

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

September 7, 2005

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

Pete Berzins - Chair
Dave Richins- Vice Chair
Tom Bottomley
Jillian Hagen
Tim Nielsen
Vince DiBella
Robert Burgheimer

MEMBERS ABSENT

Vince DiBella

OTHERS PRESENT

Kim Steadman
Lesley Davis
Debbie Archuleta
Mia Lozano Helland
John Wesley
April Ward
Gordon Sheffield
Richard Dyer
Hank Hulbert
Joe Kramer
Bill Wells
JD Berryman
Bob Saemisch
George Graves
Marcella Marios
Kevin Carr
Michael Quattrone
Steve Bauer
Ladell Call
Sean Lake
Nick Rogers

Karl Kohlhoff
Patty Powers
Jon Griffin
Chris Myers
Reisen Amado
Mike Wilson
Dave Ullrich
Tyler Wright
Dorothy Shupe
Randy Carter
Ramesh Patel
Urmila Patel
Jim Day
Lance Adams
Mike Krentz
Molly Faran
Jeff Will
Craig Boswell
Loren Dickinson
Cameron Miles
Others

1. Work Session:

CASE: Rozenman Retail/Office
2912 E Baseline

REQUEST: Approval of an office/ retail building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Concerned with traffic flow
- Landscaping at the rear
- Could the rear jog?
- North elevation needs more design
- Select different, more interesting, exterior wall fixtures
- Cut off fixtures on the rear

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Is canopy solid?
- Provide architectural interest the top of the rear
- Colors are weak and dull
- Need additional color

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- The rear is blank
- The light fixtures not above the canopy

CASE: Wal-Mart Greenfield Fueling Station
SWC Greenfield & US 60

REQUEST: Approval of a fueling canopy with a kiosk

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Redesign the canopy, the articulation looks cheap
- The price sign on the canopy to be flush with bottom of canopy
- Beef up the thickness of the canopy

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Recess the lights

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Texture to match Wal-Mart
- Incorporate Wal-Mart fascia detailing
- Needs to relate better to the center
- Proportion of building parapet and canopy
- Take some of the stone off and use some brick – like the center

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Screen wall to match center

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Too much stepping on such a small building (referring to sales booth)
- Take detailing from the center
- Bollards should match building
- Pop the columns through the top of the canopy

CASE: Banner Desert Parking Structure
1400 S Dobson

REQUEST: Approval of a parking structure

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Show lighting on the top on the next submittal

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Needs to be better designed, this will be visible
- Look at the approved Scion dealership at Superstition Springs
- This is a bone stock garage relate to the tower elements
- Maybe perforated elements
- Put all their energy on the north and south elevations
- Be careful with the number of light poles on top

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Needs more articulation, particularly along north and east sides

CASE: Plaza West Broadway
1720 W Broadway

REQUEST: Approval of two retail buildings

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Jillian Hagen:

- Concerned with shade
- The blue is not attractive

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Looks plain
- Should be better than the existing building
- Rear elevation a concern – very visible from Broadway
- Could pop-up and be more pronounced

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- The blue is a concern – could it be slate gray?
- Doors
- Could rusty color or green be used on the rear?

CASE: Commons West Broadway
1720 W Broadway

REQUEST: Approval of an industrial building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Would like to see some of this detailing on the other project

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Could they push out the red CMU bands $\frac{1}{2}$ "?

CASE: Retail Building
SEC Southern & Mesa Drive

REQUEST: Approval of a retail building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- If they went with a sign package and only used one color the band might be OK

Chair Pete Berzins:

- The signage is a concern, needs to be broken up

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Break up the sign band
- Concerned the clear vision glass could change on the north elevation
- Will there be 2-sided entry?

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Walkway is too narrow on Southern – it seems like an after-thought
- South elevation appears to be better thought out

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Could they have outdoor dining on Mesa Drive

2. Call to Order:

Chair Pete Berzins called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the August 3, and August 17, 2005 Meetings:

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

4. Discuss and consider appointing a volunteer from the Design Review Board to serve on an RFP Review Committee with regards to the Zoning Code Update.

