

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
AUGUST 3, 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
Tom Bottomley
Vince DiBella
Tim Nielsen
Robert Burgheimer

MEMBERS ABSENT

Jillian Hagen excused

OTHERS PRESENT

Kim Steadman
Lesley Davis
Debbie Archuleta
Mia Lozano Helland
John Wesley
Dorothy Chimel
April Ward
Gordon Sheffield
Jonathan Johns
Marney Frye
Tyler Wright

Liz Gaston
Shad Vermeesch
William Lally
Chumita Hurd
Mark Irby
Loren Dickinson
Grant Tayrez
Ryan Matthews
Rae Young
Gary Johnson
Marc Davis

Jeff Will
Shawn Clow
Jeff Miller
Sheila Mitton
William Johns
Others

1. Call to Order:

Chair Pete Berzins called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the July 6, 2005 Meeting:

On a motion by Vince DiBella seconded by Dave Richins the Board unanimously approved the minutes as revised.

3. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-44 Superstition Gateway Freeway Landmark Monument Sign
LOCATION/ADDRESS: US 60 & Signal Butte (Southwest Corner)
REQUEST: **Review and Recommendation** of Council Use Permit for a 65' high freeway landmark monument sign
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Bojer Land/Signal Butte Limited Partnership
APPLICANT: Diversified Partners, Elizabeth Gaston
ARCHITECT: KDRA
SIGN CONSULTANT: Christy Signs, Chumita Hurd

REQUEST: Approval of a 65' tall freeway landmark monument sign

SUMMARY: Boardmember Vince DiBella recused himself.

Liz Gaston, Chumita Hurd and William Lally represented the case. Ms. Gaston and Ms. Hurd explained that they had asked the architect to be involved in the design of the sign. She explained they revised the sign to provide a curved element at the top of the sign. The base was modified, they modified the cabinets to have push-through graphics for the anchor and majors, the tenant portions would have back up plex graphics to have a secondary look. The square footage of the text area was the same.

Staffmember Gordon Sheffield stated they have come a long way. He stated this case shows why the City Council wanted the Design Review Board involved in this process. He stated staff was recommending approval with three basic conditions.

Ms. Gaston presented a revised elevation that shows horizontal bars that do not continue through the tenant panels. This would allow the tenant panels to be revised. The sign as presented showed the maximum number of tenant panels that could be provided.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the revisions were much better. He thought this was a good example of why the designer of the center should be involved in the design of these Freeway Landmark Monument Signs.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley agreed this was much better. He thanked the applicants for rethinking the sign. He liked the change to the bars, not continuing through the tenant panels.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thanked the applicants for not having an electronic messaging board. He appreciated the connectivity to the architecture of the center and how far the sign has come.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed the individual sign color and fonts could be different.

Chair Pete Berzins thought that architecturally the sign has come a long way. He confirmed that the major and anchor on the bottom of the sign would be for the parcel on the east side of Signal Butte and the top major and anchor would be for the parcel on the west side of Signal Butte. Ms. Gaston stated those anchor and majors had agreed to those locations. He also

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

confirmed there would not be a Freeway Landmark Monument Sign for the east parcel. There would only be smaller monument signs.

Staffmember Gordon Sheffield explained that there had actually been an overlay district to allow the signage for the east side Signal Butte to be displayed on this sign.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR05-44 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 and exterior elevations presented at the August 3, 2005 meeting, 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. Compliance with the basic revised design (dated received August 3, 2005) except as modified by the conditions as noted below.
 - b. Compliance with all requirements of the Federal Aviation Administration regarding the use of visibility warning lights.
 - c. Colors of the Freeway Landmark Monument are to match those used on the submitted color board, dated July 26, 2005
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations, including all requirements of the Building Safety Division with regards to the issuance of a sign permit.
3. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for a sign permit.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0 – 1 (Vince DiBella abstained)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:

Recorded on Tape No.: (side A)

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05- 48 **QuikTrip**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 14715 S Power
REQUEST: Approval of a 5,104 sq. ft. convenience store and a 9,879 sq. ft. gas canopy
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: QuikTrip Corporation
APPLICANT: Craig Boswell, QuikTrip Corporation
ARCHITECT: JMS

REQUEST: Approval of a 5,104 sq. ft. convenience store and a 9,879 sq. ft. gas canopy

SUMMARY: Mark Irby, Craig Boswell, and Kelly Long represented the case. Mr. Irby stated this project was a dramatic change from their original design. He stated they had tried to incorporate the architectural elements and colors of the Target Center at Power and Ray.

