

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
JANUARY 7, 2004

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Lower Level of the Council Chambers 57 East First Street, at 3:45 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Carie Allen - Chair
Pete Berzins - Vice Chair
Randy Carter
Jillian Hagen
Tim Nielsen
Vince DiBella
Robert Burgheimer

MEMBERS ABSENT

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman	Mike Fraccola
Lesley Davis	Charles Stock
Debbie Archuleta	Joe Dotty
Charlie Scully	Sean Lake
Wayne Rockwood	Brent Fike
Hal Friborg	Fred Himovitz
Richard Topping	Emily Stowe
Keith Waldersen	Yin Pang
Kristian Sigurdsson	Others
Jerry Torre	
Jim Smith	
John Wesley	

1. Call to Order:

Chair Carie Allen called the meeting to order at 3:38 p.m.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the December 3, 2004 Meeting:

On a motion by Rob Burgheimer seconded by Vince DiBella the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

3. Election of Officers:

Rob Burgheimer nominated Pete Berzins to be Vice-Chair in place of John Poulsen who resigned from the Board. The nomination was seconded by Vince DiBella.

Vote: 6 – 0 Boardmember Berzins did not vote

4. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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

REQUEST: Approval of the landscape plan for Coyote Landing Apartments

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Pete Berzins that DR03-58 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the landscape plan submitted except as noted. The landscape architect has the flexibility to substitute shrubs, accent plants and ground covers on the final landscape plan provided the plants are selected from the approved plant list, the quantity of plants remains as approved and the variety of species remains the same.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is an attractive complement to the approved site plan.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-85	Commercial Building
LOCATION/ADDRESS:	4460 East Main Street
SUMMARY OF REQUEST:	Design Review of multi-tenant commercial building
COUNCIL DISTRICT:	District 5
OWNER:	Henry Wendt
APPLICANT:	Joe Dotty
ARCHITECT:	Jerry Torr

REQUEST: Approval of a 37,576 sq. ft. office, retail and auto repair facility

SUMMARY: Joe Dotty and Jerry Torr represented the case.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen liked the changes and felt the colors were OK. She was concerned with the proportions of the monument sign, and wanted more of a surround around the actual signs.

Boardmember Vince DiBella felt the project had come a long way; however, he felt the use was wrong for this site.

Boardmember Pete Berzins confirmed the tile would be 2 rows of 18" square slate. He was concerned with the use of slate as a wainscot. He felt the color of the garage doors was too dark.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed the tile would be a natural slate. He was concerned with the thin parapet on the building and with how the slate would be attached to the stucco. He felt the green accent color was too dark, and that the yellow color was too gold to work with the slate.

Mr. Dotty stated the detail at the slate would include a dovetail piece above the slate, with metal flashing that the tile would go under.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen appreciated the effort. He suggested removing some of the slate from the east elevation.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer felt the colors would be fine unless the stucco was smooth. He felt there were too many small repetitive windows. He suggested using two large windows in addition to the proposed windows or use one continuous window in some areas for variety. Because this would be a service building he felt the entrances needed to be protected, possibly with bollards or steel angles. He agreed that along the east property line they could discontinue the slate wainscot beyond the first recess, as long as there was a 6' wall along the east property line.

Chair Carie Allen agreed there was too much contrast between the yellow color and the slate.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Pete Berzins that DR03-85 be approved with the following conditions:

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. **Revise Landscape Plan to include minimum number of trees for street landscape yard along Main Street, as per Chapter 15 standards, including 2 trees and 6 shrubs per 25 feet of landscape yard with up to 20% substitution with palm trees allowed.**
8. **Modify the green accent color to a lighter color. Color to be approved by the Design Review Staff.**
9. **Revise the size of the proposed windows on the east elevation of building 1 and building 2. Elevations to be approved by Design Review Staff.**
10. **Select a softer yellow color.**
11. **If a 6' wall is provided along the east property line the east elevation of building 1 may provide the slate wainscot to the first recess, then replace the slate with paint to match the slate. The painted wainscot may also be used on building 2.**
12. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 1 (Boardmember DiBella voting nay)

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

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-94 **Retail Center**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC University & Meridian
REQUEST: Approval of commercial center
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Charles Keith
APPLICANT: Gloria Walker, Andrews Design Group
ARCHITECT: Don Andrews

REQUEST: Approval of a 14,400 sq. ft. multi-tenant retail building

SUMMARY: The applicant submitted an E-mail requesting the case be continued to the February 4, 2004 meeting.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR03-94 be continued to the February 4, 2004 meeting.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The case was continued to allow the applicant time to address the Board's concerns.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-95 **Just Trucks**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1959 East Main
REQUEST: Approval of a .39 acre used car lot
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: Sally Stephen
APPLICANT: Michael Fraccola
ARCHITECT: Kimball Design Group

REQUEST: Approval of a .39 acre used car lot with a 1,457 sq. ft. sales building

SUMMARY: Mr. Kimball, Mike Fracolla, Sally Stevens, Keith Waldersen represented the case.

