

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
AUGUST 6, 2003

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Utilities Building Community Room
640 North Mesa Drive

MEMBERS PRESENT

Carie Allen - Chair
John Poulsen - Vice Chair
Vince DiBella
Randy Carter
Jillian Hagen
Pete Berzins (left at 4:26)

MEMBERS ABSENT

Rob Burgheimer

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman
Lesley Davis
Debbie Archuleta
Charlie Scully
Dorothy Chimel
Richard Dyer
Emily
Glen Nelson
Steve Peters
Les Partch
Scott Tieken
Mark Murray
Jason Emerson
Mike Richey
Dorothy Shoupe
Scott Prickett
Fred Himovitz

Todd Trainor
Brian Premone
Robert Hansen
Sean Lake
Denise Burton
Rob Jeth
Nareen Molla
Raad Salih
Marwan Tamimi
Cameron Miles
Shad Vermeesch
Others

1. Call to Order:

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

2. Approval of the Minutes of the July 2, 2003 Meeting:

On a motion by Vince DiBella seconded by Pete Berzins the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

3. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-48 **Krispy Kreme Donuts**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 6622-B E Superstitions Springs
REQUEST: Approval of a 4,248 sq. ft. doughnut shop with drive-through
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Superstition Springs Investors Ltd. Partnership
APPLICANT: Bob Bacon
ARCHITECT: Scott Tieken, Faust Howell Associates

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,248 sq. ft. doughnut shop with drive-through

SUMMARY: Scott Tieken represented the case and stated the Krispy Kreme building would be built by the same developer as the Red Robin to the east; therefore the landscape plan will coordinate with the Red Robin.

Boardmember Randy Carter was concerned that the colored elevation drawings presented to the Board do not match the three dimensional rendering presented to the Board. He wanted the tower elements to be the depth shown on the elevation drawings. He was concerned that the windows were too close to the awning and water from the awning would run off onto the windows. He felt the large area above the windows was too plain and he recommended the addition of a decorative square above each of the windows.

The applicant explained that the canopies were open with metal cross members, so rain run off would not be a problem.

Boardmember John Poulsen did not feel it would be possible to move the windows because although there was space to shift the windows on the east elevation, there was not room on the south elevation. He agreed there should be something above the windows, maybe tile.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen confirmed the windows would be mill-finished aluminum, and the band at the base of the windows would be pre-cast concrete.

Chair Carie Allen confirmed the placement of the various colors. She disagreed with Boardmember Carter and did not want anything above the windows.

The Board was concerned that the proposed brick would actually look pink on the building and recommended the brick color be changed to match the color shown on the rendering.

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Randy Carter that DR03-48 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.)

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

4. **Provide wall and gate elevations for the trash enclosures for review and approval by Design Review staff prior to submittal of construction documents so as to ensure that the trash enclosures are compatible with the main building.**
5. **Provide a revised landscape plan for the entire site, including all parking lot landscape planters, for review and approval by Design Review staff prior to submittal of construction documents.**
6. **Show at least two trees and additional shrubs in the landscape planter area between the delivery bay and drive-through lane as indicated on the revised site plan.**
7. **Work with staff to choose a brick color that looks more like the rendering.**
8. **Provide additional accent detail above the windows. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
9. **The thickness of the parapets is to be as shown on the elevations, not the rendering.**
10. 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.
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. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
13. 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.
14. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
15. 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 5 – 0

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

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-51 **Maytag**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 300 West Southern
REQUEST: Approval of a 61,491 sq. ft. warehouse/office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: O'Lonely Enterprises Inc.
APPLICANT: Architectural Team Three
ARCHITECT: Architectural Team Three

REQUEST: Approval of a 61,491 sq. ft. warehouse/office building

SUMMARY: Bill Hunse and Jim Dallas represented the case.

Boardmember John Poulsen felt they had done some positive things to the top of the building. He still felt it was a very large industrial building in a residential area.

Boardmember Vince DiBella liked the improvements.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen confirmed the building shown in the perspective drawing titled southeast elevation would face Southern. She felt the building was acceptable.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed they had resolved the Fire Department issues, they just haven't shown them on the site plan. He felt the revisions were an improvement. He confirmed the building would be 5' off the west property line.