Staffmember Lesley Davis explained that staff is asking that the red stripe be raised, so that it would be more proportional. She stated staff was also concerned that a color on the building does not appear on the canopy and that a color on the canopy does not appear on the building.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed color of the canopy band and the body color of the building are intended to be the same. He also confirmed that the standing seam on the side of the gable is a mansard.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley was concerned with the gable. He thought it looked tacked on. He thought the EIFS area was too large and not detailed. He confirmed that the gable roof and the mansard were the same metal. Mr. Irby stated QuikTrip wanted to score the gable face in a 16 X 16 or 8 X 8 grid. Mr. Irby showed photos of the Target Center and some gables from that center. Boardmember Bottomley did not think the gable worked with the gas canopy. He thought the colors of the canopy and the c-store needed to be the same.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen was OK with the gable. He suggested that it come out and have gable supports to better shade the west facing glass. Make it a real architectural detail. He suggested they return the mansard to create a fascia. He thought there should be more contrast between the colors.

Boardmember Dave Richins agreed with Boardmember Nielsen. He thought the stone pillars on the side of the gables were too heavy, he suggested the stone be at the bottom.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer agreed with Boardmember Nielsen. He thought the use of the gable was fine, but this one was not well executed. He agreed the EIFS face was not balanced, and thought the scoring idea was good, maybe coffering, or pulling the sign up. He thought the proportion of the columns was odd, and the column tops were too close to the gable. He liked the joists and detailing of the fascia on the Bank of America at Power and Ray. He thought the fascia was too thin. He was concerned with the mansard. He suggested they pitch it or pull it out 1' or 2' and create a shadow. He thought the depth of the gable roof looked like a set. He thought it should be deeper. He thought the rear of the building was too plain. He suggested an additional color. He thought they should use raised planters in the

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

front of the store. He was concerned with the gas canopy. He thought the canopy needed to change. Maybe a gable detail or form on the canopy, or use stone on the columns. Mr. Irby stated the canopy is very tough to modify. He thought that if they added gables or peaks they would look like a set. They could do something with the columns because they are close to the customers. They want customers to see through them. Boardmember Burgheimer suggested a steel tube similar to what the "Super Pumpers" used to do. Mr. Irby stated it was very hard to get canopies changed. He stated the problem with raised planters is that they become ashtrays. He suggested using stronger plant material that can stand up to bikes and people standing. He suggested that for the large EIFS area they could create an inset and possibly put the sign in the inset. Mr. Irby was concerned with changing the fascia for the metal roof. He stated that regarding the side view and the depth of the gable, they have an issue with the mechanical units being in the center of the store behind the gable, so trying to project it further back is difficult to engineer. Boardmember Burgheimer suggested pulling the parapet up straight back from the gable. He stated they are putting the mechanical units on the high side of the roof.

Chair Pete Berzins agreed the red band should be raised on the sides and rear, but he wanted it to stay the same on the front. He thought the sign was too low on the EIFS he thought it should be centered within the EIFS.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR05-48 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 color specifications for the structural spanners on the gas canopy.
 - b. Revise the colors on the elevations of the building and the canopy so that they are consistent with one another either utilizing "Reddened Earth" or "Picnic Table".
 - c. Provide a revised copy of the landscape plan if the tree placement is modified.
 - d. Provide a screen wall to screen the SES equipment or relocate it to the rear of the building, and screen with landscaping.
 - e. Raise the red band on the building to the bottom of edge of the standing seam metal roof material and continue the band at that height around the building.
 - f. **Address the thinness of the gable end.**
 - g. **Mansard needs to be broadened, so it relates to the architectural massing of the front elevation.**
 - h. **Revise the distance between the column tops and the gable.**
 - i. **Provide a stronger color change between the wainscot and the body color.**
 - j. **Revise the massing of the side of the gable.**
 - k. **Provide a relationship between the canopy and the building.**
 - l. **Provide an additional color on the rear.**
 - m. **Revise the foundation planting at the front of the building.**
 - n. **Provide stone on the gas canopy columns.**

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all conditions of the Special Use Permit.
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.