Boardmember Vince DiBella stated he expected to see a revised proposal. He felt the canopy needed to change substantially.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen confirmed that they had not made changes to address the concerns raised in the last meeting.

Boardmember Pete Berzins stated that this was a prominent intersection and that the design should respect that. He confirmed that they were proposing to have 17 to 22 vehicles on-site for sale. He felt the garage doors made it look like a service station. If it was a showroom they wanted, they should use glass storefront instead of the garage doors.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen also felt the building looked like a gas station. He suggested the bay doors be removed or changed and massing added to the canopy columns. He did not see how 22 trucks could fit on this site.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt the proposal was only a slight enhancement to the original building. He felt the columns needed to be widened using matching stone and the bay doors needed to be replaced with glass. He was concerned the handicap parking location was dangerous. He felt the bathroom could be changed so you enter it from the interior. He felt the water feature was a liability not an asset. He did not feel the applicants had done enough.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer felt this was the wrong use for this site, but he understood that determining use was not the Board's charge. He wanted to see a site plan that shows how the vehicles would fit. He wanted the building substantially remodeled. Boardmember Burgheimer suggested the applicants think about materials, what can they save and what needs to be new. He felt the project needed a strong concept. He suggested they could play off the gas station and use a retro art deco design. He stated the building needed to be visually different from the existing. He suggested they remove the existing canopy and design a creative canopy. He wanted the bay doors removed and replaced with glass or something interesting.

The applicants stated they did not want to use glass because they were concerned about theft of the two vehicles in the bay area.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Jillian Hagen did not think 22 trucks could fit on the site and then have room for customers. She asked the applicants to think of what they would have designed if they were building a new building. She did not feel that color and stone were enough. She felt the existing canopy needed to be removed.

Chair Carie Allen was concerned about theft. She felt the intersection corner was not going to be redeveloped soon and a simple solution would be appropriate. She felt the canopy needed more massing. She felt the bays should be enclosed and air conditioned so that they look like a showroom.

The applicants passed around photos of the other intersection corners and stated they had been told when they purchased the property from the City that they would only have to make minimal changes. They stated the site is very small and this is the only use it is good for. They wanted the canopy because it provides shade.

Boardmember Pete Berzins explained that if the 7 eleven store were to come to the Board they would be required to meet the same standards. He further explained that the McDonald's had recently updated their existing facility. This applicant was redeveloping an abandoned site and changing the use. He wanted the project to look more attractive. In response to comments from the applicants regarding the time they have been the in process Boardmember Berzins reminded the applicants that the Board had made comments at their December meeting, even though no one was present to represent the case. The applicants had made no changes since then, so they have contributed to the time involved.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen felt there was an opportunity to do something to the building to creatively draw customers into the dealership. It should look like more than a service station. He was also concerned with the thinness of the canopy columns.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen stated the Board would work as a group to help the applicants once they have a concept. She did not feel they needed the stone on the building.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt the canopy and the mansard had to be looked at.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated that changes to this small building shouldn't cost a great deal. He suggested providing a nice canopy so that the building is diminished. He felt the fountain and the stone were a waste of money, and suggested that the expense of those be put into the design of the building.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR03-95 be continued to the February 4, 2004 meeting.

Three Boardmembers will meet with the applicants to review their revised sketches Friday January 23, 2004 at 1:30, in order to give them input on the new direction they are going.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: To give the applicants time to redesign the project to better meet the intent of the design guidelines.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-90 **Wal-Mart**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC Greenfield & US 60
REQUEST: Approval of Wal-Mart Supercenter Commercial Center
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Brett Berge Trust & Lumber Jack Capital LLC
APPLICANT: Pew & Lake, & Wood Patel
ARCHITECT: Boice Raidl Rhea

REQUEST: Approval of a 203,982 sq. ft. Super Wal-Mart

SUMMARY: Sean Lake and Shad Vermeesch represented the case.

Staff explained that they were presenting three different elevations for this project, the first submittal, the second submittal and a revised third submittal, which was submitted the day before the meeting.

