

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MAY 7, 2008

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

Tim Nielsen - Chair
Wendy LeSueur – Vice Chair
Tom Bottomley
Robert Burgheimer (left after consent)
Vince DiBella (left during work session)
Craig Boswell
Delight Clark

MEMBERS ABSENT

OTHERS PRESENT

Lesley Davis	James Carpenter
John Wesley	Rauf Moosavi
Mia Lozano Helland	David Schmitt
Laura Hyneman	Roy Perkins
Debbie Archuleta	Richard Dyer
Jennifer Gniffke	Kent Dounay
Joe Welliver	Keith Paul
Josh Mike	Grant Blunt
Rob Dmohowski	Ranae Price
Joy Spezeski	Shelley Johnson
Krissa Lucas	Gina Hardaway
Elizabeth Ohep	Jim Vallas
Joe DeCenco	Andrea Piering
Drew Wood	Raad Salih
Jaime Hopkins	Wilson Ejim
Ray Hult	Elmas Kapfur
Brent Hilton	
Stan Connick	
B. J. Peters	
George Gilbert	

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

1. Work Session:

CASE: North Mesa Auto Center
2431 E McKellips

REQUEST: Review of 13,950 sq. ft. auto service retail facility

DISCUSSION:

The revised site plan is much better.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: C.A.R. Clinic
5057 E McKellips

REQUEST: Review of an automotive repair facility

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- The ADA ramp should be in front of the doors
- Sidewalk should also tie into existing walkway

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Overhead doors visible from the street; backs of the building are visually prominent.
- Consider adding windows with high sills in north and west elevation to add interest to street facing elevation
- Windows will help tie it to existing retail building
- Consider adding shade element over the overhead doors to add interest; does not have to project very far and does not have to be over every door
- Consider wall lighting to define the entrance

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Use is compatible with gas station;
- Consider additional interest so the building has a presence on the street

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Fast Lane Carwash
1052 E McKellips

REQUEST: Review of a 9,490 sq. ft. carwash

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Concern with opacity of the roof membrane
- Concern that light from tunnel will go through the roof material

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Concerned with the life span of the roof material
- Concerned that replacing panels will leave variation of color between newer and older panels
- Likes the shape of the roof
- Could they use some metal panels and leave some openings
- Need to work with neighbors
- Could vending machines be better integrated
- Show the vending machines and any screening on follow-up submittal
- Could they be up against the building

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Very concerned with the material
- Long term durability
- Show construction details on follow-up submittals
- Concern with the look of this building with the adjacent uses
- Talk to Building Safety about the roof material
- Possibly perforated metal roof

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: The Commons Lifestyle Center
Sec Power & Elliot

REQUEST: Review of a 4 shops buildings and a hotel totaling 130,788 sq. ft.

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- The hotel is well integrated to the site, but not with the other buildings
- Concerned with heights on shops buildings
- Rear elevations are tall
- Rear of parapets will be visible from parking lot

Chair Tim Nieslen:

- The lighting will need to be enhanced, show it on the follow-up submittal

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer;

- Very busy for the size of the property
- Very tall parapets
- It looks set like
- Continuity between the buildings
- It looks like there were three different designers
- Too much going on
- Simplify or scale back
- The rears of the parapets will be visible from street
- Hotel and shops need to be the same scale with the follow-up submittal
- Simplify and refine
- Concern with too many color palettes
- How are you handling the streetscape?
- Will there be a gated entry?
- What will site furniture look like
- There are a lot of pad sites
- The pad sites need to be compatible with the center

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Benson System
4315 S Sagewood

REQUEST: Review of a 29,400 sq. ft. office warehouse

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- East elevation is plain, but there is a buffer

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Concerned with arch at the entry
- Did like the idea of a dome
- East elevation is blank

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Banner Baywood ED Expansion
6644 E Baywood

REQUEST: Review of a 40,000 sq. ft. expansion to an existing hospital

DISCUSSION:

No one was present to represent the case

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Center Street
2304 N Center

REQUEST: Review of a 28,891 sq. ft. multi-tenant commercial industrial building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Building is stripy
- The stripes are painted
- Stripes should be a different material instead of paint
- Could the split face come up
- The materials are good, but they should be used differently
- There is a lot of single scored block proposed

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- The truss element seems weak
- Could change the elements at those entries

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Community Bank of Arizona
1944 S Greenfield