Boardmember Vince DiBella asked that the elevations be brought so the Board could see how the changes turned out.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 1 (Boardmember Tom Bottomley voted nay)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: With the proposed changes the project was a well-designed revision to the QuikTrip prototype.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-51 **Recker Office Building**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1314 North Recker
REQUEST: Approval of a 12,493 sq. ft. office
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Darrel Berry
APPLICANT: Gary Johnson
ARCHITECT: Brian Moore

REQUEST: Approval of a 12,493 sq. ft. office

SUMMARY: Mark Davis and Gary Johnson represented the case. Mr. Johnson explained the revisions since the previous submittal.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley confirmed the glass color would be bronze tint. He appreciated the parapet being brought down. He liked the curved canopies, and the windows being raised. He thought the window recess would provide shadow. He confirmed that the curved canopy would be steel frame with steel mesh, and they were proposing standing seam on the arced canopy at the entrances.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen appreciated the refinements. He thought the windows were very standard looking. He suggested using mullions to add interest. He still thought the windows going to the ground would look dirty at the bottom with rain spray, and the landscaping.

Boardmember Dave Richins liked the revised colors.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer agreed the windows could be improved with window muntins. He was concerned they would be required to provide a roof ladder to the mechanical units in the well. Mr. Johnson stated they had designated an area for roof access ladders within the building.

Boardmember Vince DiBella agreed the windows needed mullions.

Chair Pete Berzins agreed the windows need mullions. He liked the plant palette.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR05-51 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 additional window mullions.
 - b. Provide missing 'color/materials' information.
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

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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 applicant has made efforts to refine and improve the design.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-52 **Lindsay Groves Market Place Signage**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC McKellips & Lindsay
REQUEST: Approval of a 72,458 sq. ft. shopping center
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Sterling Realty Group
APPLICANT: Sean Lake
ARCHITECT: David Schukai, Boice Raidl Rhea

REQUEST: Approval of a monument sign for a previously approved shopping center

SUMMARY: Marney Frye and Tyler Wright represented the case. Ms. Frye explained the revisions to the sign. She stated the colors of the sign would match the revised shopping center colors.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen asked to see a sample of the perforated metal. He was concerned with the side of the sign, he thought the stone should wrap. If they want the mesh detail, don't place it into the stucco, make the mesh a band element. Put the Wal-Mart sign over the mesh. If they don't want to do that they need to remove the mesh all together.

Boardmember Dave Richins agreed with Boardmember Nielsen.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the mesh might be unnecessary. He thought the stone needed to wrap around. He thought the stone caps on the top of the walls should protrude out and create a ledge. He thought the fascia was too thick, he suggested providing an additional trim board to create a shadow line. He thought the roof element would feel heavy.

Boardmember Vince DiBella liked the design.

Chair Pete Berzins thought that if they use the mesh you should be able to see through it, or remove it all together. He thought they needed to detail the access panel on the side.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley agreed the mesh should be removed. He confirmed all the pitches were the same. He confirmed the revised colors for the building have not been submitted to staff, the colors of this sign will match the revised colors.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR05-52 signage be approved with the following conditions:

1. Wrap the stone on all sides.
2. Increase the cap to protrude beyond the stone so the stone has something to return into.
3. Mesh all the way or remove it entirely.
4. Retain the massing/stepping of the stucco element and make the sides step as well.
5. Add the extra fascia trim to provide a shadow line.
6. Provide metal brackets not wood.
7. Provide metal sheathing for fascia, because this is a sign, not a building.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

8. Sign colors to match revised center colors.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: With the conditions the sign is reasonably well designed.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-55 **Comfort Inn**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 651 E. Main
REQUEST: Approval of a 12,832 sq. ft. motel
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: Ramesh Patel
APPLICANT: Ramesh Patel
ARCHITECT: Mani Subra

REQUEST: Continuance to September 7, 2005

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR05-55 be continued to the September 7, 2005 meeting:

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The applicant's DIP request has not been heard.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-56 **Lehi Commercial**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 605 E McKellips
REQUEST: Approval of a 1200 sq. ft. office
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: David Young
APPLICANT: David Young
ARCHITECT: Associated Architects

REQUEST: Approval of a 1,200 sq. ft. shell building

SUMMARY: David Young, Jonathan Johns, William Johns represented the case. The applicant stated the arches hide the mechanical units.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the simple building was OK because it is so small you can't do much.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed the building was intended to be an office. He suggested additional windows on the north elevation.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley confirmed the building would be masonry. He agreed there should be additional windows on the north, he suggested recessed windows.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed the west elevation arch would be stepped liked the others. He suggested bringing light into the top of the arches. He thought the spit face should step out from the stucco, so there is a place for the stucco return down onto.

Boardmember Dave Richins thought additional windows on the north elevation would help.