Boardmember Vince DiBella liked the first submittal better than the second. He liked the cornice at the entry; he felt it had more human scale. He felt the entry pieces were massive; however, they were appropriate because it is a large building.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen felt this site truly had four-sided exposure. Traffic along the freeway would see the north/rear elevation so the back was more than just a business side of the building. He wanted to see a vertical element or additional color for the north elevation. He felt that the rear was a business opportunity that could be enhanced. He liked the way the building moved, and the colors.

Boardmember Pete Berzins agreed the rear elevation would be very visible.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen preferred the tower massing and cornice on the first elevation. He felt the arched areas in the center portion were too busy. She felt the rear elevation was plain and suggested using the third color from the front elevation. She felt the stone on the towers made them too massive. She felt the rear elevation needed roof forms like the front.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer felt the building had nice materials and colors; however, he felt it had too much stuff on it and in the wrong places. He felt the centerpiece was too strong and looked like the entry. He felt the stone should be taken off the towers and placed on the arches. He confirmed the tower is approximately 40' tall. He suggested the mechanical units be relocated away from the peak of the roof so the tower would not need to be so high. He wanted the applicant to strengthen the entries and tone down the centerpiece. He did not feel the proportioning of the building was good.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt the towers were squatty. The "food center" element divided the tower in half. He felt the arched elements to the side of the tower were too monumental. He agreed the rear elevation needed to be revised. Boardmember Carter wanted the roof tile to be an "S" tile and be variegated instead of one color. He preferred the human scale and the cornice of the towers on the first submittal. He agreed the stone should be on the arches

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

not the towers. He was concerned that the parapet at the center of the front elevation was too thin. On the right elevation, facing Greenfield, he wanted cornices added to the wall behind the garden center. He also wanted the tower element at the lube shop entrance raised up. He was concerned with how the parapets would terminate. Boardmember Carter wanted the tower elements and the cornice repeated on the rear.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR03-90 be continued to the February 3, 2004 meeting.

During discussion some Boardmembers wondered if the case couldn't be approved subject to staff review and staff e-mailing the revisions to the Boardmembers for their review.

VOTE: 1 – 6 (Boardmember Burgheimer voting aye)

MOTION: It was moved by Pete Berzins and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR03-90 be approved with staff conditions and a condition to revise the front and rear elevations.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen then amended the motion to add:

Incorporate the entrance tower elevation from first submittal with cornice and no stone.
Provide stone on arches on either side of the entrance towers.
Use blue tile accents to be more consistent around all sides of the building.
Use variegated 'S' roof tile.
Return the parapets into the building so they appear more substantial not like a façade.
Add tile element to the rear.
Add more color to rear.
Provide tower element at loading dock.
Raise the roof element at the tire and lube area.
Cornice so that it continues around the building.

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
12. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
13. **Ensure that windows are included in the Tire Center overhead doors, as per the color renderings.**
14. **Enhance the cornice details on the south, east and west elevation on the parapets and above entry features to include more weight and more overall detail.**

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

15. **Provide revised elevations incorporating design elements listed above for approval by Design Review staff.**
16. **Include foundation base landscaping along the west elevation pharmacy drive-through lane, as per Chapter 15 requirements, to include minimum two feet (2') of foundation base except at drive-through windows and five feet (5') along drive aisles otherwise except for service or loading areas.**
17. **Out lot developments, including the fuel center and canopies, are not included in the Design Review Board approval with this application and will require review and approval by the Design Review Board at a future time. Note that the fuel center use requires a Special Use Permit from the Board of Adjustment prior to Design Review Board consideration.**
18. **On the site plan and elevations show the location of exterior vending machines, propane cylinder cages, newspaper racks, cart storage or similar outdoor items. Such outdoor items need to be located in a manner that is architecturally compatible with the building with screening as required by the Zoning Ordinance. Submit plans for review and approval by Design Review staff prior to submitting construction documents for plan review.**
19. **Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.**

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-91 **Retail Building for Lexon**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: West of SWC of McKellips & Higley
REQUEST: Approval of a 8,363 sq. ft. retail building and a 2,544 sq. ft. restaurant
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Lexon Developer Services
APPLICANT: John Surin, K & I Architects
ARCHITECT: Kristian Sigurdsson, K & I Architects

REQUEST: Approval of a 8,363 sq. ft. retail building and a 2,544 sq. ft. restaurant

SUMMARY: Kristian Sigurdsson represented the case. In response to comments during the study session he stated the sign could be redesigned. He presented a monument sign design at the request of staff and he did believe they planned to build a monument sign. He also stated there was not yet a tenant planned for the restaurant building.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen felt the monument sign needed to have more of a surround and not be consumed with the actual signage as designed it did not comply with design guidelines for signage.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt the tower width was not proportional to the horizontal nature of the building. He felt the tower should be lower or wider. He felt it was a straight roofline with a narrow tower. He felt the monument sign needed to have some of the other building colors and elements so that it tied in better with the building.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen agreed additional stepping on the front elevation at the tower would improve the elevation.