Staffmember Gordon Sheffield explained the City needs to update the Zoning Code through an RFP. He stated the staff was hoping to have 9 members of various citizen boards participate in the process of choosing the consultant. The consultant would then work with staff to update the Code. The proposed changes would then be brought to the Planning and Zoning Board, Design Review Board, City Council and other boards quarterly to update their progress. Boardmember Rob Burgheimer volunteered.

5. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-55 **Comfort Inn & Suites**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 651 E. Main
REQUEST: Approval of a 12,832 sq. ft. motel
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: Ramesh Patel
APPLICANT: Ramesh Patel
ARCHITECT: Mani Subra

REQUEST: Approval of a 12,832 sq. ft. motel

SUMMARY: Mani Subra represented the case. Mr. Subra stated Comfort Inn had approved staff conditions.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought the porte cochere was still not well integrated into the building. The tall parapet should be revised. He suggested a hipped roof. He wondered why the detailing under the porte cochere did not appear anywhere else on the building. He agreed with staff that they needed richer more vibrant colors.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen agreed the porte cochere was the only Santa Fe style element of the building, and would be better with a hipped roof. She thought the east elevation was very plain and linear. She suggested a change in paint color to break up the elevation. She also thought there should be a change in roof line.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley agreed the east elevation was too linear. The color bands look like racing stripes. He confirmed the building would be stucco. He suggested an extra layer of foam vertically to break up horizontality of building. He thought the east elevation needed more articulation. He thought the porte cochere was still too different from the rest of the building. He was concerned with the location of the sign, he thought it should be higher. He was concerned with the shape of the porte cochere below the fascia. He thought the colors were too salmon. He suggested the vertical fields of thickened wall (foam) could improve the other elevations as well.

Boardmember Dave Richins had no additional comments.

Chair Pete Berzins thought the east side would not be seen.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer agreed with previous comments. Porte cochere needs work, maybe tile roof, or a hip or gable. He thought the paint colors were too pink.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR05-55 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:

- a. Revise the elevations of the Porte Cochere to reduce the proportions and provide a better transition to the roof of the building.
 - b. The design of any proposed monument signs require Design Review approval.
 - c. Revise the color palette, staying away from the pink/peach tones, to provide richer neutral colors.
 - d. Work with staff to redesign the porte cochere.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
 3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
 4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
 5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
 6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
 7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: For the reasons stated on the record which include

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-63 Retail Building

LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Apache Trail & Signal Butte
REQUEST: Approval of a 6,483 sq. ft. multi-tenant retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 7
OWNER: Empire Development Services
APPLICANT: Mark Bowker
ARCHITECT: K & I Architects

REQUEST: Approval of a 6,483 sq. ft. multi-tenant retail building with a drive-through

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

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR05-63 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 site plan and landscape plan indicating the correct position of the trash enclosures angled with the gates turned toward the east, away from the drive through as shown with the DIP request. (Z05-076)
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with the Development Incentive Permit (DIP) approved by the Zoning Administrator. (ZA05-076)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned.
6. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
8. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: For the reasons stated on the record which include

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-64 Mesa Ridge Business Park
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 4005 E McDowell
REQUEST: Approval of a 234,402 sq. ft. Retail and Industrial project
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Wilson Property
APPLICANT: Cawley Architects
ARCHITECT: Cawley Architects

REQUEST: Approval of a 234,402 sq. ft. retail and industrial project

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

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR05-64 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 missing information on materials and colors. Provide samples.
 - b. Change the color of the metal awnings & decorative mullions to a warm color, as shown in the colored elevations.
 - c. Specify model & finish of the "Colonnade" Sconce.
 - d. Revise landscape plans to provide perimeter landscaping with the first phase of development.
 - e. Relocate these employee break areas to landscaped areas: Bldgs 2/3; 4/5, 6. Better define all break areas with amenities, per §11-14-3 (B) 13 (c).
 - f. Lower the 6'-0" high screening walls to 3'-4" between buildings 2/3 and 4/5.
 - g. Provide a parking canopy, or a landscape island in the 11 space parking area along the south property line of bldg. #1.
 - h. Redesign the retention basins to meet the requirements of §11-15-3 (D).
 - i. All future buildings to come before the Design Review Board.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, 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

