

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

OCTOBER 5, 2005

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Lower Level of the Council Chambers 57 East First Street, at 3:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Pete Berzins - Chair
Dave Richins- Vice Chair
Randy Carter
Rob Burgheimer
Tim Nielsen
Vince DiBella

MEMBERS ABSENT

Jillian Hagen

OTHERS PRESENT

Kim Steadman	Brent Kiendle	Dorothy Shupe
Lesley Davis	Sean Lake	Bob Saemisch
Debbie Archuleta	Skip Nelson	Maeve Johnson
Mia Lozano Helland	JD Berryman	Bill Wells
John Wesley	Tony Malaj	Jon Griffin
April Ward	Paul Klink	Joe Kramer
Gordon Sheffield	Gary Syryle	Others
Marty Flood	Michael Quattrone	
Jesse Macias	Kevin Carr	
Jim Day	Ed Lewis	
Kayl Smith	Lance Adams	

1. Work Session:

CASE: Broadway Higley
E of SEC Broadway & Higley

REQUEST: Approval of an office

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Concerned signage will be placed on the tower
- Cross access to future buildings from this site.

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Liked the material
- Future buildings should be compatible with this building
- Signage should reflect the retro look

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Trash enclosure needs to move

CASE: Just Brakes & Jiffy Lube
E of SEC Ellsworth & Guadalupe

REQUEST: Approval of an auto repair facility and a brake shop

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Its is a prototype
- Preferred the metal awning to match on both buildings
- Wants the colors and materials to be compatible with the surrounding retail

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Use internal drains

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Angle of trash needs to change

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Doors are too high
- Blank elevation at bay doors – should pop-out above
- Wants the cornice on the Just Brakes like the revised drawings shown at meeting
- Trash enclosure is visible from Guadalupe – should see the rear not the front of enclosure

South elevation needs additional articulation – maybe just a color change

CASE: Cobblestone Auto Spa & Market
NWC Signal Butte & Baseline

REQUEST: Approval of a car wash and related uses

DISCUSSION: Jessie Macias and Tuck Benton represented the case

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Stacking space at entrance canopy
- The canopy competes with the building
- The signage on the building will be visible from the street don't need it on canopy

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Concern with traffic flow
- The gas canopy needs to be balanced
- Need to make it obvious that you go to the entrance canopy not the finish canopy

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The canopies should not be the same – make the main canopy grander
- Concerned with the canopies
- Site plan and canopies need work
- Canopies should be smaller
- Could cantilever the girders in and run the deck off
- The traffic flow throughout site is confusing

CASE: Mesa I
407 N Lindsay

REQUEST: Approval of a retail building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Could have two sided entries

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Needs 4-sided architecture

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Very visible site on the corner needs 4-sided architecture

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Thought the building had no imagination
- The ladder needs to be interior

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Future right-of-way is not shown correctly
- Rear elevation too plain
- Needs to be redesigned

CASE: Greenfield Brown
NWC Greenfield & Brown

REQUEST: Approval of an office building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Thought the stone should come down to the ground to anchor the building

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Some elements are OK
- They are trapped by their choice of roof
- Could do something more interesting since they are at the corner
- Windows are a concern

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Windows need to tie in, they are repetitive
- Could they change the placement of the windows so they are not so rhythmic

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Racing stripe effect

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Needs to match either one of the buildings or be a melding of the two
- The language of the three buildings is too different
- The proportions need to change

2. Call to Order:

Chair Pete Berzins called the meeting to order at 4:40 p.m.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the September 7, 2005 Meeting:

On a motion by Dave Richins seconded by Tim Nielsen the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

4. Discuss and consider placing a member(s) of the Design Review Board on a joint review committee with Planning and Zoning to review the possible revisions to the Freeway Landmark Monument Guidelines.