Chair Carie Allen appreciated the improvements.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Randy Carter that DR03-51 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 a Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit.
5. Upon submittal of construction documents to Building Safety, the applicant shall submit a revised site plan and landscape plan to the Planning Division identifying the fire access alternative approved by the Fire Marshall.
6. **Maximum lighting standard heights are 25 feet in the interior, 20 feet within 50' of the perimeter. When development is adjacent to residential, maximum heights are 25 feet in the interior and 14 feet within 50' of the property line. Provide house side shield on all fixtures within 100' of the north property line.**
7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

8. 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 5 – 0

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

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-55 **Wal-Mart**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2858 South Hawes
REQUEST: Approval of 39,690 sq. ft. grocery store
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Patrick McGroder, Hawes and Guadalupe Ltd. Partn.
APPLICANT: Enda Melvin
ARCHITECT: Chris Rhea

REQUEST: Approval of a 30,690 sq. ft. grocery store

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

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-55 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. **The gas canopy and kiosk are to be reviewed by the Design Review Board.**
8. **Outdoor storage and display is not allowed in the C-2 zoning district. Maintain landscaping as shown on the landscaping plan beneath the metal canopy.**
9. **All vending machines, which face a street or public parking, and are not separated from the street by intervening building(s), shall be screened to a height of twelve (12) inches above the equipment. Screening device shall be a decorative masonry wall.**
10. **Provide house-side shields on all light standards within 50' of the southern property line.**
11. **Vehicular screen walls and monument signage to be approved by Design Review staff.**
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

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

application.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions will be an attractive project.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-52 **EWJ Commercial**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 804 North Country Club
REQUEST: Approval of a 10,200 sq. ft. retail building and 1,100 sq. ft. car wash
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Edward D. Pole
APPLICANT: Raad Salih
ARCHITECT: Marwan Mujahed

REQUEST: Approval of a 10,200 sq. ft. retail building and a 1,100 sq. ft. car wash

SUMMARY: Marwan Tamimi represented the case, and explained that this site currently contains a gas station and two houses. The two houses will be demolished and a retail building and car wash will be built. The existing gas station will be revised to tie in with the new retail building. In answer to a question from the Board Mr. Tamimi stated the gas canopy color was chosen so that it could work with different gas company sign colors, should the owner change franchises.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen confirmed the west elevation of the c-store would be covered by the car wash. She felt that the retail building and c-store needed something to tie the two buildings together. She felt the color on the east side of the c-store should continue around all four sides of the building. She was concerned with the color of the gas canopy and felt the roof materials used on both buildings needed to match. She thought the gas station was too steel gray looking and looked unfinished. She liked the painted band on the west side of the retail building and wanted it to wrap around the building to the north and south. She wanted the split face used on the canopy columns. She suggested using the olive green as the base color for the gas station.

Boardmember Randy Carter agreed the gas canopy should match the retail building and the columns should be similar. He was concerned with the color of the gas canopy and thought the painted band and the tile accents should continue around to the north and south sides of the retail building. He felt the center portion of the canopy on the retail building should be taller, possibly to match the parapet height beyond. He felt the tower elements were out of proportion with the remainder of the building and the tower columns were too thin. He felt the gas canopy needed more attention to detail, and agreed the gray is too light. He saw the retail building as having a rusticated look and suggested using color C-4 below the windows on the gas station. He agreed with staff that the metal trellises should either be moved up off the ground and be taller or eliminated. He felt the rounded arches at the corners should be simpler, more like the west elevation. He felt the teal color might be too bright, and did not feel it would work well with the olive green of the band. He suggested that the wainscot on the store be painted to match the retail building.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed the tower elements would be split face block. He confirmed the entry element would pop-out 18". He felt the mansard shape made the canopy look squatty. He did not feel the shape and color worked with the retail building. He also felt the proportions of the tower elements on the retail building were poor.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember John Poulsen acknowledged that this is not currently an attractive corner. He suggested the mansard roof be straightened. Mr. Tamimi did not feel the structure could be modified. Boardmember Poulsen felt the old building needed to tie in better with the new retail building. He suggested doing something with the soffit or double banding. He would like the olive color of the band used on the c-store.