REQUEST: Review of a 4,767 sq. ft. bank with drive thru tellers

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Concerned with the black glass
- The black will detract from the sandstone and copper
- The black seems very hard
- Look at using bronze, or maybe green, any other substrate

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Nice materials
- Windows are recessed
- Nice forms

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Landscape materials could be better placed
- Concerned some plants will grow too tall and block the nice features of the building
- The plants should be spaced to fit better with the building
- The Orange Jubilee will grow quite tall

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Greenfield Plaza II
NEC Greenfield & Baseline

REQUEST: Review of three multi-tenant buildings with drive-thru lanes on two of the buildings

DISCUSSION:

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Could they make subtle changes to the colors from the center
- Maybe add an accent color

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Like the variety

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Mountain America Credit Union
4325 E Southern

REQUEST: Review of a 5,095 sq. ft. credit union with drive-thru tellers

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- There are a lot of drive-thru lanes

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Burgundy, cream and stone are used a lot
- The proportions are 1/3, 1/3, 1/3

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- It looks castle like
- Pull out the corners
- Too narrow
- Maybe another color

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Concerned the roof material and stacked stone don't work well together
- The sloped tile roof is awkward; remove it
- Simplify

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Could use metal roof on tower elements to tie in with the canopies

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Office Complex Treehouse Josuha
1527 N Greenfield

REQUEST: Review of a 19,198 sq. ft. office project

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- The brick veneer is nice
- Could the windows be recessed
- Building has nice detailing

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Proportions of the arched entryways are awkward
- Why no fascia?
- The arches should be thicker
- Maybe arched windows somewhere else on the building or a brick detail around some of the other windows

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Maybe the arch should be taller
- Don't do too many arches

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: State Trailer Supply Facility
4000 block of East Main

REQUEST: Review of a 33,500 sq. ft. commercial/retail building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Building has a red racing stripe
- The building looks industrial
- Look at how you are massing the building
- How the materials are being used is the issue
- There are no windows and no fenestrations
- Could all three entries be combined to one element
- Could they raise that element
- You could stop the red so it doesn't touch the entry elements
- Raised channel letters on side of building could be in a recessed area so it doesn't look so industrial
- Look at the glass and store fronts
- Use light fixtures to enhance the building
- Darker glass will pop the red frame so you don't lose the impact of the red

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- It is too repetitive
- Maybe use the red in panels of color, like at the entry, instead of doing stripes
- If you use red at the entries may not want to use red frames

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Need more trees and less shrubs along the south
- Use red at main entry
- The trees at the entry will block the signs, could they be moved out

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Beef up the main entry
- Split face is heavy, you could use milled, or 8 X 8, or honed, especially at the entry
- No stained block

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Fry's Fuel Center
560 W Baseline

REQUEST: Review of a 5,418 sq. ft. gas canopy and a 176 sq. ft. kiosk

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Agree with staff that 6 vending machines is too much
- Plan looking
- They should incorporate elements from the Fry's store
- Would like to see stepping or curving of the screen wall
- Colors should be compatible with Fry's

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Even 2 or 3 vending machines is a lot for such a small kiosk
- The problem is you only have a canopy and no building
- This is very plain
- Should be designed like a building
- The red bollards are bad
- There should be landscaping
- Vending machines should be consistent with Fry's on McKellips

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Expansion of a retail service building
310 N Val Vista

REQUEST: Review of a 5,205 sq. ft. expansion of an existing 7,270 sq. ft. building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- You should go back to the original colors
- Proposed a new color, not the existing pink
- Submit a proposal to replace the Sweet Acacia

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- The panels along the side are painted
- Propose a color scheme that works with what is there

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Liked the way the bay doors are grouped on the expansion
- If you're painting the concrete paint, all the concrete
- Confirmed that the doors are painted
- Proposed two different color schemes
- The color scheme should be more sophisticated

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The issue regarding the colors is, would the Board have approved the building as built

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Riverview FLMS
Dobson & 202

REQUEST: Review of a 60' tall FLMS

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Riverview already has more FLMS than the guidelines allow
- Don't think they need it
- The sign matches exactly, the only question is how many signs should be allowed

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- This sign is identical to what exists now
- Doesn't think this is a good way to spend their money
- Maybe more lighting
- Could they revise the elevation of the restaurant building rather than build an additional FLMS?