Staffmember Gordon Sheffield explained the charge of the committee would to study and possibly recommend revisions to the Freeway Landmark Monument Guidelines. He stated that the Planning and Zoning Board and the City Council had a joint meeting at the Council study session. Planning and Zoning Board member Bob Saemisch had a concern about freeway signs and brought it up to the Council. Mr. Sheffield stated that the Guidelines were written so broadly that, so far, every Freeway Landmark Monument Sign that has come through has complied with the guidelines. The concern is that on the Riverview case there are 4 freeway signs. The freeway sign approved at Sossaman and US 60 there is a massive electronic panel that is intended to convey several messages very frequently. The last freeway sign approved by this Board was only 65' high; however it conveys more than just the name of the project, it also conveys the anchor tenants and several smaller tenants of the center. Should the intent of the guidelines be to advertise every minor tenant in addition to major tenants, or just convey the center itself? The current guidelines do not address those issues. The guidelines cover things like how large the project should be before it is eligible for a Freeway Landmark Monument Sign and how tall the sign can be, but not how many sign panels the sign can have, or even the sign area. The thought would be to revise the guidelines to be more specific and more directed toward getting a higher quality sign. Chair Pete Berzins and Boardmember Tim Nielsen volunteered.

5. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-65 Fish & Chips

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

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

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda due to a conflict by Boardmember Tom Bottomley)

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR05-65 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project makes a good addition to the center, bringing interest to the street frontage.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-70 Sam's Club

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

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

SUMMARY: Michael Quattrone and Kevin Carr represented the case. Mr. Quattrone stated they had black line elevations that addressed the staff report addendum.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley was disappointed with the way the applicants had addressed the Boards previous comments. He thought their previous comments had been about proportions. The proportions of the double arches were not what they meant. He thought the entrance was worse. He questioned why they removed the cornice from the entrance. The element to the right of the entrance still looked tacked on. He thought the design was unresolved.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought the entry was weaker, the entry canopy was too thin, and they needed people space. The entry was still too far from the parking. The building was not rich in texture and color. The loading zone canopy needed volume and interplay with the entry volume. It looked tacked on.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed there was no change in plane at the color change on the west elevation.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the applicant had tried to address the Board's concerns. He agreed the entry was weaker, he did not like the corner entry. He confirmed the north elevation projected 4'. He thought what the Board was asking for was a linkage to the buildings to the east. The strong line between the double columns and the form of the columns did not work. The curved element on the west elevation could be flat instead. He thought a portion of the color change should break the roofline, change color at a change in massing. The cornice needed to be put back on the entry. He suggested they pull the side pieces out. He stated a 4' overhang 12' high did not provide shade. He confirmed the width of the north sidewalk would be 12'. He thought they needed a colonnade, a human space.

Boardmember Vince DiBella thought the corner entry was problematic. He thought the colors seemed reversed. He suggested the entry be in the red.

Chair Pete Berzins agreed with the previous comments. He thought the applicants needed to improve the pedestrian experience along the north elevation to make up for the entry corner. The entry awning could extend 8' over the 12' sidewalk. He really thought the building should be turned 90°.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Mr. Quattrone then showed the Board revisions they had made since receiving the staff report addendum.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley did not think there had been enough of a change. The sunburst steel doesn't match anything. Rather than looking at gingerbread, the massing needed to change. He suggested the number of pop-outs may be wrong. He thought the coral was very strong, maybe that is part of the entry problem. He suggested the height of the entry could be brought up.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought the building still needed a pedestrian linkage. He thought it needed stepping of the architecture to provide pedestrian friendly, shaded areas. Need to change the massing. He thought the north elevation needed architectural volumes and massing. He suggested they step the building.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer liked the color break at the lube center. He thought the canopy at the entry was still too small and not strong enough. The main concern was the front and the entry. He wanted them to put their energy there. He was concerned with how this building would connect with the future buildings. He suggested they increase the depth of the canopy, revise the points where flat elements engage pilasters, extend the width of the canopy, may need columns. Cantilevering the canopy along north may not work structurally. Breaking of the cornice did not work. Entry canopy needs to come out more. The west elevation could be cleaned up. Maybe the entry could be taller and step down the west elevation. Maybe the columns to hold up the large canopy/colonnade become the massing.