Chair Carie Allen agreed with the comments made by other board members and agreed that the columns beneath the gas canopies should be wrapped with masonry so they matched the retail building.

Mr. Tamimi stated that since the columns are up against the gas pumps now there is not room to wrap the columns.

Boardmember Randy Carter wanted the columns encased, but stated that if there wasn't enough space to wrap them they need to be painted to match the retail building columns. He also specified that the large spandrels between the columns needed to be one of the building colors.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-52 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 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 the rezoning approval (Z03-06), the Special Use Permit and the Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit (ZA03-34).
5. **Revise the proposed elevations to include the following (Details to be approved by Design Review Staff):**
 - **Revise the elevations to accurately depict all colors and materials.**
 - **Revise the canopy mansard roof color to be match the selected metal color for the retail building. Palo Verde Green was suggested.**
 - **Encase the gas canopy columns in material to match the building if structurally possible. Otherwise they need to be painted to match the building.**
 - **The spandrels between the columns need to be modified to match the building color.**
 - **Materials, paint colors and placement of the colors on the C-store and carwash are to match the retail building.**
 - **Change the proposed teal metal color on the retail building to a color that is harmonious with the proposed olive green. Consider Palo Verde green.**
 - **If the decorative metal trellises proposed for the retail building remain, they need to be increased in height so they become a more visible accent. They may be removed completely.**
 - **Raise the center portion of the canopy on the east elevation of the**

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- **retail center to height of parapet beyond.**
 - **Revise the arched entry feature on the center portion of the canopy for the retail building so that it is more pronounced. Also, increase the size of the columns under that raised portion to balance the height.**
 - **Incorporate the wide olive color band shown on the rear of the retail building on the north and south elevations.**
 - **Revise the design of the two towers elements to simplify the arch, add a cornice and eliminate the metal structure over the towers.**
6. **Provide a revised Color/Material Board for the Design Review case file.**
 7. **If freestanding signs are proposed for this site, Design Review Board approval of the sign design is required. Compliance with an existing Comprehensive Sign Plan is also required.**
 8. 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.
 9. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
 10. Fire risers, building downspouts 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 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-56 **The Mahoney Office**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: South Extension Road
REQUEST: Develop a 21,569 sq. ft. office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: M & O Agencies Inc., Glen Nelson
APPLICANT: Robert Hansen
ARCHITECT: Robert Hansen, Encore Design Group

REQUEST: Approval of a 21,569 sq. ft. office building

SUMMARY: Robert Hansen and Glen Nelson represented the case.

Boardmember Randy Carter liked the Spanish style, but confirmed that the additional windows were to allow more light into the building. He did not like the rhythm of the windows, he suggested using mullions to break up the glass. He felt the rotunda was nice but the arches were too high and out of proportion with the columns. He did not feel the stone surround at each window was providing the effect they wanted for the expense. He felt the wall surface was too severe, and the wainscot should go through the building. He did not like the proportion of the center element. He liked the small windows but felt they needed to be recessed all the way back to the interior wall surface. He also felt the windows needed something to rest on. He suggested taller windows for a vertical look, rather than the square windows. He preferred regular spacing of the windows. The windows don't have to be in the center of each office, they can be rhythmically spaced. In order to accomplish this they only need to be moved a few inches.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen agreed mullions or maybe shutters would be a nice addition. She felt the wrought iron should be more ornamental. She suggested using creeping fig on the large building masses to enhance the building. The plant legend had very low plant materials and she felt the building needed vines.

Boardmember Vince DiBella felt the windows needed to be more deeply recessed, and he felt that the building needed thicker columns. He liked the upper windows but felt the rhythm of the lower windows was bad.

