

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

APRIL 2, 2003

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

MEMBERS PRESENT

Carie Allen - Chair
John O'Hara- Vice Chair
Robert Burgheimer
John Poulsen
Christine Close
Randy Carter
Jillian Hagen

MEMBERS ABSENT

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman	Bob Fisher
Lesley Davis	Whitney Hale
Debbie Archuleta	John Haggard
Charlie Scully	Barbara Carpenter
Richard Dyer	Mark Abel
Eric Nelson	Sean Lake
Rick Cartell	Mike Alexander
John Stocker	Dave Schukai
Richard Wood	Enda Melvin
Roger Manny	Steve Earll
Rich Gutierrez	S. G. Ellison
Curtis Sigler	
Jesse Macias	
John Fields	

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 5, 2003 Meeting:

On a motion by Rob Burgheimer seconded by John Poulsen the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

3. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-11 **Retail & Restaurant**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 6000 block of East Southern
REQUEST: Approval of a 10,062 sq. ft. restaurant and retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Red Mountain Retail Group
APPLICANT: Art Ramirez
ARCHITECT: Art Ramirez, Ethos

REQUEST: Approval of a 10,062 sq. ft. restaurant and retail building

SUMMARY: Eric Nelson represented the case. Mr. Nelson thanked staff and the Board for their help with this project.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was concerned that the site plan and elevations don't match. He wanted the building to move in and out as shown on the elevations.

Mr. Nelson confirmed the building would not be flat. The building would be built as shown on the elevations.

Boardmember John Poulsen confirmed that there would be nothing behind the window on the tower element. He was concerned about the distance the tower would project from the building face. He wanted at least a 2' difference.

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested requiring the applicant to resubmit revised site plan and roof plan.

Boardmember Poulsen inquired whether the tower window would be frosted glass that would not open up to the store. He felt the tower could be more interesting.

Boardmember Christine Close confirmed that the vehicular access to the site would be from the access drive to the south of the building. The building entrances would be along the north of the building. She also confirmed that this project had a parking agreement with the Wal-Mart.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen felt the tower element "looked" like the entry point. She felt the restaurant entrance should be closer to the tower. She questioned how well the waiting area would be utilized with the entrance so far away from the waiting area. She was concerned with the signage as shown on the south elevation. Staffmember Charlie Scully confirmed the applicant would not be allowed all of the signage shown on the south elevation.

Boardmember Randy Carter was concerned with the windows on the tower. He felt that the window needed to be moved away from the corner. He felt there needed to be some sort of decorative element on the tower, but suggested it be centered on both sides of the tower elevation.

Boardmember Burgheimer would prefer an architectural element as opposed to a window that doesn't function as a window.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Carter felt the south elevation was very severe. He wanted some of the architectural elements used on the sides and front carried around to the south elevation.

Mr. Nelson stated they would have metal awnings over each of the exit doors and they were continuing the EFIS band around the backside and included the relief in the reveals on the stucco.

Boardmember Hagen felt the awnings were too small to have an impact. She suggested using one large awning over the two doors that were close together.

Boardmember Carter questioned the type of cornice proposed. He wanted to see more than just a simple 45° cornice.

Boardmember John Poulsen stated that this project has come a long way from the first submittal; however he felt the details needed a little more work to make this a really nice project. He agreed the cornice should be special.

Boardmember Carter suggested the applicant work with staff to choose something that would fit in with the rest of the building.

Boardmember Poulsen suggested using grillwork on the "element" on the tower.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman confirmed that the Board wanted the area that says "signage" to project 2' and then the tower needs to split the difference and project 1'.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by that DR03-11 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
2. Compliance with the Preliminary Development Impact Summary Comments.
3. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
4. 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 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.
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. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and out door lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
7. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for interior and 20' height at the perimeter.
8. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

building.