Boardmember Pete Berzins agreed the tower was out of proportion.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer felt the sides of the building were better designed than the front. He wanted to see more of the second color used on the front elevation. He suggested adding the column element with the tile on the monument sign.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Pete Berzins that DR03-91 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

5. **Provide at least one tree in the center-landscaping island in the parking row directly in front of the Pad 1 building.**
6. **Provide a minimum of fifteen feet (15') of foundation base for the west elevation of Pad 2, which includes building entries.**
7. **Relocate the loading space for Pad 2 shown between the trash enclosure and the parking stalls to a location that the loading space is independently accessible and not blocking any drive lanes.**
8. **Relocate the solid waste trash enclosures at the rear of Pad 2 so that the collection truck circulation route does not go through the drive-through lane. The location and design needs to be confirmed by both Solid Waste Division and Planning Design Review staff prior to submitting construction documents for plan review.**
9. **Revise the front tower element by widening the tower or stepping the tower.**
10. **Revise the monument sign.**
11. 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.
12. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
13. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is an attractive commercial center.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-01 **Wells Fargo at Monte Vista Village**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2112 South Ellsworth, Pad 4 (SWC Baseline and Ellsworth)
REQUEST: Development of freestanding Wells Fargo Branch Bank
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Wells Fargo Corporate Property Group
APPLICANT: Byron Stephens, Wells Fargo Property Group
ARCHITECT: Hal Friborg, Leo A. Daly Architecture

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,564 sq. ft. bank

SUMMARY: Hal Friborg and David Bonner represented the case.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer liked the project; however, he felt the curved element over the entry was out of scale. He suggested it be removed.

Boardmembers Berzins and Nielsen agreed the element should be removed.

Boardmember Randy Carter was concerned with the flatness of the arch on the left side of the east elevation. Mr. Friborg explained that the arch design was similar to the arch used on the Safeway. Boardmember Carter agreed with Mr. Friborg.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen felt the building was very attractive.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR04-01 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. **Provide a total of twelve (12) trees in the street landscape yard area along Ellsworth Road.**
8. **Revise the landscape island at the end of row of parking at the south driveway entrance on Ellsworth to ensure a minimum eight feet (8') width and**

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

fifteen feet (15') length.

9. Remove the canopy above the tower roof at the entry.

10. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is complementary to the design of the surrounding center.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-02 **Air Cargo**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 7802 East Cargo Way
REQUEST: Approval of an 81,120 sq. ft. cargo transfer building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Williams Gateway Airport
APPLICANT: Fred Himovitz
ARCHITECT: Wayne Rockwood

REQUEST: Approval of a 81,120 sq. ft. cargo transfer building

SUMMARY: Wayne Rockwood and Fred Himovitz represented the case and stated it had been reviewed and approved by the Williams Gateway Airport Design Review Committee Board.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer felt the blue-trussed element over the glass area did not add to the building. He suggested raising the glass box form so that it engaged with the concrete walls. He confirmed that the "batman" images represent birds in flight. He confirmed there would be clear glass to 8' and then spandrel glass above.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen felt the space frame was "wispy" and he wanted a more human scale element.

Boardmember Vince DiBella felt the canopy element was too high. He suggested the arch be flatter, or moved down lower so that it protected the glass.

Wayne Rockwood suggested moving the arch in front of the glass so it could provide shade in front of the entry.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt that if the curved canopy were pulled down it would be a nice feature. He suggested it be nestled down and integrated into the glass.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen suggested the arch be shifted out away from the face of glass, if it stays. She confirmed the color change is really texture not a paint change, and that the color band on the side of the building is a painted recess.

Wayne Rockwood suggested the canopy could be two tiered so it shades the entry and then could have a second that breaks the top plane of the glass.

Boardmember Pete Berzins felt the building was fun. He liked the canopy. He was concerned that the windows over the doors make the doors look very thin.