Boardmember John Poulsen confirmed the windows on the rotunda were recessed just 4" and were actual windows. He also confirmed the cultured stone as proposed popped-out 2", and the tails on the trusses were 4" X 8". He liked the rotunda area. He liked the height of the rotunda arches but felt the columns needed to be thicker. He felt the landscaping could really impact this building.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Randy Carter that DR03-56 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.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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. **Relocate the driveway on Extension Road to allow shared access with future development to the south. Relocated driveway to be approved by City of Mesa Development Engineering. Contact Les Broughton at 480-644-4779 for additional information.**
6. **Install street improvement, including curb, gutter and sidewalk, as per City of Mesa Engineering Standards, at the southeast corner of Jerome Avenue and Revere Street and the northwest corner of Jerome Avenue and Vineyard Street.**
7. **Show one foot (1') vehicular no access easement around the entire radius of the street at the southeast corner of Jerome Avenue and Revere Street to ensure that no driveway or street connection will be installed to the future development from this location.**
8. **Ensure columns on east side of building are minimum five (5) feet from base of column to face of curb.**
9. **Prior to submitting construction documents for this project, provide information to Design Review staff concerning the design, materials and colors of the Parking canopies.**
10. **Provide revised Landscape Plan removing sod or turf from all areas of public right-of-way. Four (4) additional trees should be shown along Extension, as 2 trees per 25' are required. The revised landscape plan should be coordinated with the overall site plan revisions.**
11. **Revise the building elevations:**
 - **Provide window mullions. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
 - **Provide additional recess to the windows. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
 - **Provide a heavier base or sill for the windows, eliminating the surround is an option.**
 - **Increase the distance from the eave line to the top of the arches.**
 - **Provide thicker columns.**
 - **Wainscot or sill.**
 - **Guard rails to be more ornamental/Spanish in character. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
 - **Study the windows on the 2nd floor, south elevation and minimize the blank wall.**
12. 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.
13. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
14. 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.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

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

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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

REQUEST: Continuance to September 3, 2003

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

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-58 be continued to September 3, 2003

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-61 **National Bank of AZ**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1119 West Southern
REQUEST: Approval of a 21,006 sq. ft. bank and office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: ORE/Opus
APPLICANT: Scott Prickett, Mittelstaedt Cooper & Assoc.
ARCHITECT: Mittelstaedt Cooper & Assoc.

REQUEST: Approval of a 21,006 sq. ft. bank and office building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-61 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. **Comply with all conditions of the comprehensive sign plan (ZA00-063).**
5. **Incorporate a 5' wide sidewalk in the parking lot landscape island south of the employee entrance on the south side of the building.**
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 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 will be an attractive addition to the Fiesta Quadrant.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-62 **Baker Dental**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 6767 East Aspen
REQUEST: Approval of a 3,083 sq. ft. dental office
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Dr. Richard Baker
APPLICANT: Dream catchers Planning & Design
ARCHITECT: Randy Carter

REQUEST: Approval of a 3,083 sq. ft. dental office

SUMMARY: Boardmember Randy Carter declared a conflict of interest and left the room.

Dorothy Shoupe represented the case.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen confirmed that the revised entry was done at the request of the Dr.

The Board liked the project and felt it would be a nice addition to the neighborhood.

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR03-62 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 window on the east side of the north elevation to be glass block. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.**
5. **Shift the four large square windows on the north and east elevations to provide even spacing on each end and between the windows. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.**
6. **Revise the freestanding sign to incorporate building materials and forms around the entire sign. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.**
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

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 4 – 0 – 1 (Randy Carter abstained)

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

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-63 **Accountant Adv/Fantastic Sams**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 717 North Lindsay
REQUEST: Approval of a 5,422 sq. ft. 2-story office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: Donald Clark Fox
APPLICANT: Robert Hansen
ARCHITECT: Robert Hansen

REQUEST: Approval of a 5,422 sq. ft. 2-story office building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-63 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 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 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is compatible with the adjacent development.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-64 **Superstition Professional Park**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 7255 East Hampton Avenue
REQUEST: Develop four single story office buildings totaling 29,557 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Superstition Springs Hospitality Group, LLC
APPLICANT: Lesley L. Partch, Partch & Associates Architecture
ARCHITECT: Lesley L. Partch, Partch & Associates Architecture

REQUEST: Approval of four single story office buildings totaling 29,557 sq. ft.

