

**CITY OF MESA**  
**MINUTES OF THE**  
**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**  
**NOVEMBER 6, 2002**

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  
John O'Hara- Vice Chair  
Robert Burgheimer  
John Poulsen  
Tara Plese  
Jillian Hagen

MEMBERS ABSENT

Randy Carter (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman	Mark Irby
Lesley Davis	Dan Bonow
Debbie Archuleta	Vince DiBella
Charlie Scully	
Richard Dyer	
Paul Prosser	
Fawn Finchum	
Steve Stetler	
Roger Manny	
S.G. Ellison	
Peter Vargas	

1. Call to Order:

Chair Carie Allen called the meeting to order at 3:45 p.m.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the October 2, and October 23, 2002 Meetings:

On a motion by John O'Hara seconded by Rob Burgheimer the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

3. Design Review Cases:

## MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 6, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR02-52**                      **“QuikTrip 433”**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**            414 South Stapley  
**REQUEST:**                         Approval of a 14,918 sq. ft. gas station convenience store  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**            District 4  
**OWNER:**                             Dave Cisiewski  
**APPLICANT:**                    Dan Bonow  
**ARCHITECT:**                     John Smales

**REQUEST:**        Approval of a 5,040 sq. ft. convenience store and a 8,068 sq. ft. gas canopy

**SUMMARY:**       Mark Irby and Dan Bonow represented the case. Mr. Irby stated that they were looking for direction regarding how to make the stores different. He also stated that it was his opinion that the stores were far enough apart that they could have the same character. The other issue was the corporate image.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated that he didn't think the building was bad; however, they were using the same colors, the same forms, and the solution seemed to be adding more gingerbread to the outside of the building. The Board wanted to see actual variation. He gave as an example the convenience stores Fred Osmond did in Chandler. He wanted to see changes in form, use of different colors, and different variation on the façade treatment, introducing different building materials.

Dan Bonow stated that the tile, which was not used on the first 5 buildings, makes a lot more difference in reality that it appears to make on the elevations.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that we do live in a very large City and staff would like to see buildings designed to include the distinctive character of the neighborhood or area of the City they are being built in.

Boardmember John Poulsen stated that when he looked at the display provided by staff of the elevations of the previous QuikTrips approved by this Board it was hard to see the changes. He confirmed that the colors on the first 5 buildings were the Phoenix Division corporate colors. The lighter colors on the entries of the newer proposals was at the request of the Design Review Board. Boardmember Poulsen did not feel that going from one shade of brown to another shade of brown to another shade of brown was not enough change. He felt that the buildings were still too similar. He confirmed that the gas canopy columns were split face masonry. He suggested using stone on the columns and the building in the future. He stated he was tentative to approve this building because he wanted to get away from the repeated look; and he would not approve another building like this.

Dan Bonow stated that they understood from the Board with the previous approval that QuikTrip would be able to build three buildings of that same design. He understood that with the next submittal they make they will have to make changes.

Boardmember John Poulsen stated confirmed that the front entry where they have the QuikTrip sign comes out 8' from the face of the doors to the outside edge, and 4' from the main body of the building. In the future he wanted them to break the mold.

## MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 6, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Mr. Irby stated that they want to know how far to break the mold. He stated that they are dealing with a corporate client who requires a lengthy process to make any changes.

Boardmember Tara Plese agreed with Mr. Irby regarding the location. She felt that this building seemed to be far enough away from other buildings that she doesn't get the sense that she is looking at another prototype. She felt that they had made significant changes.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen stated that she felt there were quite a few in the central/southern area around Mesa Drive. She agreed that the next submittal they needed to break up the prototype. She suggested either changing the color palette drastically, or change the forms drastically, or a combination of both.

Vice Chair John O'Hara stated that McDonalds look different, banks look different. He felt that 20 pumps were too many for this location. He felt that the size of this franchise is like a mini-truck stop and should be only be located adjacent to freeways or interstates not Stapley and Broadway. He agreed that anything at that corner is an improvement over the existing; however, 20 pumps overwhelms the neighborhood. He felt that this is a residential neighborhood. He was opposing the use based on the size. He felt that a gas station of this size belongs in an industrial or major commercial area not a residential area.