9. Provide a fully dimensioned site plan with any future submittals.
10. The following required changes shall be approved by the Design Review staff and other City Divisions as noted prior to submittal of construction documents for plan review:
 - A. The location and orientation of trash enclosures must be revised to address the City of Mesa Standard Details and Specification (M-62 series) and be approved by the Solid Waste Division and Design Review staff. The trash enclosures shall be reoriented to address the minimum 30% deviation from the collection vehicle travel route and be setback out of the main drive aisle for the shopping center.
 - B. Remove the three (3) parking stalls from the traffic island with the trash enclosures, as they do not address the requirements for vehicle overhang area.
 - C. The site plan as submitted does not address the minimum number of required parking spaces. Either provide an off-site parking agreement for the required parking or reduce the size of the building.
 - D. Provide design details on the proposed pedestrian area at the northeast corner of the building, including information on the design, materials and colors for the benches, decorative paving and tree container.
- 11. Adjust the amount of signage on the south elevation. To be approved by Design Review staff**
- 12. Modify the awnings on the south elevation to make them larger, and use one awning over the two doors to the east of the south elevation. To be approved by Design Review staff**
- 13. Revise the tower window to either move the window to the center of the two elevations; or replace the window and provide an "element" to be used on the east elevation and the north elevation. To be approved by Design Review staff**
- 14. Work with staff to modify the site plan, roof plan and floor plan so that they match what is shown on the elevation. To be approved by Design Review staff**
- 15. Articulate the cornice. To be approved by Design Review staff.**

Discussion then ensued regarding moving the entrance to the restaurant closer to the tower element and outdoor waiting area. It was determined it would be in their best interest, however the Board did not want to mandate it.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is an attractive addition to the existing shopping center.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-18 **Wal-Mart Neighborhood Market**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC Horne and McKellips
REQUEST: Approval of a 39,910 sq. ft. grocery store
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Roger Yu-Shang Kao & Pearl Yo-Jo Kao
APPLICANT: Enda Melvin
ARCHITECT: Chris Rhea

REQUEST: Approval of a 39,910 sq. ft. grocery store.

SUMMARY: Sean Lake, Mike Alexander, Dave Schukai, and Enda Melvin represented the case. Mr. Lake explained that there had been neighborhood meetings regarding this case after the March 5, 2003 Design Review meeting. Mr. Lake explained that the applicants had agreed to an 8' wall between their project and the adjacent neighbors. There were three construction options for the wall: first, would be to increase the height of the existing walls by adding block to the top of the existing wall, second, construction of a parallel wall; third, tear down the existing walls and build new 8' walls. Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that if there were parallel walls the applicant would use metal flashing between the two walls. Mr. Lake stated that they would also be increasing the height of a wall to the east of this project; working with the Board of Adjustment regarding landscaping for this project; and working with the City of Mesa on traffic signal issues.

Boardmember John Poulsen was concerned with the design of the façade at the main entry. He confirmed that they were proposing corrugated metal at the main entry. He did not like the idea of the corrugated metal; he felt there were other ways to create a "country store" image. He did not like the southwest corner of the building; he felt it looked like a king's crown.

Boardmember Christine Close was concerned that the rear of the building was plain. She was concerned with the construction of walls.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen agreed that the façade at the main entry needed to have more depth. She was concerned with the change in height between the two levels of the parapet façade. She wanted to see another level added so the increase was not so dramatic. At the southwest corner, she felt the roof piece was coming up from below the top of the roof point; it did not make sense to have the horizontal line cutting through. She wanted the roof structure to be tied into the building rather than two false fronts. She liked the green awnings and wanted to see the green color used as an accent color all the way around the building.

Boardmember Randy Carter did not like the building as designed. He felt the revised building was not as well designed as what was originally proposed. He understood they were trying to address the Board's desire for "country" architecture but this did not present that image. He felt there was no cohesiveness to the building design. There was nothing tying the building together. He did not like the use of corrugated metal. He did not feel the other three elevations were detailed enough.

Chair Carie Allen agreed with the previous comments. She did not like the front entry. She did like the awnings, the use of stone and the country architecture. She did not feel this building worked.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Robert Burgheimer felt this building went from mediocre, down. He felt that the building needed to be cohesive. He suggested the applicants take a step back and look at the overall building. He stated it is not possible to make everyone happy and felt that that was what the applicant was trying to do. He liked middle portion of the front elevation, however, he did not like either of the corners. He liked the building materials that were proposed; however, he did not like the way they were combined. He even felt that the corrugated metal could be acceptable, but not the way it was being proposed. He felt the problem was how the materials were being composed.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen stated that the choice of materials was not the problem. The detailing did not work and looked awkward. Boardmember Hagen felt that masses seemed to be attached to the building without tying into it. The front entry became very large and looked like a mini barn set on pilasters without being tied into the building and becoming a part of it.