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: For the reasons stated on the record which include

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-65 Fish & Chips

LOCATION/ADDRESS: North of NEC Lindsay & University
REQUEST: Approval of a 1,365 sq. ft. restaurant
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: Lance Adams
APPLICANT: Cameron Miles
ARCHITECT: Cameron Miles

REQUEST: Approval of a 1,365 sq. ft. restaurant

SUMMARY: Cameron Miles and Lance Adams represented the case. Mr. Adams stated he did not want to match the center but the Board had directed them to.

A citizen requested to speak. Randy Carter thought the design was lacking in detail, especially the north and west elevations. He did not think the building was an enhancement to the center. He suggested the project be more aggressive and flamboyant. He suggested the height might be raised. He thought the new colors for the shopping center were worse than the original colors.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen confirmed the building would be stucco. She did not think the applicant should try to match the center or the center's colors, but complement them. She thought the canopy should be stronger. She thought the structure should feel solid, and that there should also be color on the main body of the building.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley stated that the Board had suggested they incorporate an element from the center, not copy the center. He did not think the building had an identity. He stated it needed a theme. He did not think the project looked designed, he thought the drive-through looked tacked on.; He thought it needed interesting forms and a change of color palette. Mr. Adams stated they had to get approval from the center for this building.

Boardmember Dave Richins thought this was a very small building that would blend into the background. He agreed with staff direction.

Chair Pete Berzins agreed with staff direction.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer did not think the building enhanced the corner. He thought the scale was wrong. The project was moving in the wrong direction. He suggested the applicant may need a study session to help get the project moving along.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen stated the existing center is not great and the new colors did not enhance it. This building is an opportunity to add interest to the center. He thought the applicant needed to address volume, space and interplay of forms, not just provide a canopy to eat under. The central building is just a box; it needs design, like the vertical reveals on the existing center. The color and little curve are the only things that tie to the center. He thought the project needed a lot of work.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR05-65 be continued to September 26, 2005.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 4- - 2 (Chair Pete Berzins and Dave Richins voting nay)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: To allow the applicant time to redesign the building and talk to individual Boardmembers to get assistance and direction.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05- 67 Hewson Dover Building D
LOCATION/ADDRESS: N.W. Corner of N. Greenfield & E. Presidio
REQUEST: Approval of Phase II - Bldg. D: an 87,276 sq. ft. Industrial building with Site Plan conditions
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: The Hewson Company
APPLICANT: Will Architects
ARCHITECT: Jeff Will

REQUEST: Approval of a 87,276 sq. ft. industrial building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR05-67 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 submitted to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents:
 - j. Provide recordation of cross-access and reciprocal parking agreements for the overall development with submittal of construction documents.
 - k. Ensure phased development addresses Chapter 15 requirements for temporary edge treatment with a minimum five-foot wide landscape strip.
 - l. Revise the landscape to include the entire property out to Presidio and comply with the City of Mesa Development Standards established in Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - m. All screen walls need to match what was approved with the adjacent approved project and must be installed to comply with Chapter 15 requirements.
 - n. Provide parking calculation for entire group development with application for future phases to ensure compliance with overall group development calculation.
 - o. Any proposed monument signs will require Design Review approval.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: For the reasons stated on the record.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05- 68 **Dover Industrial**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2848, 2832, 2816 N Omaha
REQUEST: Approval of three industrial buildings totaling 50,495 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Dover Associates
APPLICANT: Rick Pennell
ARCHITECT: Loren Dickinson

REQUEST: Approval of three industrial buildings totaling 50,495 sq. ft.