Chair Carie Allen stated that in the past she had made it clear she is against prototypes. She felt that her problem with giving them direction on where to go with the design of their next prototype is that she wants to see buildings that identify with the neighborhoods. Try to find what is common in the area whether it is color, building material, or design. She felt that Mesa is a large city and has many distinctive neighborhoods, she wants to see new construction that reflects the neighborhoods. She agreed that from looking at the map most of their sites are not in very distinctive areas such as Red Mountain area, or some of the more distinctive areas where we spent so much time creating an image. The only direction she could give them would be to fit the neighborhoods.

Mark Irby stated that he agreed that when you have a master planned community with a theme it is nice to blend into it, or if they were in a shopping center with a theme they would agree. He felt that in most of the city there is such a mixture or architecture you can't.

Chair Carie Allen agreed that in most of the areas they have built there is not distinctive character; however she felt that you have to look very closely to see any change in design of their buildings.

Boardmember John Poulsen agreed that in this part of town there may not be much architecture to emulate; however this area of town is very green, maybe they should have used green tones rather than desert tones, or maybe something country looking, or traditional looking, rather than something as contemporary and southwest as this design.

Mr. Bonow then stated that he felt they had addressed that through landscaping.

Boardmember Poulsen felt that one more step on the building would have been nice. He agreed that the use should fit the neighborhood and that neighborhood is not southwest.

## MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 6, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Mr. Bonow agreed with Mr. Irby that they would match a distinct neighborhood or shopping center, but with an infill it is harder to match.

Chair Carie Allen stated that there could be arches, awnings, a number of things you could pick up from a neighborhood that you could use.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated in the future he would take a dim view of this level of change for a prototype. He agreed that in this situation there was a transition and this was allowed to go through, but in the future he will expect more variation of prototypes. He understood that in the past this applicant was told by the Board that they would be allowed 3 buildings of this prototype. The next one needs to be very different.

Staffmember Lesley Davis then asked if, when this applicant comes in with a different prototype, will they again be allowed to build 3 of that prototype, or will it be specific to the neighborhood in which it is going?

The Board then agreed that it should be specific to the neighborhood. Proposals need to be reviewed on a case by case basis.

John Poulsen then confirmed that staff had requested changes to the plant palette to replace the Mesquites that did not appear to be appropriate to this area of the city, and they needed to add an additional tree specie.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen felt that the types of trees they were proposing; Mesquite, Oaks, Sissoo, were too different. She suggested a strictly ornamental palette, Oaks, Sissoo, Shamel Ash, or something evergreen, maybe Elm.

**MOTION:** It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Tara Plese that DR02-52 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 the Preliminary Development Impact Summary Comments.
3. **Provide a revised landscape plan that incorporates at least one additional tree type along the south and west property lines, additional trees between the parking and the wall along the south property line as well as an enhanced landscaping palette of trees, shrubs and ground covers providing more shade along the street frontages and pedestrian areas. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.**
4. **Applicant to work with staff to revise the landscape palette to use more ornamental trees in place of the Mesquite.**
5. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
6. Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened by a parapet wall equal to or exceeding the height of the mechanical units. To the extent permitted by law, satellite dishes shall be fully screened by a parapet wall. Ground mounted

## MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 6, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

mechanical equipment shall be fully screened from public view by a combination of a decorative wall and dense landscaping. The screen wall shall be equal to or exceed the height of the mechanical units.

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. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with the Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
9. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 20' height at the perimeter.
10. Screen all parking areas and vehicular circulation aisles adjacent to the public right of way. The screen walls along the street frontage should be varied in alignment, broken up with naturally contoured berming and staggered dense shrubs to achieve a continuous screen of no less than 36 inches above the highest adjacent grade.
11. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
12. Provide two full size and two 8-1/2 X 11 sets 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 4 – 1 (Boardmember O'Hara voting nay) (Boardmember Burgheimer left prior to the vote)

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The development as proposed with conditions complies with previous Design Review Board QuikTrip approvals.