Boardmember Vince DiBella thought there needed to be a volume change or shape change. Parapet heights are stepping along the side elevations so shallow they just don't work.

Chair Pete Berzins thought they needed to come back to the Board. They need massing and something pedestrian friendly along the north elevation.

MOTION: It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR05-70 be continued to the November 2, 2005 meeting.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

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

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-75 **Bonefish**

LOCATION/ADDRESS: The Palms at Superstition Springs: Lot 1
REQUEST: Approval of a 5,582 sq. ft. Restaurant on Pad A and Site Plan including Pad B
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: BV Development Arrowhead
APPLICANT: Mark Bowker
ARCHITECT: K & I Architects

REQUEST: Approval of a 5,582 sq. ft. restaurant.

SUMMARY: Chair Pete Berzins read comments from an adjacent neighbor into the record. The neighbor, Tony Malaj, stated he was opposed to the layout, he would support parking lot on west side closer to the La Quinta motel, he was opposed to the black awnings, does relocation of fire hydrant place hotel in jeopardy? Superstition Springs homeowners does not want any more white site walls like PF Changs, or orange and green buildings like the Mazda dealership.

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR05-75 be approved with the following conditions:

8. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Remove recessed panel detail from sign location on front entry (South elevation).
 - b. Provide decorative pavement in the pedestrian connections.
 - c. Provide pedestrian connection to existing credit union.
 - d. Provide a fixture with a fully shielded lens for fixture "O".
 - e. Show the location of a fully recessed SES.
 - f. Revise landscape plan to meet code.
9. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
10. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
11. 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.
12. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
13. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
14. Provide the following (to show compliance with conditions of approval for this case) to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application:
 - one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible
 - revised site plans,

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- revised landscaping plans, and
- revised elevations.
- revised color elevations:
 - one full size
 - two half size

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought there could be another color on the rear of the building. Boardmember Tom Bottomley agreed with the idea of another monochromatic color.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is reasonably well designed.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-77 Rozenman Retail/Office
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2912 E Baseline Road
REQUEST: Approval of a 4,262 sq. ft. retail/office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: Dimitri Rozenman
APPLICANT: James Day
ARCHITECT: James Day

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,262 sq. ft. retail office building

SUMMARY: Chair Pete Berzins was concerned with the type of trees being used in the 11' setback approved by the DIP. He wanted trees that would have a larger taller canopy. He thought there should be more Sissoos.

James Day represented the case. He stated he was willing to do whatever they wanted with trees.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the colors were anemic. He was also concerned with the wall pack lights. He wanted the lights to be something architectural, and he wanted them to be more equally placed on the building. Maybe a ceramic light.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley was concerned with the dead end parking. He agreed the colors were light and was concerned with how they would look when they fade. He was concerned with how the parapet bands engage the columns, he thought it looked too much like a cap. The roof elements would look better if they came down more.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Dave Richins that DR05-77 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.
 - a. Revise the color palette to provide more vibrant colors.
 - b. Provide taller trees adjacent to residential. Mix up the Sissoo and Shoestring Acacia.
 - c. Work with staff to provide architectural wall packs that will be located as an element of the design.
 - d. Work with staff on the proportions of the parapet bands to better engage them with the piers.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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 project, with conditions, should be a good use of an in-fill property.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-78 Retail Shops

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 417 E Southern
REQUEST: Approval of a 7,776 sq. ft. multi-tenant retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: Ken Crane
APPLICANT: J D Berryman
ARCHITECT: Kristjan Sigurdson