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- This is tenant driven
- Could they share the existing message board

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- This Board is charged with looking at the design of the sign

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Office Retail
1316 E McKellips

REQUEST: Review of two 3,600 sq. ft. office buildings and a 7,200 sq. ft. neighborhood fitness center

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- This is not a bad building, but this kind of architecture has been done enough
- The cornices are too close to each other
- Doesn't like the rotunda with the cornice on top
- Find a different way to detail the rotunda
- Look at the way the light fixtures are attached
- The cornices collide
- Should be more harmonious with the projects to the west
- The arch elements on the office is a concern
- The cornice below the fascia is awkward
- Use the same cornice and a common color and the same stone
- Maybe use the awning on the offices

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Could use more stone on buildings A & B
- The recessed panel with the light fixture is not good
- Could be something more creative
- Likes the residential scale of the offices
- Colors should match better
- Offices too many shades of brown
- Maybe the windows next to the corner piece could be different

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Industrial Addition
226 S Date

REQUEST: Review of a 6,380 sq. ft. warehouse building on a lot with one 16,000 sq. ft. building and one 640 sq. ft. building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Look at the block material, maybe create a pattern rather than a stripe
- Autumn block is not harmonious with standard gray block
- Considering changing the colors and the massing to break up the form
- Consider using insets
- Could the two doors be tied together as an element
- Look at using light fixtures and downspouts as accent features
- Maybe Fuego or Charcoal instead of Autumn with the gray block

Tom Bottomley:

- Agree they could do something with the block pattern
- Don't like the accent paint color with the block

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Entrada at the San Tan
SEC 202 & the future Williams Gateway Freeway

REQUEST: Review of a 75' tall FLMS

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Shouldn't review it, there are no buildings
- The sign doesn't look like the architecture of what they showed Planning and Zoning Board

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Doesn't like the colors
- Would not want these colors to set the precedent for the development
- Blue stucco never looks good
- You don't want the sign to set the standard for design of the center especially with those colors

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

2. Call to Order:

Chair Tim Nielsen called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the April 2, 2008 Meeting:

On a motion by Craig Boswell seconded by Wendy LeSueur the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer left after the consent agenda vote

4. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR08-22 Montecito Apartments

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 307 South Hawes Road
REQUEST: Approval of a 215 unit apartment development
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: SLAM Development
APPLICANT: Wilson Ejim
ARCHITECT: Roy Noggle
STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of a 215 unit apartment development

SUMMARY: Tyler Wright and Wilson Ejim represented the case. Mr. Ejim explained the revisions they had made since the April meeting. He explained the interior building would be the new color palette.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley was concerned with the notch in the column. He wanted the notch filled in. He thought the roof tile should be a darker richer color to better match the elevations. He liked the revised stone.

Boardmembers Craig Boswell and Wendy LeSueur thought the revised elevations were much nicer.

MOTION: It was moved by Wendy LeSueur and seconded by Delight Clark that DR08-22 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Provide a color schedule on a site plan that shows buildings and which color scheme will be used per building.
 - b. Provide a cut sheet with details for wrought iron inserts on balcony fronts.
 - c. Provide materials and color details for the carport canopies.
 - d. **Revise the color of the roof tile to be variegated and more like the elevations.**
 - e. **The vertical wall panel shown with a notch in the lower left corner on sheet A6.0 shall be revised to a solid wall panel down to grade level.**
 - f. **The stone with coping to be brought up to the spring point of the arch, on all buildings.**
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 green.
5. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
6. Provide two half size color elevations, revised site plans, landscaping plans and

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-24 Offices at Parkwood Ranch

LOCATION/ADDRESS: NEC Southern Ave & Crismon Rd.
REQUEST: Approval of nine office buildings totaling 62,375 s. f.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Robert Stave
APPLICANT: Michael Jorgensen
ARCHITECT: Sherm Cawley
STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of nine office buildings totaling 62,375 sq. ft.

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

MOTION: It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Delight Clark that DR08-24 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations.
2. Compliance with the requirements of case Z08-20.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
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 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 green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-25 Navy Federal Credit Union
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 4212 E. Juanita Ave.
REQUEST: Approval of a 4,030 sq. ft. credit union
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Navy Federal Credit Union
APPLICANT: URS Corporation
ARCHITECT: Clark Nexsen
STAFF PLANNER(S): Jeff Conkle, Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,030 sq. ft. credit union

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

MOTION: It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Delight Clark that DR08-25 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Pedestrian connections need to be a decorative surface.
 - b. The SES (Service Entrance Section) must be recessed and painted to match the building or screened on both sides with a wing wall to match the building. Staff must approve location.
 - c. Revise the landscape plan to provide foundation base landscaping per §11-15-3(C) of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
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 green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half-size color elevations, 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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-26 A to Z Auto Sales