Mr. Alexander stated that the comment at the March meeting pertaining to agrarian design is what led them to this design. He stated the Board had asked them to build a 19th century building in the 21st century.

Boardmember Randy Carter asked the applicant if they had seen DC Ranch in North Scottsdale. In that development they had taken stone and metal and created a village look that was very appealing. He was hoping this applicant would use basic materials and create a strong presence using simple forms. He questioned how the corrugated metal on their proposal ended. There did not appear to be a termination, just a flat edge. He felt the roof slopes were awkward. The façade/parapets looked like old stage sets. He did not like the cornice. He did not like the arch and felt it was not characteristic of rural architecture. He questioned the use of stucco in the middle of the metal façade. He thought the building looked cheap. He felt the entry lacked finesse. He suggested creating a stone façade and carrying the roof back over the parapet. He wanted the fascia thickened. He stated they were using nice materials in an unimaginative way. He liked the fact that the building was turned at an angle and felt it was an opportunity to showcase the building.

Mr. Alexander of Wal-Mart stated that their company had, in the past, been known for being uncooperative with Design Review Boards and cities in general. He stated that they have been working to change that approach and they want to do the best for the City of Mesa and the neighborhood to make this a store for the community. He asked for specific direction as to what the Board wants to see. He felt they were completely missing what the Board wanted.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen stated that when the Board suggested agrarian they were looking for a different architectural style, not a barn. She felt that they had been partially successful in doing that, but they needed to refine it so it worked around the entire building. She didn't feel they needed to go in another direction. She felt they needed to refine what they were doing.

Mr. Alexander stated they were hoping to open both stores by December. He wondered if they could beef up the front parapet and add a backing to, take the left corner of the building and get rid of the crown look. Could they take that direction and work with staff to complete the building?

Boardmember John Poulsen appreciated that they were trying. He felt that the other building

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

proposed on Higley was very nice. He felt the Board needed to see this building again.

Chair Carie Allen then invited citizens to speak regarding this project.

Rebecca Thorston who lives east of Horne spoke. She liked some of the materials but not the building. She did not want the front entry to be so tall. She was hoping for a country store. She did not like the stucco on the front façade. She did not think it had a neighborhood feel, she liked the awnings.

Boardmember Burgheimer felt they may be trying to put too much on this building, and it needs to be simplified. He felt that with all the different materials and elements it looked like a 100,000 sq. ft. building, not a smaller grocery store.

Chair Carie Allen agreed there was too much happening for a building this size.

Boardmember Hagen felt there needed to be detailing but not at such a massive scale.

Boardmember Burgheimer felt they had all the materials to make this a great building. He felt that the Board needed to do whatever they could to work with the applicant to help this project go forward.

Sean Lake then read a list of things he felt the Board wanted: Do something to terminate the corrugated metal so it didn't just end, if they choose to keep the corrugated metal; reduce the scale of the main entrance and make it thicker.

The Board was not as concerned with the height of the parapet as the thickness. They were concerned with the proportions of the building.

Mr. Lake continued: another issue was detailing the green around the building, either wrapping it around the building with banding or tiles. The Board did not want to see banding; they wanted accents, such as tile.

Mr. Lake added removing the crown: Boardmember Carter suggested making it a flat element, slightly raised above the building height.

Boardmember Poulsen suggested using a porch element on the building.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-18 be continued to April 15, 2003 at 8:30 a.m.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

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

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

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-19 **WalMart Neighborhood Market**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC University and Higley
REQUEST: Approval of a 39,910 sq. ft. grocery store
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Standard Chartered Bank
APPLICANT: Enda Melvin
ARCHITECT: Chris Rhea

REQUEST: Approval of a 39,910 sq. ft. grocery store

SUMMARY: Sean Lake, Mike Alexander, Dave Schukai, and Enda Melvin represented the case.

Boardmember Christine Close felt the entrance did not transition well with the rest of the building.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen liked the front elevation of the building and the way it stepped in and out. She felt the entrance should transition better, rather than being perched like a false front. The proportion of the sign seemed heavy on the bottom with open blank space above it. The front has a lot of interest with different textures and colors, which continue around to the sides, and then the rear elevation has nothing. She wanted to see changes in color or materials on the rear.

Boardmember Randy Carter liked the front entry, but did want it to be thicker. He agreed the rear elevation was too plain. He felt it needed some articulation; a dot pattern or change in materials, colors, breaking up the mass.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer felt there should be a window at the southwest corner because it would be very visible for traffic driving by.