REQUEST: Approval of a 7,776 sq. ft. retail building

SUMMARY: J. D. Berryman represented the case and stated the owner wanted the sign band, so the building was designed around the band. The design philosophy was to think of the sign band as a mass and the solution then is if it is a mass, they should use monolithic forms to take away the impact of the sign band.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley liked the colors.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought the building was very deep. He wondered if there would be a demising wall running east/west. Mr. Berryman stated it could happen but he did not think it would since there was no parking on the north. Boardmember Nielsen appreciated the reinvestment in an older area. He would if they could provide for outdoor dining the way the building was designed. He thought the storefronts were very average. Maybe they could use vertical glass with butt glazing. He thought there needed to be a comp sign plan to unify the signage with the unified sign band.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed the awnings would project 8' on the south and 4' on the north. He liked the way it engages on the sides and wanted it to do that on the front and rear.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed the color elevation and the material board were different. The coping was to be metal painted to match the building. He thought the metal coping would diminish the modern look of the building. He thought the use of standard storefronts was wrong, and that the doors should be varied. He did not think clear glass was the right choice. He thought there should be a substrate. He agreed butt glazed glass would be very nice. If the building is going to be stucco then they need to make the other elements nicer. He thought they needed a comprehensive sign plan to unify the signage. He suggested the corner continue around the north west corner and not break off. He thought the building should be EIFS rather than western one kote. He thought the lights on the columns and the building needed to be more modern.

Chair Pete Berzins thought that if they wanted the sign band they needed to have a comprehensive sign plan.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR05-78 be approved with the following conditions:

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

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

elevations.

- a. Develop architectural detailing as discussed.
 - b. Work with staff on the color of the glazing.
 - c. Work with staff on the detailing of the coping.
 - d. Provide a more modern lighting package.
 - e. Provide a comprehensive sign package to be reviewed by the Design Review Board.
 - f. Review mullion place and door placement. Look at using a butt glazing system.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
 3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
 4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
 5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
 6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
 7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project, with conditions, should be a good re-use of a small site.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-79 Banner Desert Parking Structure

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1400 S Dobson
REQUEST: Approval of a 45,570 sq. ft. parking garage
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: Banner Health
APPLICANT: HDR Architecture
ARCHITECT: Joseph Kramer

REQUEST: Approval of a 45,570 sq. ft. parking garage

SUMMARY: Boardmembers Dave Richins and Tim Nielsen abstained.

Laura Snow, Joe Kramer, John Carr and Bill Wells represented the case. The applicants stated that they had decided to recess the pre-cast panels to cast a shadow rather than use metal grilles. The staff report had asked for the metal grill work used on a previous parking structure, in areas visible from the freeway. The structure is mainly visible from the freeway; there are buildings to the east and west of the parking structure, and the hospital to the north.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was concerned with the precedence this would set for future parking structures in the City. He thought there needed to be more consistency in how every case is treated. Parking structures can be creative. Would like to see metal work or perforated metal in the open areas between the horizontal panels. Questioned why they didn't do rounded corner to tie in with the hospital and the medical office buildings. Would like this structure to be more responsive to the hospital.

The applicant stated that there would be a 7-story tower proposed for the hospital that will also not have the curved elements. They are trying to get away from the curved design element.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed the color was almost a match to the existing parking structure.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley was concerned that the form didn't look designed. You see the levels and columns. He thought the structure was too literal. The elevation drawings portrayed a lot more shadow than the 3D rendering. If the panels are set back 2' he did not think the reality would be what was portrayed on the elevation drawings. This was a very literal garage and it could have been much more.

Chair Pete Berzins confirmed the white panels are recessed and the columns stick out. He was concerned with visibility from the US 60 and the 101 freeways.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella that DR05-79 be approved with the following conditions:

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

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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

- a. Incorporate metal grille work into the design of the parking structure.
 - b. Provide a revised Color/Material Board that includes an actual Seneca paint chip of "Hickory" #373 and the charcoal color to be used for the metal railings and light fixtures.
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.