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

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR05-68 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:
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: For the reasons stated on the record.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-69 **Tesoro**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: S of SWC Southern and Greenfield
REQUEST: Approval of a 337 unit multi-family residential project
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: DR Horton
APPLICANT: Biltform Architecture Group
ARCHITECT: Vincent Scarano

REQUEST: Approval of a 337 unit multi-family residential project

SUMMARY: Vince Scarano, and Dave Ulrect represented the case. Mr. Scarano stated this project is the same as Tivoli, the buildings are very close to each other so you can't see articulation on the sides. He stated the density was 12.8 units per gross acre. Mr. Scarano stated the reason the buildings are close together is that City staff wanted them to provide open space.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was concerned with the side elevations. He thought the project looked like row houses. He stated the project would be very visible from Greenfield and the side elevations were very flat. He thought the building placement was rigid. He did not like the 2nd story part of the elevations that will be visible above the perimeter walls.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought there had been some improvements. He liked the colors. He was concerned with the flatness of the project.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen was concerned with the view of the rear elevation from Greenfield and from Sounthern. She thought the windows were too small for the building mass.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought the cantilevered second floor element needed visual support. The small corbels were not enough. The colors were nice, the flatness was a concern, and the project was too dense. He thought the buildings needed relief. They felt crammed together. He thought there should be more open space. The row house look was a concern. He confirmed the buildings were 15' apart. He thought 15' for a 2-story building would feel like a tunnel. He thought the buildings were too plain for 2-story buildings.

Boardmember Dave Richins thought the buildings appeared top heavy. He suggested bringing the stone up to the base of the cantilevers. He thought the project needed refinement.

Chair Pete Berzins stated Tivoli was smaller scale. He was concerned with the rear and the views from Greenfield and from Southern.

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR05-69 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

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

the Building Safety Division:

- a. Revise the Tri-plex elevations to create a change in plane for the entire volume of the cantilever by thickening the stucco to eliminate paint color changes at corners and paint lines. Note thickness of the stucco in that location on all elevations. Minimum 2" depth required at those points.
 - b. Replace the tri-plex unit on lot 21 (at the southwest corner of the site) with a single-story duplex unit.
 - c. Increase articulation on the rear and side elevations where visible from Greenfield or Southern to be equivalent in detail and articulation with the front elevations.
 - d. Massing below the cantilever.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
 3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
 4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
 5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
 6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
 7. Provide two half-size color elevations, one full-size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Failed 3 – 3 (Rob Burgheimer, Jillian Hagen, Tom Bottomley voting nay)

After discussion the Board confirmed that staff felt comfortable working with the applicants to revise the elevations to address the Board's concerns as discussed.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Dave Richins that DR05-69 be approved with the following conditions:

VOTE: Passed 4 – 2 (Jillian Hagen and Tom Bottomley voting nay)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: For the reasons stated on the record which include

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-70 Sam's Club

LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC McKellips & 46th Street
REQUEST: Approval of a 247,423 sq. ft. retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Marsha Greene
APPLICANT: Pew & Lake
ARCHITECT: Boice Raidl Rhea

REQUEST: Approval of a 247,423 sq. ft. retail building

SUMMARY: Michael Quatrone Kevin Carr and Sean Lake represented the case. Mr. Quatrone read a statement that had been negotiated with adjacent property owners.

Citizen comment: Randy Carter was concerned with He questioned why so much design on the south but not on the west.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley confirmed the applicant had not submitted a revised color board with the colors being proposed for the building. He thought the pilasters should either break the roofline or be shorter. He confirmed the double doors were not roll up. He was concerned that the canopies didn't seem to do anything, he thought they should cover the doors. More should happen between the pilasters to break the center portion and provide light and shadow. He thought there should be more articulation of the front entry; it is too downplayed. He suggested varying the wide diagonal piece; changing the height and break the long canopy into three pieces and provide stepping up. He was concerned with the pattern in the singlewide pilaster on the south elevation, he thought it looked forced. He thought the elevation facing 46th Street needed more attention. The bollards should be decorative. The white doors were too stark. The canopy at the loading area needs more substance; it is too thin. He suggested the entry be raised 8". He agreed there needed to be more parking at the entry. He suggested they change the color of the loading area canopy.