Boardmember Pete Berzins was concerned with the lack of color. He confirmed there are two paint colors and the "cloud" color was not shown on the color board. He confirmed the split face would be stained.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR05-56 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 information on Materials/Colors board, including stain color for split-face wainscot.
 - b. Provide landscaping to meet the requirements of the code. Include landscaping around the existing building for a cohesive landscape theme.
 - c. Provide landscaping to mitigate the blank wall/sidewalk area along the south property line.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- d. Work with Staff to bring a more commercial presence to the building.
- e. **Provide additional windows on the north elevation.**
- 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 (Boardmember Richins not present during vote)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The Board felt the project was simple and nicely stated.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-57 The Gardens at Superstition Springs
LOCATION/ADDRESS: E of SWC of Baseline & Superstition Springs
REQUEST: Approval of a 57,418 sq. ft. sq. ft. office complex
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: A.T. Meridian
APPLICANT: Randy Carter – Dream Catchers
ARCHITECT: Randy Carter

REQUEST: Approval of thirteen retail/office buildings totaling 57,418 sq. ft.

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

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR05-57 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 specifications for the roof tile.
 - b. Design Review approval is required for any proposed monument signs.
 - c. Provide trees in the street frontage to meet Code. Tree/plant counts to be confirmed by plans examiners prior to issuance of a permit.
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 is interesting and well designed.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-58 **Retail Shops Southern**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 350 E. Southern Ave.
REQUEST: Approval of a 6,500 sq. ft. retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: AVG Partners
APPLICANT: Kevin Kerpan
ARCHITECT: Robert Kubicek

REQUEST: Approval of a 6,500 sq. ft. retail shops building

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought the two stone choices were incompatible. He suggested the applicant either choose only one stone or choose two samples that were more compatible.

MOTION: It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Dave Richins that DR05-58 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. Compliance with the conditions of approval for DIP. (ZA05-050).
 - b. Provide information regarding materials and color of the storefront frames and glazing for Design Review staff approval.
 - c. Provide color specification of the smooth-face painted concrete block used in the wainscot for Design Review staff approval.
 - d. Provide information regarding the material for the shade canopy at the east elevation for Design Review staff approval.
 - e. **Work with staff to revise the stone choices to be more compatible, with one another, or use only one stone material.**
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.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is a well-designed in-fill project for an existing, abandoned use.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-59 **Retail Shops Baseline**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1960 W. Baseline Road
REQUEST: Approval of a 6,000 sq. ft. retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: AVG Partners
APPLICANT: Kevin Kerpan
ARCHITECT: Robert Kubicek

REQUEST: Approval of a 6,000 sq. ft. retail shops building

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought the two stone choices were incompatible. He suggested the applicant either choose only one stone or choose two samples that were more compatible.

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR05-59 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. Compliance with the conditions of approval for DIP - ZA05-049.
 - b. Provide information regarding materials and color of the storefront frames and glazing for Design Review staff approval.
 - c. Provide color specification of the smooth-face painted concrete block used in the wainscot for Design Review staff approval.
 - d. Provide information regarding the material for the shade canopies at the north and south elevations for Design Review staff approval.
 - e. **Work with staff to revise the stone choices to be more compatible with one another or use only one stone material.**
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.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is a well-designed corner building for a main intersection.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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: This mixed-use development is well designed and an interesting addition to northeast Mesa.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-60B **Aquila Las Sendas**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: S of SEC Power & McDowell
REQUEST: Approval of a 15.84 acre mixed use development –
 residential component
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Power & McDowell LLC
APPLICANT: HGN
ARCHITECT: George Tibsherany

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,940 sq. ft. residential development

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR05-60B 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 complete and clear landscape plan that provides specific plant species, locations and sizes. This landscape plan must be in conformance with the minimum landscape requirements established in Chapter 15 of the City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance. All plant materials should be selected from the Desert Uplands approved plant list.
 - b. Design Review approval of the entry monument shown between the entrances at the north end of the project.
 - c. Approval of a Special Use Permit for the entry Sculpture mentioned in Condition 1d. as well as any other sculptures proposed along Power Road.
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.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: This mixed-use development is well designed and an interesting addition to northeast Mesa.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-61 **Gin Building**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 206 & 214 N Power
REQUEST: Approval of a 4,018 sq. ft. office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Gene Gin
APPLICANT: Shawn Clow
ARCHITECT: Gerald Deines

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,108 sq. ft. medical office

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda. Shawn Clow represented the case.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley was concerned with the sidewalks hugging the building. He thought the central canopy should have a pedestrian connection to the parking lot. He thought the columns seemed spindly and out of scale with the building. He was concerned with the darkness of the colors.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen appreciated the building in this area and liked the way it addressed the corner.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the SES needed to be screened. He said this design would succeed, if it had quality detailing.

