjusted the roof planes, provided cmu not stucco, added landscaping, and removed the blue medallions from the sign area.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought the building was still too stripy, the side elevations were very bland, and the building was too flat. He thought the design was very static. He thought it just met the minimum standard for retail design and that was not enough on an arterial street. He did not think the building was interesting.

Boardmember Craig Boswell was concerned with the signage. He did not think the signage met the design guidelines.

Chair Tim Nielsen was concerned that the tenants not be industrial users. He confirmed the owner is the builder and he would be leasing the building out.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought it met standards. He stated the building had good materials, there were undulations, and some details.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Craig Boswell that DR07-102 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 minimum of 24 trees and 72 shrubs within the landscape setback fronting on Southern Avenue. Landscaping within the public right of way can be counted towards landscaping requirement.
 - b. **Work with staff to revise the signage.**
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 SEPTEMBER 5, 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 green.
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 – 1 (Boardmember Bottomley voting nay)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 103 Sanctuary at Alta Mesa
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 5565 E. McKellips Rd.
REQUEST: Approval of a 46 unit townhome project
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: RSB Partners LLC
APPLICANT: Woods Associates
ARCHITECT: Fred Woods

REQUEST: Approval of a 46 unit townhome project

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda due to a conflict.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR07-103 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:
 - b. Revise the proportions of the covered entrances to widen the arch over the doorways.
 - c. Identify the proposed Master Plan numbers on the revised documents submitted for the Design Review case file.
 - d. Provide side elevations for the two story buildings. The side elevations need to include detailing similar to the front and rear elevations.
 - e. Provide an additional tree type with a smaller canopy to replace some of the Live Oaks along the west and north property lines.
 - f. Provide light fixture cut sheets and specify the color of the fixtures. Attached fixtures need to have a residential character and enhance the 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 green.
6. Revise the site plan and landscape plan to include pedestrian pathways to cross the private drive throughout the project. Surfaces should be a decorative material such as colored concrete or pavers where they cross drive aisles.
7. Provide a complete landscape plan that indicates locations of all plant material, including shrubs and ground cover. Compliance with Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance is required.
8. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

9. Provide two half-size color elevations and one half-size set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0 – 1 (Chair Tim Nielsen abstained)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-104 **Costco Plaza Retail Development**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1330 S. Sossaman Rd.
REQUEST: Approval of 37,800 s.f. of retail shopping space in three buildings including Pad B, Pads C and D (one building), and Pad E.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Wilshire Property Company
APPLICANT: David Parker, Archicon
ARCHITECT: Vince Dahlke

REQUEST: Approval of a 37,800 sq. ft. retail 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 Craig Boswell that DR07-104 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 light fixtures cut sheets. Light fixtures to be decorative and enhance the elevations in pedestrian areas or areas visible from the public streets.
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. Design Review Board approval is still required for Pads A & F.
6. All foundation base landscaping must be in conformance with §11-15-3(C) 2 of the Zoning Ordinance.
7. Indicate locations of the Service Entrance Section (SES) on site plan, floor plans and landscape plan. They should be recessed and painted to match the building
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 green.
9. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
10. Provide two half size color elevations, and two half-size 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 SEPTEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 105 Gilbert Road Business Center
LOCATION: 845 and 851 North Gilbert Road
REQUEST: Approval of a 19,162 square foot office condo center.
DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: Floyd R. Fisher Senior
APPLICANT: Ron Walker

REQUEST: Approval of a 19,162 sq. ft. office condo 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 Craig Boswell that DR07-105 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 gabled entryway shall be painted a contrasting color from the main building color. The applicant shall work with staff in selecting a color from the proposed color palette or a new compatible color.
 - b. Remove the Mexican fan palms from the palette and replace with another tree species. Tree selection must be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff prior to submittal of final plans
2. The plans shall reflect a 3' to 5' change in wall plane or jog where stone veneer building segments occur.
3. Provide pop-outs or decorative trim around all windows, except for entry door windows.
4. Shows reveal lines on elevations in a manner that compliments the building.
5. The landscape plan must show accurate spacing based on potential growth of tree and shrub species.
6. Provide continuous Willow Acacia trees or a non-deciduous tree along the north, south, and east landscape setbacks. Trees should be spaced 15' to 20' feet apart and planted a minimum of 10' feet from adjacent property lines.
7. Provide a minimum of 14 trees and 56 shrubs on each of the north, south and east property lines
8. Provide landscape berming fronting on Gilbert Road per §11-15-4(10).
9. Provide keynote number for each stucco color and illustrate on elevations.
10. Identify material and color of decorative window moldings on plan keynotes.
11. Screen walls must comply with Screening Standards §11-15-4(B)(4)(10)(a-e).
12. Provide low-level lighting fixtures with a residential character along the south and east elevation. Provide lighting cut sheets with the construction documents.
13. The project must comply with all conditions of approval listed for zoning case (Z07-85).

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

14. All roof equipment, ground mounted equipment, service entrance sections, and wall mounted equipment must comply with §11-15-4 (Screening Standards) of the Design Guidelines.
15. Provide trash enclosure details in final submittal. Trash enclosures and gates must be complimentary to the main building.
16. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
17. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
18. 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.
19. 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.
20. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
21. 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 SEPTEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Discuss, receive comment and take action on the following appeals of Administrative Design Review:

ADR07-58 District 1 Dobson & 202. Riverview Nissan. Revisions to previously approved elevations.

Summary: Trent Jones represented the case. Mr. Jones explained that the applicant wanted to have additional in-door display due to the Arizona heat.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur thought the applicant could use red brick and make the project very interesting. She thought this submittal was a better building; however, she did not think the applicant had done what the Board originally conditioned.

Chair Tim Nielsen confirmed the reason for enlarging the building was to bring customers inside in air conditioning. He was concerned that the glass was not shaded enough. He confirmed there would be a second floor office above the showroom; and that the additional height was to screen the mechanical units. Chair Nielsen stated the dealership in Chandler was recently constructed with a warmer color block, which was what the Board had asked for at this location. He did not understand why the applicant told the Board that they could not use a warmer color block for this site when it has been done in another City.

Boardmember Craig Boswell questioned why they had removed some of the red elements. He stated he liked the red on the building as an accent.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer agreed this building was better; however, he stated it still was not what the Board expected for Riverview. He stated the applicant had ignored the Board in using the gray block. He agreed the four buildings were a family, he did not feel they were designed to be part of the Riverview family.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley stated the Board wanted this project to have some compatibility with the Riverview project. On it's own merits it is a good building, but not at this location.

Boardmember Craig Boswell confirmed there are three other buildings and they all match this one.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tom Bottomley that ADR07-58 be denied because the original building was not what the Board conditioned. The Board was asking for a color change.

VOTE: 4 – 1 – 1 (Boardmember Boswell voting nay, Boardmember DiBella abstained, Boardmember Clark excused)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Other Business:

Discuss changes to agenda format:

Staffmember Lesley Davis explained that the agenda format had been revised to be more in line with the Council agendas.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated he was concerned that by adding "council districts" to the agenda it might appear that different areas of the City were being treated differently than others.

Discuss upcoming Board and Committee member Orientation:

Staffmember Lesley Davis explained the new Boardmember orientation in September was open to all Boardmembers.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da