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

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-64 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. Retention basins to be 6:1 slopes maximum when adjacent to public rights-of-way or pedestrian walkways.
8. Provide two half-size color elevations of the 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 is reasonably well designed.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-65 **KBAD Offices**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 5304 East Southern
REQUEST: Approval of a 17,550 sq. ft. office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Robert Hershey, KBAD Enterprises
APPLICANT: William Johns, Associated
ARCHITECT: William Johns

REQUEST: Approval of a 17,550 sq. ft. office building

SUMMARY: Mark Murray and Bob Hershey represented the case. Mr. Hershey stated the main entry would be on the north. The windows would be recessed 2', and there would be signs above the arches.

Boardmember Randy Carter was concerned with the proportion of the arches and windows. He stated the elevations show changes in plain that are not shown on the site plan. The plan shows that the gable sections would extend out, yet the elevations were flat. He felt the changes in stone height were arbitrary. He wanted the arch at the south elevation to be raised to match the other side.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen felt there should be a main entry. She agreed the changes in the stone did not appear to have any reason. She felt a color change could pop the entry.

Boardmember Vince DiBella felt the tower on the south should be higher. He liked wrapping the corners with higher stone, but felt the rest could be the same height.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR03-65 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. **Confirm location and orientation of trash enclosures with City Solid Waste Division.**
5. **Provide copy of recorded cross access easement with the abutting commercial property to the west for use of shared driveway and parking lot circulation prior to submittal of construction documents for plan review.**
6. **Cross access driveway and circulation drive aisle on abutting property to the west to be installed with this project.**
7. **Revise the building elevations:**
 - **Raise the arched opening surround on the south elevation to match the north elevation.**
 - **Place the stone at the same medium height on each elevation except at**

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

the corners where the stone is to be raised to the bottom of the arch.

8. 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.
9. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
10. Fire risers, building downspouts 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 4 – 0 (Boardmember Poulsen left prior to this case)

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

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-66 **Wilson Office**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 3960 East Broadway
REQUEST: Approval of a 3,416 sq. ft. office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Barry & Paulette Pieta
APPLICANT: Steven Wilson
ARCHITECT: Cameron Miles

REQUEST: Approval of a 3,416 sq. ft. office building

SUMMARY: Cameron Miles and Steven Wilson represented the case. Mr. Miles presented an alternative elevation for the Board to consider. The alternate eliminated wainscot and extended the split face block around the windows down to the ground and up to the eave line. He stated the block around the windows would stick out 8" and that the windows are recessed. Mr. Miles also stated the adjacent building on this site is slump block.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen confirmed the glass block would be bronze. She did not feel the windows were attractive, she felt they were too small. She felt that the size and shape of the windows made the building look like a bunker. She wanted to see more details, and combinations of textures and sizes. She wanted the landscape palette to provide more height.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt the block was incongruent and severe. He stated that the area around this building is primarily residential. He suggested keeping the wainscot and creating a stepped detail at the top of the wainscot by using 12" thick block at the base and a 10" thick block cap. He suggested that the quoins be eliminated and the windows widened. He felt they were missing an opportunity to have a marketable building. He suggested making the windows wider and taller, perhaps with transoms above. He did not want the split face surround on the windows. He felt the entrance was too subdued, and suggested it be widened and raised with a gable or parapet. He felt the building was squat and there was too much blue. He did not feel the glass block made sense; He felt 2' square windows higher up on the building would give some rhythm to the sides, and give the building better proportion. He suggested awnings like the other building on the site. He felt integra block can work with all different styles of architecture. Additionally, the fascia needs to be beefed up. He suggested using a graduation or build up of color.

Boardmember Vince DiBella wondered why the block is the size it is. He felt the scale of the material to the building was a problem. He wanted a change in block size to break up the mass. He suggested integrating 4" block. He suggested the wainscot be a different size. He did not like the 24" centers of the roof material seams. He did not like the architectural character or the choice of materials.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR03-66 be continued for redesign.

VOTE: Passed 4 – 0

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

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-67 **Cimarron XV-B**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 6355 South Sossaman
REQUEST: Approval of a 17,036 sq. ft. office hangar
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Himovitz Properties
APPLICANT: Wayne Rockwood
ARCHITECT: Wayne Rockwood

REQUEST: Approval of a 17,036 sq. ft. office hangar

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Fred Himovitz represented the case. He explained that the texture would be hammered or exposed aggregate similar to the smooth and split faced CMU used on the first building.