Michael Quatrone then stated the front elevation canopy and landscaping would provide shade as a semi-covered walkway. Adding height to the double pilasters and at the entry was O.K.. He would like to study breaking that up. Along 46th Street the columns at the drive through could increase to 5'-4". Single pilasters could be replaced with something different. Articulating the cart storage area would be difficult. The white doors were pre-finished. Boardmember Bottomley stated the doors are available in other colors, such as putty. Boardmember Bottomley was also concerned with the loading zone and how it transitions into the side of the entry.

Boardmember Dave Richins thought the top of the double pilasters should be analytical gray. The applicant confirmed this. The elevations called out the wrong color.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the entire project had too many pads. He wanted the canopies to be real canopies. He stated pedestrians would want to walk along the front of the building to get to the future retail buildings to the east, then the Board could require the future sites to connect to the canopies. He thought this project should use the vaulted pieces and green color from the Wal-Mart site to the west. He thought this project should tie in better with that center. He agreed the white doors needed to be toned down. The double columns should be raised above the roofline. The sidewalk/landscape area along the north elevation is only

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

12' wide. It should be wider, or people won't want to walk between the shops and the Sam's Club.

Michael Quatrone then stated they wanted to use trees to provide shade across the front. He stated they canopies could be pulled out and maybe the canopies alternate between flat and the arched form used on the adjacent center. Boardmember Burgheimer stated that if the entry were flipped to the east it would be in the center of the site, which would be much more visible.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen stated he understood the footprint was a prototype, but they are designed to meet the neighboring area. Is there a prototype that doesn't have a corner entry so the parking would be easier to get to. If they insist on having a corner entry they should have more parking to the side of the entry. He confirmed Quick brick is 4 X 8 X 16, like "jumbo brick". He confirmed the material at the entry was a quick brick and it was flashed, not monolithic. He thought the entry canopy was light and whimsical, (but did not appear to be stable) While the loading area canopy was more substantial than the main entry. The area above the whimsical canopy was very flat, and the canopy was too thin. He suggested they pop the volume in and out, and make the entry more dominant than the loading area canopy. He thought they should use integral color block.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen agreed with previous comments regarding the entry and double pilasters. She was concerned that all the importance of this building was at the west corner and all the design was elsewhere. The landscaping makes people think they shouldn't be at the entry. They needed to use architecture to draw people to the walking area, and create a pleasant pedestrian space. Why do they need bollards, because of inadequate site design. Provide more at the entry.

Chair Pete Berzins stated integration of landscaping at pedestrian level with a canopy was what they want.

Boardmember Bottomley thought the loading area canopy should step back from the main entry corner.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR05-70 be continued to the September 26, 2005 meeting.:

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: To allow the applicant time to redesign the building.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-71 Tri-City Pavilions

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1982 W Main
REQUEST: Approval of a 7,150 sq. ft. retail building with a drive-through
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: Rising Sun
APPLICANT: K & I Architect
ARCHITECT: K & I Architect

REQUEST: Approval of a 7.150 sq. ft. retail building with a drive-through

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

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR05-71 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. Pedestrian pathways connecting the building to the parking areas shall be of a stamped decorative material.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: For the reasons stated on the record.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05- 72 **Red Mountain Office Suites**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC Power & Thomas
REQUEST: Approval of a 48,700 sq. ft. office complex
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Red Mountain Village Investors
APPLICANT: Craig Cote, Shea Commercial
ARCHITECT: DFD Cornoyer Hedrick

REQUEST: Approval of a 48,700 sq. ft. office complex

SUMMARY: Mike Kretz and Steve Bauer represented the case. Staffmember Lesley Davis explained there was a neighbor who wanted an 8' wall between their property and this project. She stated the neighbor would accept one additional course of block if an 8' wall was not possible. She explained that this is something that should have been addressed at Planning and Zoning and City Council. Apparently the neighbor was present at the Planning and Zoning Board meeting, but chose not to speak. This is not something the Design Review Board can enforce, the applicant simply wanted it on the record that they were willing to work with the neighbors to attempt a solution. Mrs. Davis stated the neighbor also requested the Palo Verde trees be replaced with Sissoos.