The applicant's stated that the kitchen for the deli was there so a window would not work. Mr. Schukai felt that the west elevation was weighted toward to the rear of the store and should be weighted toward to the front of the store.

Discussion ensued regarding the wall-mounted flagpole, the Board preferred a ground-mounted flagpole.

Boardmember Poulsen agreed with previous comments.

Chair Carie Allen was concerned with the arched parapet front. She wanted it to be thicker.

Boardmember Hagen thanked the applicants for the trees in front of the building. For the rear of the building she suggested less massing of the Ironwood trees, and adding an additional tree that would grow more quickly. She suggested they intersperse the Ironwoods with the other trees so that the other trees fill in and the Ironwoods are more ornamental.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-19 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 outdoor storage areas for materials, equipment, and service entrance section (SES) shall be recessed or fully screened from view by a masonry wall the same height as the utility cabinet.
6. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
7. Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened by a parapet wall equal to or exceeding the height of the mechanical units. To the extent permitted by law, satellite dishes shall be fully screened by a parapet wall. Ground mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened from public view by a combination of a decorative wall and dense landscaping. The screen wall shall be equal to or exceed the height of the mechanical units.
8. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
9. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
10. **Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 14' height at the perimeter.**
11. Screen all parking areas and vehicular circulation aisles adjacent to the public right-of-way. The screen walls along the street frontage should be varied in alignment, broken up with naturally contoured berming and staggered dense shrubs to achieve a continuous screen of no less than 36 inches above the highest adjacent grade.
12. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
13. Change the wall-mounted flagpole with a freestanding flagpole.
14. Design of the palette storage system to be approved by Design Review staff.
15. Revise the landscape plan along the north elevation to use the Ironwood trees as accents and change the spacing of them.
16. The left side of the front elevation to be articulated similarly to the wall between the right side of the front elevation between the two larger pieces.
17. Provide additional detailing to the rear elevation, using different colors, materials, etc.
18. On the left elevation, move the plant on piece more to the front and tie it into what is being done on the left hand side of the front elevation.
19. The articulated arch above the Wal-Mart sign to be thickened to at least double what

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- it proposed.
20. Provide two half size color elevations, two full size and two 8-1/2 X 11 sets of revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevation 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.

Recorded on Tape No.: 2 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-22 **Lexus**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 6348 East Test Drive
REQUEST: Approval of a 5.99 acre new car dealership
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Superstition Springs Enterprises
APPLICANT: Autopilot Development Services
ARCHITECT: Robert Brown

REQUEST: Approval of a 5.99 acre new car dealership

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

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR03-22 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concerns 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 required 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 outdoor storage areas for materials, equipment, and services entrance section (SES) shall be recessed or fully screened from view by a masonry wall the same height as the utility cabinet.
6. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
7. Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened by a parapet wall equal to or exceeding the height of the mechanical units. To the extent permitted by law, satellite dishes shall be fully screened from public view by a combination of a decorative wall and dense landscaping. The screen wall shall be equal to or exceed the height of the mechanical units.
8. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
9. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with Chapter 6 of the City Code "outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
10. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
11. 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 APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

12. **Submit color elevations for any freestanding monument signs for review and approval by Design Review staff prior to submittal of construction documents for plan review.**
13. **Submit revised elevations and plans showing the design, materials and colors of screen walls and gates for review and approval by Design Review staff prior to submittal of construction documents for plan review. Special attention should be given to the details of the decorative screen wall from the golf course elevation. In addition, provide a revised site plan, which indicates the exact location of various types of walls including the solid masonry screen walls and wrought iron view fences.**

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0 – 1 (Boardmember Randy Carter abstained)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is consistent with the approved design guidelines for the development.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-23 **Target**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1625 West Southern
REQUEST: Approval of a 124,000 sq. ft. retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: Target Group
APPLICANT: Val-Tec Inc.
ARCHITECT: Michael Rumpelstin, RSP Architects

REQUEST: Approval of a 124,000 sq. ft. retail building

SUMMARY: This case was added to the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually. During the study session the applicant agreed with work with staff on the design of the downspouts.

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR03-23 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 Board of Adjustment regarding proposed signage for this project.
5. **Provide a painted masonry base for the detached sign. Sign base to match color and material of the Target building.**
6. **Provide details of the proposed garden center fence and screening for approval by Design Review staff. Proposed screening device should provide the same opacity as recently approved garden center screening.**
7. **Relocate downspouts to the interior of the building or provide an enhanced design, which complements the character of the building with decorative metal leaders and pipes. Approval by Design Review staff.**
8. **Wrap the C-11 color on the northwest corner; study resulting changes to colors on the west elevation. Details to be approved by Design Review staff.**
9. All equipment, and service entrance section (SES) shall be recessed or fully screened from view by a masonry wall the same height as the utility cabinet. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
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

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- 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. Light standards (poles) shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 20' height at the perimeter.
 13. Fire risers 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.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0 – 1 (Boardmember Randy Carter abstained)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is well designed and meets the intent of the B.I.Z. overlay zoning designation.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-24 **Perkinson Investment**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 159 South Power
REQUEST: Approval of two 4,970 sq. ft. office buildings
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Perkinson Investments
APPLICANT: Randy Carter
ARCHITECT: Randy Carter

REQUEST: Approval of two 4,970 sq. ft. office buildings

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

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR03-24 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. **The paint color selected for the carport structure should be a subdued color similar to the "Autumn" split face selected for the building. Color to be approved by Design Review staff.**
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
6. All outdoor storage areas for materials, equipment, and service entrance section (SES) shall be recessed or fully screened from view by a masonry wall the same height as the utility cabinet.
7. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
8. 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.
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. 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.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

11. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 20' height at the perimeter. Light standards (poles) for pad sites are to match the light standards used within the shopping center.
12. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
13. Provide two half size color elevations, two full size and two 8-1/2 X 11 sets of revised site plans, landscaping plans, color board 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 Randy Carter abstained)

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

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-25 **Wendy's**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC Baseline & Ellsworth
REQUEST: Approval of a 3,300 sq. ft. fast food restaurant with drive-thru
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Wendy's International
APPLICANT: Mark Abel Architects
ARCHITECT: Mark Abel

REQUEST: Approval of a 3,300 sq. ft. fast food restaurant with drive-thru

SUMMARY: This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually. Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thanked the applicant for doing something unique with a franchise building.

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR03-25 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. **EFIS and masonry should not be "Grape Thistle": EFIS to match ICI Paints "Brickdust" and masonry to match Superlite "Black Canyon".**
5. **Sand blast the "Black Canyon" masonry or match Trendstone masonry proposed for the shopping center.**
6. **Wall mounted light fixtures to be dark bronze.**
7. **Masonry wall tile around drive through windows to match color of adjacent masonry. Proposed tile sample to be approved by Design Review Staff.**
8. **Service door at rear of building to be painted to match adjacent EFIS color.**
9. **Metal pipe bollard to be painted to match integral color masonry.**
10. **Provide colored concrete at the pedestrian crossing east of the building.**
11. **Revise the landscaping plan:**
 - Substitute "Texas Mountain Laurel" (*Sophora secundiflora*) or "Willow Acacia" (*Acacia Salicina*) for the *Cercidium Praecox* proposed in the foundation base north of the building.
 - Enhance the proposed landscaping in the foundation base on the south side of the building.
12. All outdoor storage areas for materials, equipment, and service entrance section (SES) shall be recessed or fully screened from view by a masonry wall the same height as the utility cabinet. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
13. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within 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

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- color.
14. 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.
 15. Light standards (poles) shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 20' height at the perimeter. Light standards (poles) for pad sites are to match the light standards used within the shopping center.
 16. Light standards (poles) shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 20' height at the perimeter. Light standards (poles) for pad sites are to match the light standards used within the shopping center.
 17. 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 – 1 (Boardmember Randy Carter abstained)

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

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-26 **CVS Pharmacy**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 360 North Val Vista (SWC Val Vista and University)
REQUEST: Approval of a 13,000 sq. ft. drug store
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: Gustine Properties
APPLICANT: Kathi Walp, Carter Burgess
ARCHITECT: Steve Porter, Carter Burgess

REQUEST: Approval of a 13,000 sq. ft. drug store

SUMMARY: Roger Manny and S.G. Ellison represented the case, and explained that this project had received a DIP. The applicants stated they would be providing additional landscaping and a pedestrian connection at the corner. The building would not have a corner overhang element. The arcade was continued down each of the sides of the building, the awnings were wrapped around the corner. The depth of the pilasters would be thicker than previously presented.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman explained that CVS has done a great deal to differentiate each of their stores. The applicant asked if it would be possible to present an elevation that had been previously approved on another site. Mr. Ellison stated that what they had actually done was taken elements of the store at Sossaman and Guadalupe and blended them with elements of the store at Brown and Recker.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen stated she prefers the colors as shown on the elevations rather than those on the color board. She felt the color board was too bland.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed the color scheme was not chosen to complement anything in the area. He preferred the elevation to the color board as well. He was concerned with the orange block. He wanted to see a stronger accent color used, perhaps in the archways. Roger Manny explained that the band at the top of the pilasters that continues around the building was a good opportunity to bring in a bolder color, and then carry it into the arch. Boardmember Carter appreciated the pedestrian connection from the corner. He would like more shape to the cornice.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer liked the building, he felt it was simple and clean. He agreed that the colors on the elevation were nicer. He thanked CVS for leading the way in their design.

Chair Carie Allen stated that the Board agreed with Mr. Burgheimer regarding the work CVS has done.

Boardmember John Poulsen agreed the colors on the color board were too monochromatic.

Chair Carie Allen preferred the colors on the elevation.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR03-26 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 outdoor storage areas for materials, equipment, and service entrance section (SES) shall be recessed or fully screened from view by a masonry wall the same height as the utility cabinet.
6. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
7. Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened by a parapet wall equal to or exceeding the height of the mechanical units. To the extent permitted by law, satellite dishes shall be fully screened by a parapet wall. Ground mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened from public view by a combination of a decorative wall and dense landscaping. The screen wall shall be equal to or exceed the height of the mechanical units.
8. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
9. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
10. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 20' height at the perimeter. Light standards (poles) for pad sites are to match the light standards used within the shopping center.
11. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
12. Provide two 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.
13. **Compliance with the conditions of Board of Adjustment case #BA03-004 which approved a Development Incentive Permit (DIP) on February 11, 2003, to allow reductions in site development standards for this project.**
14. **Revise the monument sign design to include a minimum 2' high split face CMU base and wider border around the sign cabinet materials and colors similar to the building.**
15. **Revise elevations on all four sides to provide increased depth to the wall and column surfaces.**
16. **Work with Design Review staff to revise the color scheme to be bolder, and closer to the elevations.**

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is well designed and should be a nice addition to the neighborhood.

Recorded on Tape No.: 2 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-27 **Eckerd**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: Main Street and Val Vista
REQUEST: Approval of a 13,813 sq. ft. drug store
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: Centres Inc.
APPLICANT: RHL Design Group
ARCHITECT: Brent Fike

REQUEST: Approval of a 13,813 sq. ft. drug store

SUMMARY: This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually. During the study session the applicant presented a revised sign proposal, which was approved by the Board.

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR03-27 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, and the revised sign package presented at the April meeting, 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. **Plant material in the foundation base landscape planters adjacent to parking stalls shall be restricted to groundcovers and shrubs no higher than twelve inches (12") in height at full growth.**
6. All outdoor storage areas for materials, equipment, and service entrance section (SES) shall be recessed or fully screened from view by a masonry wall the same height as the utility cabinet.
7. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
8. 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.
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 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.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

10. 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.
11. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 20' height at the perimeter. Light standards (poles) for pad sites are to match the light standards used within the shopping center.
12. Screen all parking areas and vehicular circulation aisles adjacent to the public right-of-way. The screen walls along the street frontage should be varied in alignment, broken up with naturally contoured berming and staggered dense shrubs to achieve a continuous screen of no less than 36 inches.
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.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0 – 1 (Boardmember Randy Carter abstained)

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

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-29 **Auto Zone**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NEC Guadalupe & Sossaman
REQUEST: Approval of a 5,400 sq. ft. AutoZone
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: AutoZone
APPLICANT: RHL Design Group
ARCHITECT: Brent Fike

REQUEST: Approval of a 5,400 sq. ft. AutoZone

SUMMARY: Jessie Macias and Curtis Sigler represented the case. Mr. Macias stated that they thought they had pulled in elements of the shopping center that were appropriate. He stated they had agreed with staff to use a trellis element on the north elevation and use vines to enhance that elevation.

Boardmember Randy Carter was concerned that the photos of the shopping center do not match the elevations approved by the Design Review Board. He felt the Auto Zone was too plain: the entry needed more work, he wanted to see more paint colors, the cornice was too small, the wainscot needs more detail, the columns are plain. He suggested bringing the columns up and adding articulation. Mr. Macias stated that they were matching the colors from the shopping center, the only color they were not using was the gray from the awnings. Mr. Carter wanted the applicants to enhance what was in the shopping center, it didn't have to match the center. Mr. Macias was willing to add color. Mr. Carter felt the reveal lines should be stylistic.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer felt this was a nicer Auto Zone than previously built. He agreed that the use of additional color would help. He wanted to see a different color used at the arches. He felt the entry feature should be a different color. The tile could be a brighter color. On the east elevation the pop-out should be taller and maybe it could match a darker color used on the entry façade. He felt the cornice should be thicker and a different shape at the entry. Curtis Sigler stated that they would prefer the entry façade be a lighter color so their signage pops out. He would prefer to use the darker color above the arches.

Mr. Macias asked if they could use the field behind the Auto Zone sign with a slightly darker color field between the arches, and use something peachy tan as an accent color. He did not want to use a green inset.

Boardmember Burgheimer felt that working with a center was different from matching it. He did not want them to match the center exactly. He would not have a problem with them adding a new color.

Boardmember John Poulsen confirmed that the pop-out was 4". He agreed 4" would be O.K. if they were a different color.

Discussion ensued regarding the use of external downspouts. Mr. Sigler explained that on the shopping center the downspout is between the horizontal pop-outs. Staffmember Laura Hyenman stated that on the shopping center the downspouts are on the rear of the center with no public access.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Jillian Hagen was concerned with the thickness of the side of the monument sign, because it would not enclose the sign box. She wanted it at least double or triple. She agreed there needed to be an additional color; however, she did not want to see another beige.

Discussion ensued regarding the additional color. Mr. Macias suggested "Coral"; the Board did not want Coral. They wanted a darker neutral color.

Boardmember Hagen was concerned with the way the doors were placed in the arches on the south elevation. Discussion ensued regarding the placement of the doors and the color of the man door and the roll up door. It was decided the applicant would replace the man door and roll up door with double doors 6' X 8', which would be painted. Mr. Sigler explained that the restroom was located in the corner and the fire risers would be between the doors, so it would not be possible to center the doors in the arch on the north elevation. The Board determined that since the doors would be painted to match the wall it would be all right.

Discussion ensued regarding the north elevation which fronts onto Guadalupe. The applicant was willing to add trellises and vines if the Board wanted them. The door on the north elevation was for emergency exit only. The Board wanted the door moved to the east elevation. Mr. Sigler wanted to check with his operations manager to see if that would work. The landscape plan showed ground cover in the foundation planting the Board wanted shrubs used also. If the applicant could not functionally move the door the trellises would be placed in the two center arches. Boardmember Poulsen felt the Board should mandate the door be moved or the decision will be based on where the operations manager wants to place his shelves. Mr. Sigler stated they had met with the neighbors to the east and they wanted the landscape materials proposed along the east elevation. If they had to move the door to the east they would have to move or eliminate a tree. If the door could be moved the Board wanted the trellises on all four arches.

Boardmember Carter wanted the Fan Palms changed to a different tree specie. Mr. Macias asked if the landscape island in the center of the west elevation could be moved away from their entrance. The applicants were willing to change the tree to a Palo Verde or Acacia.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-29 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. **Provide additional color to the building elevations to incorporate additional elements of the existing shopping center. Details to be approved by the Design Review Board.**
3. **Landscaping for the project must comply with Zoning Ordinance requirements for this project, which are one tree and three shrubs for every 25 feet of street frontage.**
4. **Downspout design to match the existing building. To be approved by the Design Review staff.**
5. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

6. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
7. All outdoor storage areas for materials, equipment, and service entrance section (SES) shall be recessed or fully screened from view by a masonry wall the same height as the utility cabinet.
8. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
9. 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.
10. 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.
11. 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.
12. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 20' height at the perimeter. Light standards (poles) for pad sites are to match the light standards used within the shopping center.
13. Screen all parking areas and vehicular circulation aisles adjacent to the public right-of-way. The screen walls along the street frontage should be varied in alignment, broken up with naturally contoured berming and staggered dense shrubs to achieve a continuous screen of no less than 36 inches above the highest adjacent grade.
14. **Fire risers, 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.
16. The color palette to be revised to have a lighter color on the Auto Zone entry façade, two other colors for the archway and above the arch, the diamond accent tile to be a brighter color.
17. Add trellises to the north elevation.
18. Add shrubs to the foundation base along the north elevation.
19. Change the three fan palms to Palo Verde or a similar tree.
20. Replace the roll up door and man door to double 6' X 8' doors, to be painted to match the building.
21. The downspouts to be painted to match the field color.
22. Enlarge the cornice size.
23. Provide additional articulation to the columns on either side of the Auto Zone sign.