MOTION: It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR05-61 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. Compliance with the conditions of approval for Z05-21 – Ordinance No. 4370.
 - b. Compliance with the conditions of approval for BA05-25.
 - c. Provide a thirteen-foot (13') wide patient drop off area with at least one five-foot (5') wide accessible sidewalk.
 - d. **Revise the color palette to reflect a lighter roof color and lighter bronze color.**
 - e. **Work with staff to re-scale and lower the center colonnade.**
 - f. **Provide a pedestrian connection through the colonnade to the parking.**
 - g. **Screen the SES.**
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.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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 is a well-designed addition to this neighborhood.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-62 **Riverview**
RELATED CASES: Development Agreement, DR04-82, Z04-85
LOCATION/ADDRESS: Dobson & 202 south of the southeast corner
REQUEST: Approval of 194,575 sq. ft. of retail, restaurants and a movie theater building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: DeRito/Kimco Riverview, LLC
APPLICANT: Saemisch DiBella Architects, Inc.
ARCHITECT: Saemisch DiBella Architects, Inc.

REQUEST: Approval of a 194,000 sq. ft. retail project

SUMMARY: Vince DiBella recused himself.

Bob Saemisch, Rick Schraeder, Jeff Miller, and Doug Himmelberger represented the case.

It was decided the Board would review the Cinemark first and then the rest of the case. Mr. Saemisch showed the Board another revised elevation for the Cinemark, which changed the fins at the top; the Mesa Stone base was changed to green paint finish; the Mesa Stone was on the tops of the columns; the emblems were on the corners. They had added the corner elements, as requested, they added the fin elements, the sign was half the size, they maintained the Mesa Stone on the top of the caps including the tall columns. On the side elevations they included the harlequin pattern on all sides of the building. They did not agree with the staff condition to add the serpentine canopy back, they were replacing it with trees. As in the previous plan, staff had recommended the green wainscot be replaced with Mesa Stone; they wanted to do that with green paint. Another condition was that they roof over the stairways as previously approved. Mr. Saemisch stated the stairs were emergency only for the projectionist, they did not want them to become places for people to hang out.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed they were still proposing tilt-up. He confirmed the diamond pattern would be a beveled $\frac{3}{4}$ " to 1" reveal cast with the panel. He confirmed the distance between buildings C and D and the Cinemark was 60'. He confirmed the landscape plan would be brought back for a future review and approval. Boardmember Burgheimer stated he was OK with the canopy trees to replace the canopy. He was concerned with how the building planes change and move. This was a big box and they have taken off the interesting elements and replaced them with trees. This Board does not allow other big boxes to use trees for interest. He confirmed the blue line was a recessed reveal, and that the stairs would be the same lattice as behind the sign. He supported the landscaping at the entrance; however, on the other three sides it was not enough. He wanted a cover over the four columns and something at the corners. He thought the building should stand alone with the trees. He thought 8" pilasters were not enough. He liked the corner elements on the previous drawings. He thought the project needed layering. He thought the building was too massive and boxy.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley agreed the previous scheme was nicer. He was concerned that the arc effect was lost. He preferred the arc. He thought the building needed relief. He stated you can add relief to a tilt-up building and it can still look good.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen stated the big box was a concern. The west facing entry will be

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

harsh. It's a rectangular box. This building will be close to the neighborhood. Removing all the interest and only using trees may not be enough. There doesn't seem to be that much room on the plan for trees. He thought there should be interest at a people scale for the customers. He confirmed the canopy's next to the building would be roofed and would come out about 20'. He thought the nicer architectural fenestrations had been cleaned off the building.

Boardmember Dave Richins stated the neighbors don't want to look at rooftop mechanical. Mr. Miller stated they had calculated the parapet to be 10" above the highest point of the mechanical units. Boardmember Richins stated he liked the new plan. He did think there should be shade over the doors on the rear of the building. He liked the shade element over the doors on the rear of the building.

Chair Pete Berzins liked the taller tower. He confirmed the freeway landmark monument signs would be 60' and 70' tall. He thought the new tower was squashed down. He stated trees change, are blown down, removed. He stated he would look at the architecture of the building. He was disappointed with what was being removed. He thought the building should stand on its own. He thought the front was nice but the other three sides were supposed to be hidden by trees. He was disappointed with the direction the project had gone. There was a lot of interest drawing people into the theatre, but three sides are just boring.