The motion died for lack of a second

Laura Snow stated the parking structure is one small piece of a 75 million dollar project, this will affect their ability to provide patient care. She stated timing is crucial to there ability provide patient care. She asked what the Board specifically wanted.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated they should respond to the hospital, this looks like a prototype garage. Stair well should have rounded sections to mimic the hospital.

Boardmember Bottomley stated it needs to be compatible, this is just a box. This is so big and so visible. What will happen when their next parking structure and tower come through? He thought they were going in the wrong direction. This structures needs more shadow and possibly something rounded to respond to the surrounding architecture.

Chair Pete Berzins thought it needs to look like the colored elevation, not the 3D rendering. He thought they should break up the massing, and not be so repetitive. They need to address the south elevation and the southwest corner.

MOTION: It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR05-79 be continued to a special meeting:

VOTE: Passed 3 – 1 (Boardmember Vince DiBella voting nay)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: To allow the applicants time to redesign the south elevation and the southwest corner.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-80 Hawes Road Apartment

LOCATION/ADDRESS: The 400 & 500 blocks of South Hawes

REQUEST: Approval of Design for 11 4-plex multi-family residential buildings

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6

OWNER: John Bellerose

APPLICANT: Dorothy Shupe

ARCHITECT: Randy Carter

REQUEST: Approval of a 44 unit townhouse project

SUMMARY: Boardmember Tom Bottomley abstained.

Randy Carter and Dorothy Shupe represented the case.

Chair Pete Berzins removed the case from the consent agenda.

Boardmember Dave Richins made the comment that in West Mesa they deal with these type of PAD overlays as a problem. He said shame on the Planning and Zoning Board for approving these type of developments where you have four-plexes with a PAD so that only investors can purchase the four-plexes. When you end up with eleven different owners in one complex they are a long-term maintenance nightmare. He encouraged Planning and Zoning not to approve any more of these projects.

Chair Pete Berzins stated his concern was that the submittal showed different colors; however, they were so subtle it was hard to tell they were different at all. He was disappointed that the entries were all still the same.

Dorothy Shupe stated they were supposed to be different. The renderings were incorrect. They were intended to have entries that were either red, green, or golden rod.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated he wished there was a little more of an overhang to give the buildings a little more residential feel. He liked the colors.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR05-80 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - c. Color:
 - i. Provide variety of 3 color schemes (using previously submitted color palette) to be applied in random order throughout the site.
 - ii. Revise the colors at the entries to be red, green, or goldenrod.
 - d. Submit landscape plan for approval to reflect changes:
 - Variety of tree type to provide variety of screening density and canopy heights along north, south, and east property lines

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- Tree alignment along east property line shall be irregular in shape, contoured and designed as an integral part of the landscape theme.
 - e. Widen pedestrian path from Tot Lot to covered parking as well as pedestrian path parallel to covered parking and pool area.
 - f. Eliminate the landscape island under covered canopy.
 - g. Continue pedestrian connection at south entry drive and in front of south/east trash enclosure.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
 3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
 4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
 5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
 6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
 7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project, with conditions, is a reasonable use for an in-fill property.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-81 Plaza West Broadway
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1720 W Broadway
REQUEST: Approval of two retail buildings totaling 18,120 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: Plaza West Broadway
APPLICANT: Robert Saemisch
ARCHITECT: Robert Saemisch

REQUEST: Approval of two retail buildings totaling 18,120 sq. ft.

SUMMARY: Boardmember Vince DiBella abstained.

Bob Saemisch represented the case.

Chair Pete Berzins removed the case from the consent agenda. His concern was with the banding of the CMU, which he thought was too repetitive. He liked the different materials but thought they were so evenly spaced they were repetitive. He would like to see that broken up. Mr. Saemisch stated that if he did that it would be incongruous. They wanted the building to be predictable. He thought it would be helter skelter. He stated that the 4" would be split faced.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer liked the building in the rear. He was concerned with the engagement of the rear of the building along Broadway. He suggested adding the green massing on the east elevation.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley confirmed the periwinkle would be the flashing material.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen liked the simplicity and the shadow lines.