Chair Carie Allen liked the canopy; however, she felt it should be lowered. She wanted it to break up the glass and the flatness of the roof.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR04-02 be approved with the following conditions:

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
- 2. Compliance with all requirements of Williams Gateway Airport.**
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. Revise the location of the canopy so that it relates to the glass, makes the scale of the building more pedestrian and shades the break area.**
- 6. Revise landscape plan to show Cercidium praecox where Parkinsonia hybrid 'desert museum' is shown.**
- 7. Metal roof to match Regal Blue.**
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. Screen all exterior roof mounted and ground mounted mechanical equipment.**
10. Fire risers 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 revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is should be an attractive, fun addition to the Williams Gateway Airport.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-03 **East Valley Ophthalmology**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 5602 East Broadway
REQUEST: Approval of a 10,008 sq. ft. ophthalmology office
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Warren Hill M.D.
APPLICANT: Yin Pang
ARCHITECT: Yin Pang

REQUEST: Approval of a 10,008 sq. ft. medical office

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Pete Berzins that DR04-03 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. **Compliance with all conditions of approval for BA03-058.**
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 site plans, revised landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.**

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is an attractive medical office building.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-04 **Retail Building**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1151 West University
REQUEST: Approval of a 4,370 sq. ft. multi-tenant retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: City of Mesa
APPLICANT: John Surin
ARCHITECT: Kristian Sigurdsson

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,370 sq. ft. retail building

SUMMARY: Kristian Sigurdsson represented the case. He explained that the setbacks were negotiated with Economic Development, Planning and the owner. The setbacks for adjacent properties were from 0' to 10'. He explained that the existing bus shelter determined the driveway location.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer felt the driveway was too close to the corner. He wanted the bus shelter moved. He felt the Board should tell the Transportation Division that this design is unacceptable.

Mr. Sigurdsson explained that they had tried to negotiate cross access with the Jack in The Box to the east. Jack in The Box was unwilling to allow the access because they would have lost two parking spaces.

Boardmember Burgheimer offered the suggestion of providing a bus stop instead of a bus shelter. He also wanted the driveway to the egress only.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed that there is an SRP box located at the corner that is determining the shape of the lot.

Boardmember Pete Berzins confirmed the windows on the west elevations are regular windows. He suggested the canopy be cantilevered or something to provide additional shade for those windows.

Boardmember Randy Carter wanted to make sure the backs of the parapets were finished because they would be visible. He wanted the spit-faced block used on the backside where split face block occurred on the front side.

MOTION: It was moved by Jillian Hagen and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR04-04 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
2. **Compliance with all requirements of the Development Incentive Permit.**
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations, except as allowed by the Development Incentive Permit.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.), excepted as allowed by the Development Incentive Permit.
5. **Front and rear sides of the raised parapet elements are to be finished.**
6. **Provide continuous concrete curb in lieu of precast wheel stops.**
7. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
8. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
9. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions should be an attractive addition to this area of town.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Other Business:

DR03-04 Eckerd Drug Store at the NWC Southern and Greenfield.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman explained that the Eckerd Drug Store at the northwest corner of Southern and Greenfield is requesting permission to replace the decorative lights approved with their original proposal with "wall-packs".

Brent Fike represented the case and stated the Eckerd's people from Florida felt the fixtures were unsafe and wondered why they had to use decorative fixtures when the CVS across the street had wall-packs.

He explained that the contractor had used an alternate arm, which pulls the fixture further out from the building, and the fixture was installed lower than shown on the approved drawings.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed that the sconces were mounted in the wrong location and would need to be higher. They would have to move the junction box and patch the original location. He felt it would be cheaper to redesign the cane. He was OK with the wall-packs.

Boardmember Pete Berzins confirmed the manufacture still makes the bracket that was approved by the Board it just wasn't available at the time they installed the brackets on this building.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen suggested they choose a different decorative fixture, possibly smaller.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen confirmed the applicants proposed the decorative fixture in the original proposal now they want wall-packs. She was concerned with the precedent this would set. She confirmed it was the contractor who made the error in purchasing the wrong bracket and installing them in the wrong location.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed they were installed in the wrong place, and they need to be placed higher. He confirmed they should not have used a "shepherd's arm." He felt they needed to use decorative lights. They were installed incorrectly, and he was also concerned with a precedent for future projects.

Chair Carie Allen had no problem with the wall-packs.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Jillian Hagen that the Board require a different decorative fixture.

VOTE: 6 – 1 (Boardmember Randy Carter voting nay)

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant