

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

APRIL 7, 2004

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

MEMBERS PRESENT

Carie Allen - Chair
Pete Berzins - Vice Chair
Randy Carter
Vince DiBella
Tim Nielsen
Robert Burgheimer (left for a portion of the meeting)

MEMBERS ABSENT

Jillian Hagen (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman
Lesley Davis
Debbie Archuleta
Charlie Scully
John Wesley
David Johns
Jeff Looker
Richard Topping
Vince Dalke
Sean Lake
Mike Reidy
Sherman Cawley

Greg Hitchens
Boyd Thacker
Bob Saemisch
Mike Clemens
Mike Blazer
Betsy Moll
Mike James
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 March 3, 2004 Meeting:

On a motion by Tim Nielsen seconded by Vince DiBella the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

3. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-10 **Buggy Bath Office**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1945 West University
REQUEST: Approval of a 2,352 sq. ft. office building with 400 sq. ft. garage
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: Desert Mountain Associates
APPLICANT: Robert Ivory
ARCHITECT: Arvid Johnson

REQUEST: Approval of a 2,352 sq. ft. office building with 400 sq. ft. garage

SUMMARY: The applicant has decided not to proceed with this project. The case was tabled.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR04-10 be tabled.

VOTE: Passed 4 – 1 Rob Burgheimer nay

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The applicant had not made a resubmittal.

Recorded on Tape No.: (side A)

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-17 **Main & Greenfield Retail**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 4380 East Main
REQUEST: 3,413 square feet addition to a 2,687 square feet building for
a 6,100 square foot retail and restaurant use at the northwest
corner of Greenfield Road and Main Street.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: Greenfield Main Investors
APPLICANT: Michael Gana, Bolinger Cardenas Architects
ARCHITECT: Kevin Bollinger, BCA

REQUEST: Approval of a 3,413 sq. ft. addition to a 2,687 sq. ft. building for a 6,100 sq. ft. retail and restaurant use at the northwest corner of Greenfield Road and Main Street

SUMMARY: Kevin Bollinger represented the case. Mr. Bolinger stated the case had received a Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed it was the applicant's choice to stay with the AM/PM look.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer understood this was a remodel but stated this project would not be approved if were new construction. He felt the building was too plain and needed more embellishment. He suggested providing an additional color, new material on the vertical elements and "stronger" light fixtures.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen agreed the columns needed to be stronger, he suggested raising the masonry on the columns or painting them a new color. He felt the applicant could do a better job with the area of new construction.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed there was an offset and the eastern storefront would not be covered. At a minimum he wanted an additional color, and more attention to the inset area. He confirmed the applicant was willing to do a sloped parapet as opposed to a straight parapet at the end of the mansard.

Boardmember Pete Berzins confirmed the applicant would be removing two driveways. He was concerned the landscape was too close to the driveways and would create a line of sight problem. He liked the revisions from the original submittal.

Chair Carie Allen stated she could accept the proposal as a remodel; however, she wanted an additional color.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR04-17 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 approved by Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application:

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- Provide enhanced wall mounted light fixtures for street side building elevations.
 - Provide color elevations for monument signs.
 - Ensure any SES panels for the new addition are located within a building niche and painted to match the building.
 - The applicant is to work with staff to choose an additional color for the building elevations.
 - Add more masonry to the columns.
 - Maintain visibility triangle at the driveways.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
 3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
 4. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
 5. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
 6. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is acceptable as a re-use of an abandoned service station.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04- 20 **Red Mountain Professional Plaza**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2158 S Gilbert
REQUEST: Approval of four office buildings totaling 29,654 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Shea Commercial
APPLICANT: DFD Cornoyer Hedrick
ARCHITECT: Joseph Worrall

REQUEST: Approval of four office buildings totaling 29,654 sq. ft.

SUMMARY: Jason Allen and Mike Frenz represented the case. Mr. Frenze stated they had changed the site layout. The architecture of the building had not been changed. They felt that the presentation to Gilbert Road was the main concern of the Board.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated he felt the Board had been clear that they wanted the buildings to be revised also. He still felt the buildings needed to be revised. He wanted the building to be different, not just rotated.

Chair Carie Allen wanted the color changes to be more of a contrast. She confirmed the color board was accurate. She did not like the proposed colors. She wanted variation between buildings.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen stated that site planning was still a concern. The parking was not convenient to the tenants. The neighbors had stated at the March meeting that they would prefer to have a building at the west end of the property rather than a parking lot.

Mr. Frenz stated that it was harder to lease buildings the farther away they are from the road.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed the arched element is 8" above the straight element. He felt the entrance elements seemed pinched. He confirmed there was a gable above each entrance. He felt the colors were a concern; especially the green. He preferred the colors on the rendering as opposed to the color board or elevations. He felt the depth of the fascia was too thin, and the light color made it appear thinner. He liked the curved roof of the entrances but felt they needed to be wider and more proportional. He wanted variety between the different buildings.

Boardmember Pete Berzins agreed the colors were a concern. He wanted the buildings to be different. He liked the previous site plan but wanted the buildings to be different. He wondered why the applicants were unwilling to revise the buildings.

The applicants stated that the buildings have already been sold with this design.

Boardmember Berzins felt they could revise the buildings without a lot of cost. He liked the building design but did not want it repeated four times. He suggested the entrances could be different. He stated that at the March meeting the Board had suggested joining two of the building so it looked like one large building from Gilbert Road with a courtyard on the west side. He suggested changing the dormers.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Vince DiBella felt there was not enough difference between the two color palettes. He agreed the entrances should be changed.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR04-20 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:
 - Provide a revised site plan showing walkways connecting the parking areas and entrance doors.
 - Provide sidewalks connecting the buildings to the public right of way.
 - Provide sidewalks connecting the office buildings within the development.
 - Show location and screening of S.E.S. panel.
 - Revised plan showing compliance with all requirements Development Services, including Transportation and Solid Waste.
 - Provide house-side shields on light standards to ensure that fixture light bulbs are not visible from adjacent properties.
 - Provide one 8' wide landscape island per 8 contiguous parking spaces.
 - Provide elevation of proposed parking canopy. Design of canopy should complement architecture of proposed office buildings.
 - Revise the color palette to provide more contrast between the two palettes. To be approved by Design Review staff.
 - Revise the architecture of buildings C & D or the east elevation of building A to provide variation in architectural form, either by changing the side dormer elements or by changing the entry elements. To be approved by Design Review staff.
 - The colors are to be like the rendering but with more contrast.
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. Coordinate with the irrigation provider and neighbors to ensure site provides continued irrigation service to surrounding properties.
5. If the buildings are to be individually owned the project requires a PAD overlay approved by City Council.
6. 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.
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 reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

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

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side A & B)

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-18 **QuikTrip**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 5957 East McDowell
REQUEST: Approval of a 5,104 sq. ft. convenience store and a 9,380 sq. ft. gas canopy
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: QuikTrip Corporation
APPLICANT: QuikTrip Corporation
ARCHITECT: John Smales

REQUEST: Approval of a 5,104 sq. ft. convenience store and a 9,380 sq. ft. gas canopy

SUMMARY: Dennis Archuleta and David Jerseski represented the case. Mr. Jerseski stated there were numerous site constraints on this project including right-of-way dedication and the slope of the site. He stated that they had changed the rear roofline. He also stated they were willing to building the perimeter wall the Board wanted. Mr. Jerseski stated that there was a significant amount of landscaping in the future right-of-way.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated that he needed to leave; however, he felt that the prototype saturation for these projects has been met. He wanted more changes to the design.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen asked why QuikTrip was unwilling to make changes. Mr. Jerseski stated that according to focus groups their customers look for recognizable identity. They feel there buildings are quality construction. Boardmember Nielsen asked if they would be willing to change colors. Mr. Jerseski stated they want that recognition also. Boardmember Nielsen stated that all national corporations adapt. Some architectural enhancements or fenestrations could make it unique to this site. He was concerned that with the grade change the pumps might not be visible from the street. The applicant stated the pumps would be visible.

Boardmember Randy Carter stated that the QuikTrip buildings in the Valley are much nicer than the ones in Oklahoma. He suggested using a wainscot of a different masonry material. He thought the little tile elements on the roof seem contrived; he suggested using another material, may a metal roof or different color tile. He thought the building wasn't really what people see as the drive down the road, they see the gas canopy. Perhaps they could change the canopy. He confirmed with staff that the landscape plan for this site is the same as most of the other QuikTrip locations.

Boardmember Pete Berzins thought the buildings were quality materials. He thought that there was not much variation in the colors, and was concerned the colors would blend together more than what the elevations show. He thought there was little change in the roof tile.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed most of their sites are stand-alone and where they are part of a center, the QuikTrip was the first thing approved so they had nothing to match. He thought the building was low-key. He agreed they could change the canopy.

Chair Carie Allen stated she looks for the QuikTrip sign and she sees the canopy but doesn't see the building from the street. She felt they need to fit in with the neighborhood they are building in. She stated the applicants don't need to change the footprint of the building. She agreed they could change the canopy, but thought that the building and canopy should match so they might have to change the building to fit in with changes to the canopy.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

There was discussion regarding this particular site location. It was determined that in this location the project is compatible; however, in future cases there will need to be more changes.

Boardmember Carter suggested they change the masonry, EIFS entry, perhaps by using curved metal for the entry.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Pete Berzins that DR04-18 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:
 - The design of the Retention basins must comply with Zoning Ordinance requirements.
 - Revise the landscape palette to include additional species to provide a wider variety of trees, shrubs and groundcovers. All of the selected plants should be compatible with the Desert Uplands plant palette and the palette approved for the Longbow Development. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.
 - Revise the landscape plan to disperse some of the required trees into the right of way, closer to the pedestrian sidewalks.
 - Incorporate view fencing into the perimeter fencing for the project. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with the Ordinance Conditions that accompany Zoning Case Z03-58 as approved by City Council.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
5. Full compliance with all current Code requirements, unless modified through appropriate review and approval of the variance outlined in the staff report.
6. Review and approval of a Special Use Permit by the Board of Adjustment for gas pumps.
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 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.

Boardmember Randy Carter asked staff not to bring forth another QuikTrip unless they felt there had been significant changes.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0 (Boardmember Burgheimer was not present for the vote)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The design is appropriate for this site.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B) and Tape 2 (side A)

CASE #: DR04-21 **Carl's Jr.**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: East of the SEC Greenfield & McKellips
REQUEST: Approval of a 3,158 sq. ft. fast food restaurant with drive-thru
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: MJKL Enterprises
APPLICANT: Jeff Looker
ARCHITECT: Jeff Looker

REQUEST: Approval of a 3,158 sq. ft. fast food restaurant with drive-thru

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

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR04-21 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:
 - The light fixtures or light fixture shields selected for the building are to be a style that mimics the design of the square medallions used on the buildings within the center. Details to be approved by Design Review staff.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
5. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
6. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 4 – 1 Rob Burgheimer voting nay

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

Recorded on Tape No.: (side A)

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR04-22 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:
 - Extend the low stucco and stone sitewall along Portobello Avenue across the front of the buildings; and revise landscape plan to include trees and shrubs that screen the mechanical room and center parapet on the street side elevations.
 - Freestanding monument signs shall be approved as submitted or revised plans to be submitted for approval by Design Review Board.
 - Submit a complete lighting plan and photometric study for the entire project for approval by Plan Review Planning staff to ensure compatibility with the surrounding residential development.
 - Revise the building colors to match the perspective renderings.
 - Revise the elevations to incorporated the parapet/tower solution as shown in the three dimensional renderings presented at the meeting not as shown on the colored elevations.
 - Comprehensive Sign Plan to be approved by Board of Adjustment.
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 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

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

Recorded on Tape No.: 2 (side A & B)

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04- 23 **Office for State Farm Insurance**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 5524 East Baseline
REQUEST: Approval of a 3,595 sq. ft. office
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Lynn Urry
APPLICANT: Greg Hitchens
ARCHITECT: Greg Hitchens

REQUEST: Approval of a 3,595 sq. ft. office

SUMMARY: Greg Hitchens represented the case. Mr. Hitchens stated the client wanted a white building with a red roof; however he felt they would be willing to revise the building colors if the Board required it. He stated he had addressed staff's concerns for connecting the first and future second building.

Boardmember Randy Carter was concerned with the small gables, he felt they were out of scale with the rest of the building. He was also concerned with the repetitive nature of the arched windows. He felt the relationship of the windows to the columns were pinched and tight. He wanted to see the monotony of the windows improved. He was concerned with the color and size of the cornice and the proportion between the arches and the roof.

Boardmember Pete Berzins felt the windows were interesting but repetitive. He suggested breaking up the roofline. He felt that if there was going to a second building the windows would really be too much. He confirmed the floor plan design is set.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed that the windows and the soffit are arched. Boardmember DiBella felt the wainscot was weak and should be more than just a color change. He was concerned that there would probably be two buildings and potentially even more with the same repetitive windows. He felt there were too many arches. The arches were too close to the eave line and they didn't seem to serve any purpose architecturally because they did not support anything. He felt that if they were going to go with the theme, they needed to beef it up and give it depth and quality.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought the front door should be closer to the parking spaces. He confirmed there could be two different users. He thought there should be more protection for the entry. He also thought the entry was too narrow and out of scale to the building. He wanted a deeper inset for the entry to protect it from the weather.

Chair Carie Allen was concerned that this office and the apartments proposed surrounding it were very dissimilar. She agreed this building was very repetitive and confirmed there was very little depth at the windows. She felt the roof was too steep and there was too much of the red tile. She was concerned with the bright red doors and grill. She was very concerned that there would be two repetitive buildings.

Boardmember DiBella thought there were a lot o arches, which were too weak. He felt the number of arches detracted from the building.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Carter suggested that maybe the building was too short. The proportion between the roof and the top of the arches needed a more massive fascia or cornice to pull it together.

At this time Eric Alexander asked to speak concerning the case. He stated he was the contractor for this project. He stated they had built three buildings very similar to this at Baseline and Greenfield and they sold faster than any other buildings he has built in Mesa. He stated this was an owner occupant and he liked the building. He was willing to do something with the color.

Boardmember Carter stated the issue was context. There were two projects next to each other that were very dissimilar.

Mr. Hitchens stated that there was a timing issue, they had submitted their project first. He explained that he faced the building toward Baseline so that the owner's clients could see the building from Baseline. Mr. Hitchens felt that the discussion had gotten off track when he mentioned there may be a second building. He stated there may not build a second building. For now Phase One is this building only.

Mr. Alexander stated that the reason for the second building was that the owner's son may need a second building for his clientele. Mr. Alexander understood that the Board had to look at the project as if there would be a second building. He stated that the existing modular house was white and red State Farm colors. He felt the owner may be willing to change colors. He suggested the Board look at the buildings at Baseline and Greenfield. He felt the Board's objections were subjective.

Chair Carie Allen stated she felt that with one building the windows were repetitive. She was willing to look at the buildings on Baseline.

Boardmember Carter stated that it would definitely help to widen the space between the top of the arched windows and the cornice. He also suggested widening the gables, may over two windows or three windows.

Mr. Hitchens stated that that change would make all three elevations essentially the same. Boardmember Carter stated that the front gable should be even larger. Mr. Hitchens stated where the small gables occur the building is shorter. Boardmember Carter confirmed Mr. Hitchens was willing to raise the height of the building. He also confirmed the plate height was 11' with a 9' ceiling height. Mr. Hitchens stated he could go 10' and 12'.

Mr. Alexander wanted to know why they were discussing the design of the building if it had been approved three years ago.

Boardmember Carter stated that the two issues were the color scheme and the proportions. He also stated that in the last two to three years this Board has seen projects of a much higher quality and design than they have in the past. He stated the Board is looking for better solutions and better quality than they did in the past.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Randy Carter that DR04-23 be continued to the May 5, 2004 meeting:

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Color changes, width of the cornice, better proportions, change the height, widen out the gables on the east and west side, consider three colors, consider dark base color with lighter around the inside of the arch, extend the color up and make the fascia different.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0 (Boardmember Burgheimer was not present for this case)

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

Recorded on Tape No.: 2 (side B) and Tape 3 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

retaining wall height and length.