Staffmember Dorothy Chimel stated there are very few parcels in the City with Development Agreements, or with BIZ overlay districts. The Zoning Ordinance states that projects with BIZ overlay districts need to be of superior quality. Using trees to cover up the building is not enough. You stand in long lines waiting to purchase tickets in the sun. Superior quality is very important. Landscaping is not in lieu of architectural details it should enhance the building. The reveals are $\frac{3}{4}$ " to 1" deep, the blue appears to be painted on, there is no transition from the interior to the parking lot when you exit the building. At least keep the cover over the doors. One side of this building 360' long and people park there. Theatres can be used for meetings, there are drop-off zones at the rear of this building the rear is not inviting. She thought the details that were taken off the building needed to be put back on. This building is important.

Mr. Saemisch then described the revisions to the remainder of the project. Working out from the theatres, there were pavers, Date Palms, and 20' umbrellas in front of the theatre. There were 16" high planters with inset benches. By the fountain there were covered trellises with misters. The Design Guidelines had been amended to show the planters, the shade structures and potted plants to be used throughout the walkway. They wanted to use white for their cornices and canopies. He stated there would be a 16" high stage element near the theatre entrance, a fountain with seating around it, then the interactive fountain, with seating around it. The diagonal lines would be light bulbs on strings. There would be pots in front of the pilasters. The canopies would extend out 10' in front of the buildings with mister systems. The tower elements would part of the their theme, as accents to the ground level architecture. They would use a darker pattern at the stores and a lighter pattern out and around.

Boardmember Rob Burghiemer confirmed there was no shade if you were walking north to south. The shade was along the buildings for pedestrians going east/west. He confirmed they were only proposing Date Palms in that area.

Mr. Saemisch then explained the elevations for the buildings. There were some shade structures, which would be white. There would be 10 different cornices. The street would be

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

pavers in a diamond pattern. There would be three gateways: one at the south entrance coming in from the parking lot; one at the east end; and one at the west/Bass Pro end. The building heights would vary. The materials would continue around to the rear of the buildings. He stated staff was requesting that the glass on the rear entrances be clear glass. They did not want that because many tenants would not want rear entrances because they don't have enough staff to monitor those entrances. They want to use spandrel glass. He stated there might be restaurants at the ends with side patios. He stated those buildings would come back for approval. He stated they would have more quality materials than what was being shown at this meeting. He stated the trash pickup areas would have trash compactors. The trash areas would have 11' high walls and 10' high gates. The fire riser rooms and access to roof hatches, and SES would be within those trash areas. Drop off areas and valet areas would be along the entire exterior, and the handicapped spaces were moved closest to the building. They would be identifying additional handicapped spaces on the main street. There would be two new sculptures; one at the drop off area, there would be three drop off areas for the Cinemark, one at the west end, north end of the plaza and one at the south, with a sculpture at the drop off area to the west, and at the mid-point of the shops there would be a circle turn around with a sculpture there. The amount of emphasis will be for the Bass Pro, which will be the king of the road. They also feel that this building could stand on its own.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley stated there is definitely a lot going on in this project. One of the things he was considering was how this plays into a retail environment; will people want to be there, want to spend time there. The Board wants this to be a successful center. He was concerned with the linear nature of the shops, and the fact that there is no play under the canopies. He was concerned with the ribbon effect of the storefronts. He did not feel this project met the Design Guidelines for the City in relation to horizontal articulation. He was also concerned that the project would be boring at that level of the details. The fact that there are patterned pavers, and interesting canopies, shouldn't get lost at the plan level where you enter the stores. He thought the project should be broken up more in a village concept. He thought there were some very good design details in landscape, hardscapes and canopies. He was concerned with the approach from the parking lot. He understood the SES and refuse had to go somewhere. He was concerned that the rear elevations looked like "the back of the building". He was OK with the concept of the drive aisle through the center. He thought there should be more play horizontally.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen stated very few people would be able to park in front of the stores; he noted that double sided stores would help. Mr. Saemisch stated you can't market double sided stores because too much merchandise is stolen out the back of the store and the shops would be 80' deep in 20', 40', or 60' modules with end caps being restaurants. The boardmember noted the design went from a nice river-like movement with ins and outs to a straight streetscape. He thought the awnings and shade were very nice, but the stores were very monotone. He confirmed the stores would be given some leeway to have their own unique identify, similar to shops in a mall. They would be offering variety to tenants like at Kierland. They could pop-out or recess the store. They would be allowed varieties of texture and materials at the storefront. He was concerned with how the shops would look from the parking lot, which is where most people will be entering from.