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 727 W Broadway
REQUEST: Approval of a 528 sq. ft. trailer for auto sales
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: Haddad Talab
APPLICANT: Raad Salih
ENGINEER: Raad Salih
STAFF PLANNER: Jennifer Gniffke

REQUEST: Approval of a 528 sq. ft. trailer for auto sales

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

MOTION: It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Delight Clark that DR08-26 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 detailed drawing with materials/colors indicated for curb opening and riprap spillway (key note #17 on Grading and Drainage plan).
 - b. Provide minimum 5' foundation base adjacent to the refuse enclosure.
 - c. Monument signs require Design Review approval prior to submittal for a sign permit.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
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 green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Non-conforming and/or prohibited signs shall be brought into conformance prior to the issuance of a building permit.
8. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

CASE #: DR08-27 Mesa Family Medical II

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1353 E McKellips
REQUEST: Approval of a 9,357 sq. ft. medical office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Richard Dobrosin
APPLICANT: Marc Brimhall
ARCHITECT: Paul Devers
STAFF PLANNER: Josh Mike

REQUEST: Approval of a 9,357 sq. ft. medical office building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Delight Clark that DR08-27 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
3. 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.
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 green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
5. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-28 Banner Technology Center
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1010 North Country Club Drive
REQUEST: Approval of a 65,718 sq. ft. data processing building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Banner Health
APPLICANT: Kerby Spitler, Gensler
ARCHITECT: Jeffrey Maas, Gensler
STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of a 65,718 sq. ft. data processing building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR08-28 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations.
2. Compliance with the requirements of Z08-06.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
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 green.* (*The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.*)
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0 – 1 (Chair Tim Nielsen abstained)

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-29 Bank of Arizona

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 901 N Dobson
REQUEST: Approval of a 5,500 sq. ft. bank with drive-thru tellers
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: DeRito/Kimco Riverview
APPLICANT: Architectural Resource Team
ARCHITECT: Richard Moore
STAFF PLANNER: Joy Spezeski

REQUEST: Approval of a 5,500 sq. ft. bank with drive-thru tellers

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley wanted the panels to be wider. He also thought the shoulder gable should be pulled down to the band line. He was concerned the lintel line was lower than the fascia.

Chair Tim Nielsen agreed the proportion was awkward, he suggested it be raised 12".

MOTION: It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Wendy LeSueur that DR08-29 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. Design Review Staff to review and approve glazing on glass
 - b. **The shoulder gable ends be raised 8" to 12" or the opening be moved down 12" with the fascia staying where it was.**
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
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 green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, 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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-30 Babbitt Motorworks
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2020 N Mesa Drive
REQUEST: Approval of a 6,996 sq. ft. auto service
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Nathan Babbitt
APPLICANT: KDA Architecture
ARCHITECT: Gary King
STAFF PLANNER: Rob Dmohowski

REQUEST: Approval of a 6,996 sq. ft. auto service facility

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda by an adjacent neighbor.

Tyler Wright represented the case.

Ranae Price, an adjacent neighbor spoke regarding the project. Mrs. Price wanted the building re-orientated so the bay doors face south onto McKellips.

Mrs. Babbitt stated the Lehi Association supported the project. She stated they also notified 40 neighbors along Mesa Drive.

Mrs. Price stated the neighbors directly to the north are opposed to the building.

Gary King, the Architect, stated the bays would be 45' deep. He stated that flipping the building would site the building very close to the neighbors. He felt that having the building that close could be just as noisy because noise can transfer through walls.

Chair Tim Nielsen confirmed this would be a light mechanical shop that would not use many air tools.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley confirmed they don't rebuild engines or change tires; however, they do do brake work.

Boardmember Craig Boswell stated he could see both sides of the issue. He stated the problem was Babbitt Motorworks is going in there now, but in the future there could be a tire shop or any other allowed use.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley stated he thought the reveal work of standard block should be either wider or there should be more bands that start and stop to create a pattern. He stated the windows on the revised elevations were better and he liked the pier at the entry. Aesthetically he could approve the building. He agreed he could see both sides of the siting issues. A higher end shop that does mainly electrical and not heavy repairs can be quiet, but if this user outgrows the facility a more intense use could move in. He stated that if the building were flipped he would want windows facing McKellips in between the bay doors and the bank of windows on the end of the building. He also wanted the gabien wall to be a requirement. He stated that if the building were re-sited and moved closer to the neighbors they could solid grout the building walls to help reduce noise.