2. Compliance with granting of variances by the Board of Adjustment for Zoning Ordinance requirements, including, but not limited to, building separation, parking lot landscaping, and retention basin retaining wall design.
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 minimum requirements of the City's Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) Program for Mini-Storage Facilities. Provide elevations for the six feet (6') masonry wall between the mini-storage site and the commercial use to the east to include wrought iron view fence sections for enhanced security. Contact Tim Zehring, CPTED Mini-Storage Program Supervisor at 480-644-2090.
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: The development as proposed with conditions is reasonably well designed for this location.

Recorded on Tape No.: 3 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-25 **San Angelin**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Inverness & Sunnyvale
REQUEST: Approval of a 312 unit apartment complex
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Ruiz Engineering
APPLICANT: Pew and Lake
ARCHITECT: Ruiz Engineering

REQUEST: Approval of a 312 unit apartment complex

SUMMARY: Sean Lake and David Johns represented the case.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed the project would be gated. He liked the site plan and layout of the buildings.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed the lap siding would be a composite wood material. The only actual wood on the project would be the rafter tails. Mr. Johns stated the wood would be used in areas without direct sun light. Boardmember Nielsen was concerned there was not much richness to the project. He thought the gables were plain.

Boardmember Randy Carter thought the recessed area on the rear elevation of 'Cluster B' was a concern and thought the corbels should be similar to the others in the project, not flat. He suggested a horizontal element to break up the blank area on the rear of 'Cluster B'. He thought the proposed paint Adobe SP41 was too yellow.

Boardmember Pete Berzins was concerned with the colors. He suggested the applicants work with staff to revise the color palette. He thought the project looked like it should be in Flagstaff.

Chair Carie Allen wanted to see more railings. She agreed the proposed new color was too yellow. She thought additional stone would enhance the project.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer liked the colors and textures.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Pete Berzins that DR04-25 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:
 - Provide landscape yard setbacks required by Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - Provide a sidewalk and gate connecting the project to Inverness Ave.
 - Perimeter wall shall not encroach into the building/landscape setbacks along Baseline, Sunnyvale or Inverness more than 24". Along Baseline and Sunnyvale the solid part of the wall shall not exceed a height of 36".
 - Design of perimeter wall to be approved by Design Review Staff.
 - Provide 24" offset in perimeter wall at intervals not greater than 50 linear

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

feet.

- When 16' deep parking spaces are proposed, provide at least 24" between curb and perimeter wall.
 - Revise design of the solid stair enclosures to allow visibility into the stair. Details to be approved by Design Review staff.
 - Substitute paint color Dunn Edwards #DE 3208 "Congo" for Dunn Edwards #DE3044 "Malaysian Beige" on the building elevations.
 - Provide additional stone on the A B & C rear elevations.
 - Provide wrought iron railings as shown on alternate A.
 - The gables on Cluster C rear to be the same as cluster A for venting.
 - On the 3 story elevations the brown section to have a horizontal element like a pop out or EIFS, to be in the field color.
 - Use the new brown color Congo DE3208, but not the new Adobe SP41.
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 minimum requirements of the City's Crime Free Multi-housing program. Contact Tim Zehring, Program Supervisor, 480 644-2090.
 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: The development as proposed with conditions reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: 3 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-26 **Sycamore Bus Transfer and Park-and-Ride Facility**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC Sycamore and Main Street
REQUEST: Approval of the preliminary bus transfer facility and Park-and-Ride Lot designs.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: City of Mesa
APPLICANT: Jeff Martin, Assistant Development Services Manager, City of Mesa
ARCHITECT: Ken Caswell, Architectural Manager, Valley Metro

REQUEST: Approval of the preliminary bus transfer facility and Park-and-Ride Lot designs