Mr. Bauer stated he accepted the landscape change. He explained that providing an 8' wall can be a nightmare to coordinate. First all of the neighbors have to agree to the 8' wall, then the applicant has to coordinate the timing of removing all the neighbors walls and replacing them. There can also be problems if some neighbors have painted and/or stuccoed their sides of the walls, etc. He stated it takes approximately 2 to 3 weeks to replace all the walls.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought that adding additional trees or providing larger box size trees was a better solution.

Mrs. Davis stated that alternative had been discussed with the neighbor.

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR05-72 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. Incorporate Sissoo, or similar tree type into the palette, where adjacent to residential. Details to be approved by Design Review staff.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations for the condominium form of ownership.
6. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

the building.

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

VOTE: Passed 6 - 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: For the reasons stated on the record.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-73 **Southgate Commerce Park**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NEC Germann & 88th St
REQUEST: Approval of an 111,831 sq. ft. office/industrial project
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Ladell Call
APPLICANT: Dream Catchers
ARCHITECT: Randy Carter

REQUEST: Approval of a 111,831 sq. ft. office/industrial project

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda because Boardmember Bottomley recused himself.

MOTION: It was moved by DaveRichins and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR05-73 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. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
2. Any proposed monument signs require Design Review approval.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0 – 1 (Boardmember Tom Bottomley abstained)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: For the reasons stated on the record.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-74 Falcon Gateway Parcel 3

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 4505 E McKellips
REQUEST: Approval of two retail buildings and one fast food with drive-through totaling 18,283
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Arizona Partners
APPLICANT: Dwayne Griffin
ARCHITECT: Randall Ewers

REQUEST: Approval of two retail buildings and one fast food with a drive-through totaling 18,283 sq. ft.

SUMMARY: Dwayne Griffin and Dave Ward represented the case. Dwayne Griffin explained the changes to the two retail buildings. Dave Ward explained the changes to the Jack in the Box.

Dave thought the project could have been on consent. No comments.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the little details on the south elevation columns may be overdone. He appreciated that the two projects had worked together.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen agreed there were too many details. He thought the storefront windows could be more interesting. He suggested using the detail from the squares, especially on the transom piece. On the Jack in the Box south elevation metal grid is applied and stands out 2". He thought the metal grid should be recessed into the wall. He liked the way the brick turns the corner at the front, but thought it should also wrap the corners of the south elevation.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen suggested another color on the south elevation entry piece of the retail buildings, to make it stand out.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley agreed the corners of the east elevation could lose the three decorations. The radiused arches on the north and south elevations of the bank building should be flattened to better match the other arches.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR05-74 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. Building 'B', south elevation: Delete the metal grillwork from behind the three central signs. Put the signs directly on the stucco.
 - b. Provide foundation base planting at the north elevation of Jack in the Box (equal to 33% of bldg. length, min.). Also, plant the empty planter adjacent

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- to the west entry of that building.
 - c. Provide foundation base planting on east elevation of bldg. 'B' (equal to 25% of bldg. length, min.).
 - d. Bldg 'A': Correct the elevations to show the SES on the north, as shown in plan. Bldg 'B': Recess the SES into the building. Also, relocate it to the east elevation, if possible.
 - e. Add a fourth wall to the rear of popped-out volumes on all three buildings, to make them read as solids.
 - f. Provide a Public Art piece at the corner as a condition of substantial completion of the current project. Design Review Board to review and approve.
 - g. Delete monuments signs.
 - h. Flatten the north and south EIFS arches on Building 'A', the bank building, to better match the other arches.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
 3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
 4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
 5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
 6. Fire risers, 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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: For the reasons stated on the record.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da