Boardmember Randy Carter was concerned with the size of the reveals on the hangar doors. He preferred a natural color to the paint proposed. He felt the designs of this building and the previous building were incongruent, and felt the two buildings should relate better.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen confirmed which elevation faced Sossaman. She felt that from the west both buildings would be visible. She confirmed that Mr. Himovitz was willing to use block instead of tilt-panel. She wanted the same detail and materials as the first building.

Mr. Himovitz stated this building would be hidden behind the first building. He stated the paint was intended to seal the block, and would be a natural concrete color.

Boardmember Vince DiBella stated you can't get a deep texture with sand blasting; they would need to use a chemical treatment to expose the aggregate.

Chair Carie Allen stated she could not approve this building as proposed. She liked the previous building and felt the new building was not as rich. She wanted something more like the previous building.

MOTION: It was moved by Jillian Hagen and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-67 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 stipulations of the Williams Gateway Airport Design Review Committee, including approval of the site plan.**
5. **Provide an elevation of the proposed parking canopy. Design to match canopy approved with DR02-42.**

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

6. **Replace Acacia Aneura, Acacia Salicina, Dalea Frutescens, Gaura Lindheimeri, Ruellia Brittoniana with plants from the approved plant list.**
7. **Use the same building materials and patterns as DR03-42. Revised elevations to be approved by Design Review staff.**
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. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
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 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The Board liked the design of the first building and wanted this building to match it.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-68 **Check Cashers**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1210 South Country Club
REQUEST: Approval of a new bank building on the site of an abandoned gas station
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: Ken Crane – PLS Realty
APPLICANT: Archicon
ARCHITECT: Kevin Garey, Archicon

REQUEST: Approval of a 2,126 sq. ft. bank building

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Nareen Molla represented the case.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen was concerned with the blankness of the west elevation and the lack of any foundation landscaping for that elevation.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated the project had received a DIP through the Board of Adjustment, which allowed relief from the landscape requirements.

John Poulsen confirmed the roofline projects over the southwest corner.

Vince DiBella felt the project was acceptable.

Boardmember Randy Carter stated that the applicant could provide a foundation landscaping planter on the west side of the building by reducing the 6'-7" sidewalk to 6', reducing the 16'-6" parking stalls to 16' and moving the building 1' to the east, which would allow 2'-7" for a planter. He felt the south and west building walls needed more articulation, not just a flat block wall with split face wainscot. He was concerned with the lack of relief around the stucco soffit, he suggested a 8" in the stucco band aligned with the stone band on the wall. The new band to be either recessed or popped-out.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen felt the foundation landscaping added to the west side of the building should be 2' to 3' in height, not ground cover.

Chair Carie Allen agreed the band should continue around the soffit.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-68 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.)

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

4. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
5. **Relocate the Mexican Fan Palms on the east side of the building. Place them next to the building, match the placement of the Palms on the north side of the building. Location to be approved by Design Review staff.**
6. **Design of the louvered mechanical equipment screen enclosure to include a concealed access panel.**
7. **Shift the building 1' to the east, reduce the parking stalls to 16', reduce the sidewalk to 6', in order to create a 2'-7" planter along the west side of the building.**
8. **Provide shrubs in the west planter. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
9. **Provide a 8" band in the stucco soffit. The band may be recessed or popped-out and should align with the stone band.**
10. Fire risers, building downspouts 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 5 – 0

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

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-72 **Bank One**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Guadalupe and Ellsworth
REQUEST: Approval of a 6,479 sq. ft. bank
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Bank One Corporation
APPLICANT: DPA Architects
ARCHITECT: John Szafran

REQUEST: Approval of a 6,479 sq. ft. bank

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Todd Trainer represented the case. He stated the rafter tails match the proposed Walgreen's at the corner.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt the building had very interesting parts, however, he wondered why they were using 'S' tile and not metal or maybe a flat tile. He felt the fascia was too thin and out of character with the building, and that the building didn't work from the eave line up. He felt that shopping centers should harmonize but not look exactly the same, their needs to be flexibility.