Boardmember Dave Richins thought the center would be nice in his neighborhood. He liked it. He was concerned with street level view for pedestrians. He confirmed the tenants could alter everything up to the top of the windows.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the project had lost something. He thought there

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

should be more shade that goes transversely. He thought the Board needed to be looking at the big picture. The meandering and the skewing were all gone. He thought the project had lost its character. It was all at the same plane. He confirmed there was a 4" difference in plane every color change. He thought the project was very stucco looking. All the movement was gone. He stated it had been scaled back for cost. The details were lost. He liked the idea of the north and south being entries. He thought the rear elevations were not inviting. The previous felt inviting now it feels like the back of a building. He was concerned with the actual buildings, he thought they had lost something and we need to get some of it back.

Chair Pete Berzins agreed with the concerns about the linear storefronts. He was concerned that the center's look would be determined by future tenants, and we are hoping the tenants will make this a good project. He thought the rear elevations would be most visible. The center area was fun with a lot of fun things happening. The surroundings were nice but the building were not. The buildings were long and flat.

Boardmember Dave Richins stated the neighbors want this to be built. He thought the Board was micro-managing the project, let the experts do what they want, it is their money on the line.

MOTION: It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR05-62 be continued to a special meeting on August 17, 2005.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated his main concerns were: massing of the center; the materials and how they were used; question of whether this is 2-sided architecture; and transition from the parking lot.

Boardmember Bottomley stated he was also concerned with the flatness of the interiors.

Mr. William Lally stated the applicant's did not want to be continued they preferred a denial. He stated they would look at their issues and costs and determine what they are willing to change. He stated there were a few items they agree could be looked at but other items they are not willing to change. He stated they had a difference of opinion on some major concept items. He stated a complete redesign of a lot of the features was not something the applicant was willing to do in two weeks. The applicant's position was to move forward and not come back to this Board for a complete review of the project.

Chair Pete Berzins confirmed that it was an opinion of the applicants that a denial allowed them to move the project forward through Council where a continuance would not allow them to move the project forward. Mr. Lally stated a continuance would not move them forward; it would put them back at looking at the entire concept. He stated they had a staff report they had a recommendation and a set of stipulations they wanted to work with at the Council level and work on a few items that were very important to the Board. But a complete review of the large concepts was not something they thought they could do in two weeks. He thought that in two weeks they may still not see eye to eye on some major points in terms of large concepts that they patently see differently on. There are some issues that two weeks will not allow them to resolve. They think they can do that at Council.

Dorothy Chimel explained how a Design Review Board appeal works. And then Kim Steadman mentioned that this case (heard for the first time) be continued for a special meeting was a typical method of responding quickly to applicant's time frames.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought it might be faster for the applicant to work with the Board. He did not like the cloud of thought that the Design Review Board won't work with applicants. This Design Review Board is very willing to work with applicants and have a number of times held special meetings for applicants.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 1 (Dave Richins voting nay)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: There were too many issues that needed to be addressed in order to ensure the project was a superior quality design.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Hewson Dover Building D
NWC Greenfield & Presidio

REQUEST: Approval of an industrial building

DISCUSSION: Jeff Will represented the case

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- The building will be a mirror of building E
- Provide elevations of previously approved buildings.
- He liked the metal detailing.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Dover Industrial
2848, 2832, 2816 N Omaha

REQUEST: Approval of three industrial buildings

DISCUSSION: Loren Dickinson represented the case

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Liked the shade screen behind the corten steel
- Agreed there should be light for the plants at foundation

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Concerned the corten steel would stain the concrete and wall
- Concerned the split face may look like a racing stripe
- Bring the stripe on building 2 down to the wainscot level

Chair Pete Berzins:

- The rear elevation on some buildings will be visible from street
- Four-sided architecture, project design should be expressed on all exterior elevations
- Most importantly an elevation visible from r-o-w

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Tesoro at Greenfield
S of SWC Southern & Greenfield

REQUEST: Approval of a multi-family residential project

DISCUSSION: represented the case

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Concerned with how you enter the units

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Flat wall planes
- Provide a sense of entry at all entrances
- Extend the patio so it is over the door
- Separate volume at paint color change

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Flat
- Uninviting
- Duplexes are a better scale

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Needs four sided architecture

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Sam's Club
E of SEC McKellips & Greenfield

REQUEST: Approval of a

DISCUSSION: represented the case

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Break down the scale of the building
- Need deeper pop-outs
- Provide more detailing
- Pedestrian walkways
- Signage placement is a concern
- Better layering, suggested they look at project that have good massing
- Colors are OK
- The entry was weak

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Finish the whole building, it could be a while before the attached shops are built
- Looks like two different design themes; entry vs. the rest of the building
- Design elements look tacked on
- Break up the racing stripe