Boardmember Dave Richins requested that there not be any check cashing facilities. He stated there are 29 check-cashing facilities currently in West Mesa. He confirmed the future pad building would come back to the Design Review Board.

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR05-81 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Provide missing "Materials/Colors" information.
 - b. Wall sconces are to be pre-finished to match "Morning Coat", ICI #982. Fixture to match rounded profile. Provide cut sheet.
 - c. Provide non-metal door pulls on the west-facing doors of the tenant spaces.
 - d. Provide a plan detail of the edge of the stucco accent piece to show how it meets the outside corner of the CMU substrate.
 - e. Note which of the CMU colors is to be split face block.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- f. Add a screening wall between the parking field and Broadway Road.
 - g. Show the location of the SES, and fully recess it into the building.
 - h. Provide decorative paving at pedestrian paths.
 - i. Remove monument sign from Right of Way. Staff to approve design.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
 3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
 4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
 5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
 6. Fire risers, downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
 7. Provide the following (to show compliance with conditions of approval for this case) to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application:
 - one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible
 - revised site plans,
 - revised landscaping plans, and
 - revised elevations.
 - revised color elevations:
 - one full size
 - two half size

VOTE: Passed 3 – 2 (Boardmembers Rob Burgheimer and Pete Berzins voting nay)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is reasonably well designed.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-82 Commons West Broadway
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1720 W Broadway
REQUEST: Approval of 32,736 sq. ft. of industrial
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: Broadway Mesa Commons
APPLICANT: Robert Saemisch
ARCHITECT: Robert Saemisch

REQUEST: Approval of a 32,736 sq. ft. industrial building.

SUMMARY: Boardmember Vince DiBella abstained.

Bob Saemisch represented the case.

Chair Pete Berzins removed the case from the consent agenda. His concern was with the banding of the CMU, which he thought was too repetitive. He liked the different materials but thought they were so evenly spaced they were repetitive. He would like to see that broken up. Mr. Saemisch stated that if he did that it would be incongruous. They wanted the building to be predictable. He thought it would be helter skelter. He stated that the 4" would be split faced.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer liked the building in the rear. He was concerned with the engagement of the rear of the building along Broadway. He suggested adding the green massing on the east elevation.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley confirmed the periwinkle would be the flashing material.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen liked the simplicity and the shadow lines.

Boardmember Dave Richins requested that there not be any check cashing facilities. He stated there are 29 check-cashing facilities currently in West Mesa. He confirmed the future pad building would come back to the Design Review Board.

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR05-82 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Provide information missing from the "Materials/Colors" section.
 - b. Wall sconces are to be pre-finished to match "Morning Coat", ICI #982. Fixture to match rounded profile. Provide cut sheet. (See "Materials/Colors" section.)
 - c. Provide non-metal door pulls on the south-facing doors.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- d. Advance the "Fuego Red" bands by 1/2 " to create a shadow line.
 - e. Note which of the CMU colors is to be split face block.
 - f. Provide materials / finish information for trash enclosures.
 - g. Show the location of the SES, and fully recess it into the building.
 - h. Provide an outdoor employee area and a bike rack.
 - i. Add 7 shrubs to the east property line to meet code.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
 3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
 4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
 5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
 6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
 7. Provide the following (to show compliance with conditions of approval for this case) to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application:
 - one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible
 - revised site plans,
 - revised landscaping plans, and
 - revised elevations.
 - revised color elevations:
 - one full size
 - two half size

VOTE: Passed 3 – 2 (Boardmembers Rob Burgheimer and Pete Berzins voting nay)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is reasonably well designed.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 5, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da