Chair Tim Nielsen stated they could also sand fill the wall, which would be less expensive.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

He preferred flipping the building.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur would be in favor of flipping the building so it would be less impact for the neighbors to the north.

MOTION: It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR08-30 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. Identify the Service Entry Section (SES) location on the site plan, floor plan etc. This equipment should be fully recessed and designed to match the building or provide screen walls and paint to match building.
 - b. Provide an elevation and detail of refuse enclosure.
 - c. Provide an updated color and materials board.
 - d. Provide an elevation and detail of the site screen walls. Indicate the height and location on the elevations and site plan.
 - e. Show the location of all building mounted lights on the elevations. Provide a lighting cut sheet.
 - f. Clearly identify and label the horizontal recesses in the masonry on the elevations.
 - g. **Site plan is not resolved, Design Review Board would be in favor of flipping the building if Board of Adjustment votes to do so.**
 - h. **Provide gabien fencing for parking screen walls.**
 - i. **Provide additional recessed reveals without creating a striped effect around the building.**
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all conditions of approval for Zoning Administration case ZA08-031 except as modified through this case.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
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 green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, 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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-31 Dana Park Village Square
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 3510 E. Baseline Road
REQUEST: Approval of a 9,500 sq. ft. retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: Dannel Drutsch, Village Square Dana Park
APPLICANT: Vince DiBella, Saemisch + DiBella Architects, Inc.
ARCHITECT: Vince DiBella, Saemisch + DiBella Architects, Inc.
ENGINEER: Jeffrey L. Williams, R.B. Williams & Associates, Inc.
STAFF PLANNER: Joe Welliver

REQUEST: Approval of a 9,500 sq. ft. retail building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Delight Clark that DR08-31 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
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 green.* (*The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.*)
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-32 Residence Inn

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 10325 E. Hampton Ave.
REQUEST: Approval of an 104,345 sq. ft. hotel
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Vance Marshall, VJ Crismon, LLC
APPLICANT: Kent Dounay
ARCHITECT: Keith L. Paul
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of a 136 room, 6-story hotel

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

MOTION: It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Delight Clark that DR08-32 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Provide a revised color board with paint chips, manufacturer, and ID number for each material/finish. Provide cut sheets and finish information for lighting fixtures.
 - b. Replace the Pink Oleander in the plant palette with a plant that is more complimentary to the building.
 - c. Fully recess the SES into the building, or provide an architectural surround. Staff to review and approve.
 - d. Provide elevations of walls and gates for trash enclosures. Color/materials to be compatible with the building.
 - e. Compliance with all Foundation Base landscape requirements as stated in §11-15-3(C) of the Zoning Ordinance.
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 green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half-size color elevations, 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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

F. Appeals of Administrative Design Review

DR07-12 Mt. Vista Business Center. East of the SEC Hampton and Crismon.
Request approval to use stained block in place of previously approved integral block.

Jim Valis represented the case. Mr. Valis stated they were concerned that the building would look blotchy because the masonry supplier could not guarantee consistent dye lots for such a large order. He stated the rear elevations would face the freeway. He also stated the Home Depot building had been tagged.

Boardmember Craig Boswell confirmed they were requesting to stain standard gray CMU and not use integral block. Boardmember Boswell stated he was only in favor of staining integral block.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley stated he understood the concern regarding graffiti. He stated the variation of the natural block can be mitigated by a good mason. He stated as long as the mortar color is consistent, the changes in the block would be fine. He stated he could only be in favor of a very light stain on integral block. He also stated that if the order the block they should be able to get it consistent, the problem is when you try to buy what is on hand. He stated if they use a light stain they would also need a good sealer.

Chair Tim Nielsen stated commercial buildings need richness. A good manufacturer can control that a lot. A good mason can mix up the variation and then you get interest in the building. Staining gray block looks plastic. He stated they need a good manufacturer and a good mason. A good manufacturer can control the amount of the aggregate and the quality. He stated he would be in favor of transparent stain on integral only, not paint or gray block.

Boardmember Bottomley asked if this was a matter of cost. Mr. Valis stated no, it was about consistency.

It was moved by Boardmember Tom Bottomley and seconded by Boardmember Craig Boswell that ADR08-29 be approved with the following condition.

1. **The applicant be allowed to maintain integral color with a light body, translucent stain and a sealer to even out the colors.**

Vote: 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da