Staffmember Laura Hyenman confirmed with the Board that they would not approve an administrative change to allow red store fronts on this project. Mr. Sigler stated that they no longer use red storefronts because they cost more.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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

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

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-30 **Webb Distributing**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 3457 East Main
REQUEST: Approval of a 36,276 sq. ft. sales building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: Webb Distributing
APPLICANT: John Stocker
ARCHITECT: John Stocker

REQUEST: Approval of a 36,276 sq. ft. sales building

SUMMARY: John Stocker, John Haggard, and John Fields represented the case. Mr. Stocker explained that Webb Distributors sells most of their equipment to general contractors. There would be some retail operations but mostly wholesale operations. Webb Distributors did not want to have anything too fancy because they were afraid they would scare the contractors away. They were proposing a pre-fabricated steel building with stucco on three sides, a four-foot change in parapet height with clerestory windows and a 6' projection/overhang, above the doors/windows. Mr. Stocker stated they could extend windows to the base of the building. He stated the colors on the color board are Webb Distributors corporate colors.

Boardmember John Poulsen confirmed that the masonry on the color board was for the screen wall and that it would not be on the building.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated this project was in a prominent location. He stated he could not approve this project. He would have a problem approving this building in an industrial complex, let alone in such a prominent location. He stated that this Board has approved metal buildings in the past, but this building lacks total design effort. He could not approve an industrial looking building along Main Street. He felt this project needed attention to detail: how the massing could be broken down, and how the colors are oriented around the building. He wanted to see this project have the same attention that was given to the other buildings reviewed by the Board at this meeting.

Boardmember John Poulsen agreed this was not what the Board wanted to see in this City. He did not accept the argument that they can't have a nicer building because there are other service companies that have quality buildings. This was not appropriate for Main Street.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen agreed there was not any attention paid to detail, or any effort to make this look like anything other than a box. She felt that every building requires detail. Even if this was in an industrial park it is lacking any sort of detail that would give it any interest.

Chair Carie Allen felt the building needed detail and styling.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated there are buildings that are simple and well executed. This site will be very visible to the public and needs to have the same attention to detail as the other projects reviewed at the meeting. The Board was not asking them to spend a lot of money but it needed more than what was proposed.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR03-30 be continued for redesign

The Board then suggested moving the security wall back to the side of the building. The Board was concerned that there would not be enough maneuvering room behind the angled parking at the front of the building.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

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

Recorded on Tape No.: 3 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

and 14' height adjacent to residential neighbors. Light standards (poles) for pad sites are to match the light standards used within the shopping center.

11. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
12. Provide two 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 – 1 (Boardmember Randy Carter abstained)

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

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-32 **350° Bakery**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NEC Thomas and Raftriver
REQUEST: Approval of a 2,296 sq. ft. restaurant and bakery
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Dan Janssen
APPLICANT: Basilio Coracides
ARCHITECT: Basilio Coracides

REQUEST: Approval of a 2,296 sq. ft. restaurant and bakery

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

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR03-32 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. All outdoor storage areas for materials, equipment and service entrance section (SES) shall be recessed or fully screened from view by a masonry wall the same height as the utility cabinet.
5. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
6. **Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened on all sides by a parapet wall equal to or exceeding the height of the mechanical units. The materials of this screening device shall match the materials and paint colors of the building.**
7. **Attached and monument signage 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. 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.
10. Screen all parking areas and vehicular circulation aisles adjacent to the public right-of-way. The screen walls along the street frontage should be varied in alignment, broken up with naturally contoured berming and staggered dense shrubs to achieve a continuous screen of no less than 36 inches above the highest adjacent grade.
11. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
12. Provide two half size color elevations, two fully size and two 8-1/2 X 11 sets of revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations where applicable showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review staff prior

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0 – 1 (Boardmember Carter abstained)

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

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da