Mr. Trainer stated he wanted a rusticated look and felt the roof tile would work well with the stone. He was willing to change the fascia. He stated the vestibule needed shading and good security for the ATM.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen felt the curved element seemed foreign and wasn't tied into the building. She was concerned with how the roof stops at the curved wall. She wanted it to tie into the other shape so the two elements blend together.

Boardmember John Poulsen stated he originally felt the curved wall would not go with the rest of the building, however; he thought that if it were done right it might work. He confirmed the curved entry would have a flat roof.

Boardmember Vince DiBella felt the project was fine as presented.

Chair Carie Allen liked the suggestion of flat tile. She confirmed the only peach on the building would be the integral color EFIS.

Kelly Hilgart of Evergreen Devco then asked to speak concerning the case. She stated that the Planning and Zoning Board review of this preliminary plat. With that approval they had been required to provide design guidelines for the entire project. She objected to the use of flat tile even if the tile color was the same.

Mr. Trainer stated he had used the tile to tie into the center.

The Board felt the use of the curved wall was more a departure from the shopping center than the use of flat tile in the same color as the S tile proposed for the Walgreen's.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-72 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 and compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations Technical Review requirements.
4. **Provide a revised landscaping plan showing specific plant locations and quantities. Landscaping plan to be approved by Design Review staff.**
5. **Revise plant list so that all proposed species are listed on the approved Design Guidelines list or provide a letter from the developer accepting the proposed revisions.**
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 are to be located within the building.
8. Provide two half size color elevations in addition to one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 copy of revised landscaping plans showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Failed 2 – 3 (Boardmembers Carie Allen, Jillian Hagen and Randy Carter voting nay)

Discussion then followed regarding the changes the Board would like to see:

- The contemporary feeling of the curved element versus the rustic feeling of the rest of the building.
- Should the entrance wall corners come up above the Bank One sign?
- Bring the wainscot down like the drive-through.
- How the rafter tails are finished off.
- 2' on center is a lot maybe it should be spaced further apart.
- Square off the Bank One element.
- The wall should be lower than the roof; step down the curved element.
- Maybe take the roof up slightly.
- Redesign the front entry so it doesn't fight the curved feature.

Boardmember Vince DiBella felt that if they were going to make changes to a primary feature of the building the project needed to come back for review.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR03-72 be continued to the September 3, 2003 meeting.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: To allow the applicant time to address the Board's concerns.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-50 **Augusta Ranch Market Place**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC Crismon and Baseline
REQUEST: Approval of a 11.53 acre shopping center
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: A.R. Development
APPLICANT: A & C Properties Inc.
ARCHITECT: Design Plus Architectural Ltd.

REQUEST: Approval of a height exception for a previously approved shopping center

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

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-50 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with all previous conditions of DR03-50.
2. Replace the Acacia Smallii trees located within the landscape yards adjacent to the south and west property lines with Dalbergia Sissoo. Sissoos to be located in the 25' wide landscape yard at grocery store building corners.

VOTE: Passed 6 –0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The Board finds that increased setbacks, enhanced landscaping and the fact that the exception is necessary to screen the roof top mechanical equipment, mitigating the impact of the additional parapet height proposed for this building.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Other Business

DR03-58 Coyote Landing Apartments

David Kincaid and Denise Burton were present to ask the Board to give them direction regarding the changes they are making to their project. Mr. Kincaid stated they were trying to stagger and angle the buildings. They were using landscaping to buffer the buildings at the northeast corner from the adjacent bleachers. He stated they had changed the roof pitch, eliminated the skinny poles, and enclosed the stairs.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen felt the base was too thin,

Boardmember Vince DiBella suggested eliminating the drive and parking at the two buildings at the northeast corner to enable them to turn the buildings and get more landscaping.

Mr. Kincaid stated the drive is a fire lane and they had to have it for fire access.

Boardmember DiBella wanted to see more color varieties used on the buildings.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt the site plan changes were an improvement. He was hoping to see more colors.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da