SUMMARY: Betsy Moll, Tim Lidster, Mike James and Ken Haseweld represented the case. They gave a power point presentation on the overall Light Rail project. They stated there would be five bus routes that will come to the bus transfer and light rail facility. Transit facilities are big because the vehicles are big. Buses need independent arrival and departure routes. Most of the riders will be 'park and ride' users. Pedestrians need to feel safe and comfortable. They stated there would be a screen wall along Sycamore to screen the homes across the street. The TPSS building is a functional building of approximately 20' X 60'. The building houses all of the equipment to power the system. They have to be placed at certain intervals to avoid power surges. They were proposing to design the building to relate to the Tri-City Pavilions.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed the gate to Webster Elementary is existing, and is used for overflow parking. The school had asked the Valley Metro planners to maintain the gate and allow the school to lock it. Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that Valley Metro would be adding an additional decorative iron rail along the screen rail along Sycamore. She stated that the applicants have been working closely with the school and the City has agreed to accept what the school requests, for instance the school may want fewer trees along the shared property line in order to have a better view into the park and ride lot. Boardmember Carter confirmed the fence was wrought iron. Boardmember Carter was concerned that on the TPSS building there appeared to be open bond beam at the top of the wall with the mansard set back from it. His concern was that there would also be metal along the top to prevent water seepage.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed there would be exterior lights on the building and that these lights would be backlit.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed the City would be reviewing the fixtures for compliance with the Night Sky Ordinance.

The applicants stated that they were planning to use masonry to match the Tri City Pavilions.

Discussion ensued regarding the TPSS being moved east to the corner of Sycamore and Main. The previous location was further west of the corner.

Betsy Moll stated that as presented there would be three pedestrian paths; one to the west, one through the transit center and one along Sycamore. She asked for the Board's input

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

regarding whether there should be three paths or two.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the new proposed location of the TPSS at the corner was the worst possible location. He thought the station was nicely designed. He thought the TPSS building was this poorly designed and it should be hidden rather than placed at the intersection. He did not think the building would be well received in that location. He was concerned that they would be approving one very small element of the project without knowing what the entire project would ultimately look like. He did not want to approve only that building at this meeting.

Boardmember Randy Carter agreed the building should be moved to another location.

Betsy Moll stated that they could move the TPSS building back to the original location and then try to discourage pedestrians from using that area. Then they would promote pedestrian flow through the center of the transit center and along Sycamore.

Boardmember Pete Berzins confirmed the building would house power equipment.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated it was clear that the TPSS building was designed by other people, not the station designers. He either wanted it moved or it needed to be designed to match the rest of the transit center. He thought that the proposed location caused the building to block the whole view of the transit center from traffic going west on Main.

Betsy Moll stated that one of the things the Engineers wanted the Board to understand was that they had a 200 to 300 foot area perpendicular to the rail line where the TPSS building could be located. She also mentioned they could make all of their contracts work if the Board could approve the floor plan for the building and then defer the colors and textures of the building until there was a more comprehensive plan.

Boardmember Burgheimer thought the building looked out of character to the rest of the plan. He thought it should match the rest of the transit center. He had no problem with the plan or the function. He wanted the building to look like the shade structure.

Betsy Moll stated that they want the building to be a background building. She asked for direction on whether to match it to Tri City Pavilions or should they match it to the transit center.

Boardmember Burgheimer thought it should be part of the transit center, if this transit center is going to have a unique identity it should match that theme.

Boardmember Randy Carter thought there should be more individuality. He did not want the TPSS building on the corner. He suggested changing the roof structure to bring in scale with what they are doing. He thought it was part one and part the other.

Boardmember Pete Berzins thought the TPSS building was too far away from Tri City Pavilions to be part of that center. He thought it should be designed to fit in with the transit center. He thought it should be sleek like the trains, or tie it into the shade structure. He suggested designing the roof to look like the shade structure.

Betsy Moll asked if they could keep the horizontal roof and add elements that don't mess with the actual structure of the building. She suggested adding shading elements that try to put it

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

within the building itself as well as the colors and textures.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that if the building had to be in the new location, then the design of the building solution needed to be a stronger solution.

The applicants stated that there is some flexibility in the location of the building and they felt it could be in the original location. They were willing to study the box and try to incorporate elements from the transit center in the design. They could not do much with the floor plan.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that in Tri City Pavilions they have brick not masonry. The brick also occurs in the screen wall around the site. She felt that the use of brick could be justified.

Chair Carie Allen confirmed the station is in the middle of the street and it would be the same as every other station along the line.