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Tri-City Pavilions
1982 W Main

REQUEST: Approval of a retail building for multiple tenants

DISCUSSION: Chris Myers represented the case

- Project should be consistent with the existing Safeway and shops structures that have already been developed
- Question regarding a drive-through in this area that will be served by mass transit
- Project should be pedestrian friendly
- Relocate the trash enclosure away from Main Street
- Provide pedestrian connections in the drive through area at the nwc of the project
- The existing Taco Bell drive-through traffic exits adjacent to the new drive through
- Provide a stamped surface pedestrian connection across drive aisle to building

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Red Mt. Office Suites
Thomas & Power

REQUEST: Approval of an office complex

DISCUSSION: Craig Cote represented the case

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Needs more variation at the street view
- Soften project at the edge
- Shift buildings slightly to create a more varied site plan
- Consider a revised building elevation to break up the linear site plan from the street

Chair Pete Berzins:

- 2' shift
- More shift on Power than on Thomas which has the grade change

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Southgate Commerce Park
NEC Germann & 88th Street

REQUEST: Approval of an office industrial project

DISCUSSION: Dorothy Shupe represented the case

The Board liked the residential character of the buildings

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Falcon Gateway Parcel 3
NEC Greenfield & McKellips

REQUEST: Approval of a retail and fast food project

DISCUSSION: represented the case

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Parking for Jack in The Box is a concern

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Too much going on
- Columns are cumbersome
- Metal grill work is awkward
- Spacing
- Street elevations should not look like the back side of a building
- Finish back side of parapets
- Jack in the Box doesn't match anything
- The height of the room with the drive-through window is not realistic

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Concerned with site design
- Eliminate the parking spaces that will be clipped by trash trucks
- Concern sanitation requirements not being met

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Other Business:

Discussion regarding changes to QuikTrip prototype design

Craig Boswell, Mark Irby, Gina Heids, Kelly, John and Kevin represented QuikTrip.

Mark Irby explained that personnel from QuikTrip wanted to meet with the Board in order to better understand what the Board likes and does not like about the various elevations they have submitted in the past. QuikTrip was planning to review the information and hopefully design a new building the Board would be comfortable approving for some future sites. Mr. Irby provided a Board with six buildings that had been approved by the Board including the one that was approved with conditions earlier in the evening at this meeting.

Chair Pete Berzins confirmed there were six buildings including Power & Galveston and McKellips & the Canal; there were only two gas canopies.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated he would like to see the building be visually different. He stated they should mix them up a little. He stated you can drive all over the valley and see former circle K's, that is not what the Board wants.

Mr. Irby stated QuikTrip would like to propose three or four types and then when they propose a site they can propose elevation 2 or 4 or whatever. Mr. Irby wanted to know what elements they like so they know what to keep.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen stated they should play to their strength; the materials, patterns, etc. but change them up a little. Context to site and neighborhood, massing, proportions, rich materials.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated Fred Osmond designed Quick Stops that were similar but all different. Similar brick and tile but used in different ways. He stated the canopy is such a big element, look at Super Pumps. He wanted to challenge QuikTrip to be innovative.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley stated Diamond Shamrock has used the same colors and materials but changed the elements and used different shapes.

Gina Heids stated they do their own maintenance and they don't want the buildings to look old or dated. They also don't want to use materials they can't replace later.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated they could use the same materials; they need to vary how they are used. Think of the materials as a kit of parts.

Gina Heids stated they are making segmented changes now.

Boardmember Bottomley suggested they vary the block patterns. He stated they have a good strong building that looks like it is going to stay.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that on the board the top two elevations and the one with the silver star look very similar. The two with the gable roofs look similar to each other. He thought the building with the yellow dot was well proportioned and harmonized well. Maybe with metal not tile.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Gina Heids stated they do not want to change the fascia portion of the canopy. They could change the columns on the canopy. They could take the columns on the yellow dot building and use them on the canopy columns.

Boardmember Burgheimer questioned if the canopy could connect to the building.

Mr. Irby stated QuikTrip wants a certain distance in front of the stores.

Boardmember Nielsen suggested a steel shade canopy.

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested skylights in the gas canopy.

Boardmember Bottomley suggested an arc or curve.

Boardmember Burgheimer suggesting looking at how the use the pumps. Maybe a spandrel element?

Gina Heids stated safety is very important. The employees need to see all the pumps.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated they could be very creative with bollards. Could there be a spandrel piece between the pumps that reflects the roofline of the building?

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da