Recorded on Tape No.: 143 - 1 (side A and B)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 6, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR02-56**                      **“Smith Southwestern Inc. – Warehouse Addition”**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**            1850 North Rosemont  
**REQUEST:**                         Approval of a 54,141 sq. ft. warehouse addition for an  
  existing industrial building  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**            District 5  
**OWNER:**                         STYD Development Co.  
**APPLICANT:**                   Bruce Finchum, Smith Southwestern Inc.  
**ARCHITECT:**                    Paul J. Prosser

**REQUEST:**            Approval of a 54,141 sq. ft. warehouse addition to an existing industrial building

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

**MOTION:**            It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR02-56 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, including the Preliminary Plan Review Team (Development Engineering, Solid Waste and Facilities, Building Safety, Fire, Plan Review, etc.)
4. Compliance with the requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the parcel is divided.
5. All outdoor storage areas for materials, equipment, and service entrance section (SES) shall be recessed or fully screened from view by a masonry wall the same height as the utility cabinet.
6. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
7. Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened by a parapet wall equal to or exceeding the height of the mechanical units. To the extent permitted by law, satellite dishes shall be fully screened by a parapet wall. Ground mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened from public view by a combination of a decorative wall and dense landscaping. The screen wall shall be equal to or exceed the height of the mechanical units.
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. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with the Chapter 6 of the City Code “Outdoor Light Control” and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.

## MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 6, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

10. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 20' height at the perimeter.
11. Fire risers and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
12. Provide two half scale 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

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The development as proposed with conditions is compatible with the existing project.

Recorded on Tape No.: 143 - 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 6, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR02-57**                      **“CVS Pharmacy”**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**            9152 East Brown  
**REQUEST:**                            Approval of a 12,000 sq. ft. drug store  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**                5  
**OWNER:**                                Armstrong Gustine Development  
**APPLICANT:**                        Carter Burgess  
**ARCHITECT:**                         Carter Burgess

**REQUEST:**        Approval of a 12,000 sq. ft. drug store

**SUMMARY:** This case was removed from the consent agenda. S.G. Ellison, Roger Manny and Peter Vargas represented the case.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen wanted two additional foundation trees on the north side of the building as depicted on the elevation.

Boardmember John O’Hara confirmed the two additional trees would be Sweet Acacia.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thanked the applicant’s for the changes they have made to each of their buildings that have been reviewed by the Board. He felt that they had taken these pharmacies and made each one a little different while still maintaining a common thread. He wanted the applicant’s to know that appreciated their work.

Chair Carie Allen agreed that the Board appreciates their efforts to design the buildings to reflect the neighborhoods.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Jillian Hagen and seconded by John O’Hara that DR02-57 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. Submit a Native Plant Preservation Plan and application to Wahid Alam, Planner II (480) 644-2385.
6. All outdoor storage areas for materials, equipment, and service entrance section (SES) shall be recessed or fully screened from view by a masonry wall the same height as the utility cabinet. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.

## MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 6, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

7. Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened by a parapet wall equal to or exceeding the height of the mechanical units. To the extent permitted by law, satellite dishes shall be fully screened by a parapet wall. Ground mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened from public view by a combination of a decorative wall and dense landscaping. The screen wall shall be equal to or exceed the height of the mechanical units.
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. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with the Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
10. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 20' height at the perimeter. Light standards (poles) for pad sites are to match the light standards used within the shopping center.
11. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
12. Provide two additional Sweet Acacias in the foundation planting area on the north elevation.

**VOTE:** Passed 6 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The development as proposed with conditions is well designed and complies with the Desert Uplands Development Standards.

Recorded on Tape No.: 143 – 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 6, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR02-58**                    **“Retail Building – Lot 1”**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**       6955 East Baseline  
**REQUEST:**                        Approval of a 8,400 sq. ft. multi-tenant retail building  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**        District 6  
**OWNER:**                         Baseline Roslyn Investors, L.L.C.  
**APPLICANT:**                 Kristian Sigurdsson  
**ARCHITECT:**                 K & I Architects & Interiors

**REQUEST:**        Approval of a 8,400 sq. ft. multi-tenant retail building

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

**MOTION:**        It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR02-58 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, sign criteria package 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. **The smaller tiles on the center tower element on the south elevation to be replaced with the diagonal tiles utilized on the rest of the building. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.**
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. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with the Chapter 6 of the City Code “Outdoor Light Control” and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
8. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25’ for the interior and 20’ height at the perimeter.
9. Light standards (poles) for pad sites are to match the light standards used within the shopping center.
10. Screen all parking areas and vehicular circulation aisles adjacent to the public right of way. The screen walls along the street frontage should be varied in alignment, broken up with naturally contoured berming and staggered dense shrubs to achieve a continuous screen of no less than 36 inches above the highest adjacent grade.
11. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 6, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

12. Provide two half size color elevations, two full size and two 8-1/2 X 11 sets 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 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The development as proposed with conditions complements existing retail development in the area.