Boardmember Carter confirmed that the applicants were willing to use the clay masonry units or concrete masonry units in the same module, to match Tri-City Pavilions. They would be using concrete masonry units in integral color in most of the other sites. Boardmember Carter was concerned with the use of integrally colored unless they were planning to waterproof them. He confirmed they were bidding the building now.

Betsy Moll stated that they could change the concrete structure through an addendum. The real cost was for the equipment.

Boardmember Berzins confirmed that they needed a footprint, and location for the building. They were willing to come back for the design of the building. They needed to firm up the location and they would come back in May with a firm location and a comprehensive site plan that shows the transit center as well as the park and ride and presumably a design for the TPSS and operator facility. He confirmed they wouldn't need a decision on the operator facility for another 6 to 8 months.

Chair Carie Allen confirmed they were not making any decisions at this meeting, they were simply giving direction.

The Board agreed they had no problem with the floor plan of the building.

Recorded on Tape No.: 3 (side B) and Tape 2 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR02-112 **Dana Park Village Building K**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1740 & 1750 South Val Vista
REQUEST: Approval of a 10,701 sq. ft. retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: Triple Five Arizona
APPLICANT: Robert Saemisch
ARCHITECT: Robert Saemisch

REQUEST: Approval of a 10,701 sq. ft. retail building

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda due to a conflict of interest by Boardmember DiBella.

Bob Saemisch, Mike Clemens and Mike Blazer represented the case. Mr. Saemisch explained the design of the building was consistent with the shopping center. In answer to a question from Boardmember Randy Carter Mr. Saemisch explained that there was a 26' height limitation on this building.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR02-112 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:
 - Confirm required foundation base around the building.
 - Attached signage shall comply with the Comprehensive Sign Plan approved for this site.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
5. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
6. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0 – 1 Boardmember Vince DiBella abstained

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is consistent with the architecture in the center.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Recorded on Tape No.: (side A)

CASE #: DR03-41 **Lot 4 Val Vista Plaza**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC Southern & Val Vista
REQUEST: Approval of alternative roof tile
COUNCIL: District 2
OWNER: Lexon Developer Services
APPLICANT: John Surin
ARCHITECT: Kristian Sigurdsson

REQUEST: Approval of revised roof tile

SUMMARY: Richard Topping represented the case. Staffmember Laura Hyneman explained this project had been approved by the Design Review Board in 2003. At that time the applicant had proposed the roof tile to match the existing shopping center. When the building was actually constructed the zoning inspector was concerned the roof tiles did not match, therefore the applicant was now requesting approval of the revised roof tile. Mr. Topping stated that the clay tile used on the existing shopping was no longer available and they had were requesting approval of the concrete tile they had used.

Boardmember Randy Carter stated that there is a dark flash on the clay tile of the shopping center and the tiles look like true clay tiles. He noticed that the tiles on the shopping center were starting to break and some had fallen off the gables. He thought the color on the new building was as close as the applicant could get, and the black flashing on the existing center doesn't show that predominantly with the new building. He thought it would be a fine to leave the new tile as is. He had looked at a number of tile manufactures catalogs and could not find a better match.

Chair Carie Allen confirmed the new building is not physically attached to the existing center, so the tiles would not be side by side.

It was suggested that when the shopping center replaces the existing tile they use the same tile used on this building so that they will then match. Mr. Topping stated he represents the entire center and they were already proposing to do that.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR03-41 be accepted as revised:

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The roof tile used on the existing shopping center is no longer available and the Board thought the concrete tile used on the new building was a close match.

Recorded on Tape No.: 4 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-27 **Staples**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 4535 E. McKellips
REQUEST: Approval of "red" storefronts for Staples
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: W.M. Grace Development Co.
APPLICANT: Tracy Folmer

REQUEST: Approval of red storefronts instead of the green used within the rest of the shopping center.

SUMMARY: There was no one present to represent the Staples.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Pete Berzins that DR04-27 be required to change the storefronts to match the green used on the rest of the shopping center:

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The Board felt the red storefronts were not complementary to the existing block colors; were not compatible with the colors used in the shopping center; and they thought the red was selected because it matched the red "Staples" sign.

Recorded on Tape No.: 4 (side A)

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da