Recorded on Tape No.: 143 – 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 6, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR02-59**                    **“Superstition Point Offices”**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**       SEC Madero Avenue & Power Road  
**REQUEST:**                        Approval of a 22,603 sq. ft. office project  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**         6  
**OWNER:**                         Di Bella Family LLP  
**APPLICANT:**                 Vincent DiBella  
**ARCHITECT:**                 Vincent DiBella

**REQUEST:**       Approval of a 22,603 sq. ft. office project

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

**MOTION:** It was moved by John Paulsen and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR02-59 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. **Revise the landscaping plan. Substitute an evergreen tree with a broad, dense canopy. Plan to be approved by Design Review staff.**
5. If not located in the “electrical room”, service entrance section (SES) shall be recessed or fully screened from view by a masonry wall the same height as the utility cabinet. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
6. Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened by a parapet wall equal to or exceeding the height of the mechanical units. To the extent permitted by law, satellite dishes shall be fully screened by a parapet wall. Ground mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened from public view by a combination of a decorative wall and dense landscaping. The screen wall shall be equal to or exceed the height of the mechanical units.
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. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with the Chapter 6 of the City Code “Outdoor Light Control” and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
9. Light standards (poles) shall be a maximum height of 25’ for the interior and 14’ height at the perimeter.

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 6, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

10. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.

**VOTE:** Passed 6 – 0

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

Recorded on Tape No.: 143 – 1 (side A)

## MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 6, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

### Other Business:

Chair Carie Allen then introduced other business. The first item was a discussion of the "Commercial Center Development Policy". Staffmember Charlie Scully then handed out the DRAFT policy. He explained that in the last few months' staff has reviewed several proposals for new shopping centers. He stated that staff is repeatedly discussing the same issues over and over with applicants regarding the revised Design Guidelines. He stated that staff felt it would be helpful to developers and everyone involved to have a policy that would help them understand the Design Guidelines. This policy document would be to explain and clarify the Guidelines.

Chair Carie Allen confirmed that staff is asking for the Board's support of the "Commercial Center Development Policy". Staff will present this document to shopping center developers.

Staffmember Charlie Scully asked the Board to read through the policy and give staff input on what should be added or deleted. Mr. Scully stated that the Planning and Zoning Board had already reviewed the policy and made suggestions, which had been incorporated into the version the Design Review Board was given. In fact the Planning and Zoning Board wanted to see policy statements regarding multi-family projects, industrial projects, etc.

It was agreed that the Board would review the document and give staff their suggestions at the December 4, 2002 meeting.

Staffmember Scully in answer to a question from Boardmember Jillian Hagen confirmed that staff would be taking this document to Redevelopment and Economic Development, returning to the Planning and Zoning Board then they would get comments from developers. He suggested that maybe this document should have a section regarding prototypes.

Boardmember Tara Plese stated that she agreed the issue of prototypes is very important. She stated that the Mesa Grand center at Stapley and the Freeway looks just like a development in Awatukee and one in Glendale, as far as the placement of the restaurants and theaters, etc. She felt that we need to be more innovative.

The next item on the agenda was "Freestanding Pharmacy and Drug Store Report".

Staffmember Charlie Scully passed out copies of the "Freestanding Pharmacy and Drug Store Report" to the Board and to members of the audience who had stayed to hear the discussion.

Mr. Scully stated that pharmacy/drug stores are convenient, and offer a wide variety of products. The question is do we need three on a corner, and how many do we need in our community? This report does not have any recommendations, it simply raises questions, and tries to track what this trend means. This document came about because staff was seeing a trend of pharmacy expansions. CVS is proposing as many as 12 to 15 stores in Mesa, Walgreen's is proposing another store and may build two more, staff has had meetings with Eckerd who state they may want 10 to 15 stores in Mesa. The question is what would it mean if all of the proposed pharmacies were actually built? These are large stores proposed on arterial corners. Mr. Scully explained that there are 50 or more actual pharmacies within Mesa if you look at hospitals, in-line stores, and pharmacies within grocery stores. The issue isn't actually pharmacies, it's the large drug stores on corners. This study tracks the sizes of

## MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 6, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

the parcels, the buildings, and the amount of parking these uses insist they need, which can be 2 and half times the Zoning Ordinance requirement. In some cases the applicants are asking for variances to the setbacks and landscaping in order to accommodate the size of the building and all of the parking they want. Staff is concerned that requests for variances to site amenities is becoming a trend. This is an issue that other communities are dealing with. In the past these corners were smaller uses, a bank or fast food, which were a few thousand square feet, now we are seeing 12,000 to 15,000 square feet even 17,000 and they are 30 feet tall. There are even examples in other parts of the country where they are over 20,000 square feet.

Boardmember John O'Hara asked if any other cities had done anything about this question. The answer was not specifically, they are researching also.

Chair Carie Allen felt that this issue is more Planning and Zoning than Design Review.

Staffmember Scully stated that the Design Review Board does need to look at how the rear and sides of the buildings relate to the surrounding shopping center. Pedestrian connections between pharmacies and the shopping centers.

Chair Carie Allen noted that there are several Walgreen's throughout the City that do not address anything else around them.

Boardmember Tara Plese wondered what happens to the sites where the pharmacies have vacated in order to build stand-alone buildings.

Staffmember Scully stated that there is an evolution to these types of situations where the uses out compete each other or evolve into something different. Then the City will be left with empty retail space that will be hard to find a use for. He felt that that was more of a Planning and Zoning issue.

Chair Carie Allen then stated that this addresses her concerns regarding designing for the neighborhood. If there are four pharmacies on each corner they will all want to be designed differently. She felt that this issue needs to be addressed at Planning and Zoning where they can say we will take only one or two of these uses at a corner.

Boardmember O'Hara felt that Mesa is so heavily reliant on sales tax that they are reluctant to say no to anything.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that staff has been told by Economic Development that there is no real sales tax gain in these situations because you are simply taking sales tax from another store.

Boardmember John Poulsen then asked the representatives of CVS who were in the audience to hear this discussion why these stores are so tall.

Roger Manny explained that internally the stores have 12' ceilings. The reason for the 12' ceiling is so that customers can read signs above the 5' to 6' shelves. Then above the ceiling is the distribution system, drainage, ducts, etc. There isn't a lot of extras space, maybe 6". Above the roof structure is the roof top cooling and heating systems, which range in size from 4' to 6' tall.

## MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 6, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Poulsen asked if ground mounted mechanical were an option.

Mr. Manny stated that the unit would be a very large thing to screen on the ground. It would also be inefficient to carry the air from ground level rather than from above.

Boardmember Poulsen felt that these buildings are very hard to re-use. They don't really work for offices or other retail.

Mr. Manny felt that they could be broken up into more than one retail or restaurant use.

Boardmember Poulsen and Boardmember O'Hara felt that the real decisions need to be made at the City Council level. Regarding how many should be built at an intersection, where they should be located, etc.

Boardmember O'Hara stated that it seemed that lately the Planning and Zoning was approving things and then expecting the Design Review Board to clean them up. He did not feel the City needs to develop every corner that comes through.

Boardmember Poulsen stated that he liked the way the CVS proposed at Brown and Ellsworth had divided the building with the columns, the colors, and chamfering the roofs. Other Boardmembers agreed.

Mr. Manny stated many times the architect/applicant is stretched in many directions, the owner, the developer, the municipalities. He appreciated the fact that communities are concerned with how development looks. He felt that the store proposed for Brown and Ellsworth would probably be too much for most other sites, but the client realizes this is a unique area. He stated that this project would not be as well designed, as it was if staff had not been very clear in what their expectations were and their willingness to work with staff. He felt that these stores, over time would actually become a replacement for neighborhood grocery stores at a smaller scale.

Boardmember Poulsen stated that what makes this particular building unique is that it was split in half, with the awnings and the colors so it has a low profile streamlined look.

Recorded on Tape 143 – 1 (side B)

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta  
Planning Assistant

da

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 6, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING