

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

MAY 4, 2005

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

MEMBERS PRESENT

Pete Berzins - Chair
Dave Richins- Vice Chair
Randy Carter
Jillian Hagen
Tim Nielsen
Vince DiBella
Robert Burgheimer

MEMBERS ABSENT

OTHERS PRESENT

Kim Steadman	Richard Harris	Drew Aquilina
Lesley Davis	Lyn Mineo	Tom Bottomly
Debbie Archuleta	Steve Atkins	Stuart Rider
Mia Lozano Helland	Chris Anderson	Kory Dingle
John Wesley	Jorge Pierson	Doug Martin
Dorothy Shupe	Jack Swanson	Others
David Winfrey	Jack Mandel	
Jim Reynolds	Chris Bratty	
Betsy Vidman	Jim Pembroke	
Carrie Thinson	Gordon Haws	
Dave Jarrus	Ken Lenz	
Deana Meis	Scott Long	

1. Call to Order:

Chair Pete Berzins called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the April 6, 2005 meeting and April 19, 2005 Meeting as revised:

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

3. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-29 **Jade Grading**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 10646 E Pecos
REQUEST: Approval of a 2.705 acre construction office/yard
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: David Jarvis
APPLICANT: David Jarvis
ARCHITECT: Randy Carter

REQUEST: Approval of a 2.7 acre construction yard with a 9,421 sq. ft. office

SUMMARY: Boardmember Randy Carter abstained. Dorothy Shupe and Tom Bottomly represented the case.

Boardmember Vince DiBella was glad the project had one theme. He thought the colonial look for an industrial building was unusual but it was OK.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought the project had come a long way, and was unique.

Boardmember Dave Richins liked the revisions.

Chair Pete Berzins thought the rear elevations needed something more. He did not think there was 4-sided architecture.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen suggested more defined score lines.

Tom Bottomly stated they could off-set the center portion.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR05-29 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. If revisions are required to the drawings presented, submit revised drawings to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division.
 - a. Revise the site plan and landscape plan to shift the sidewalk from Pecos to the building so that it leads directly to the front entrance. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.
 - b. Future review and approval by Design Review is required for any freestanding signs.
 - c. Incorporate an outdoor employee area that includes shade and seating. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.
 - d. Provide the specifications for the roof material over the curved portion of the main covered entry. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- e. Provide a revised color/material board for the file that includes the proposed brick for the Design Review case file.
 - f. **Work with staff to revise the rear 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 4 – 0 – 1 (Boardmember Randy Carter abstained)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project as revised and conditioned was reasonably well-designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: (side A)

MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-36 **Lowe's**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Ellsworth & Southern
REQUEST: Approval of a 134,934 sq. ft. home improvement store
 With a 31,659 sq. ft. garden center
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Ray Downs
APPLICANT: Jack Swanson
ARCHITECT: Silvio Popovsky

REQUEST: Approval of a 134,934 sq. ft. home improvement center

SUMMARY: Jack Swanson, Jorge Pierson, and Jack VanDell represented the case.

Boardmember Randy Carter thought the building looked monolithic. He wanted to see more variation between the different colors. He liked the red but thought the entry canopy was too low. He wanted to see more lively colors. He thought the entry was out of scale.

Boardmember Dave Richins liked staff's suggestion to remove the stone from the rear elevation and use more stone on the front.

Chair Pete Berzins agreed there should be more color.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought there should be more variety of color. He thought the front entry canopy needed to be thicker and stronger. Jack Swanson suggested a shed roof. Boardmember Burgheimer suggested the 2" squares could be ceramic tile or maybe red. He thought there should be decorative lights around the building not wall packs. He was concerned with the truss area at the garden center, he wanted the pilasters to be higher than the trusses to shield them from view. He thought the cloth screening for the garden center would be inadequate to screen the stacks of fertilizer bags normally placed up against these areas. He suggested vision slats. He thought the stone wainscot was too small for such a large building. He wanted the stone to cover the columns along the front elevation.

Boardmember Vince DiBella agreed there should be more color and more detail to the entry. He thought the columns should be stronger.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen suggested they use the stone to break the horizontal lines. He thought the entry should be dynamic. He suggested they mimic the front entry parapet on the rear of the building. He thought they should do something to enhance the pilasters to give them more interest. He liked the red suggested there could be more of it.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR05-36 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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:

- a. Increase the main-entry pilasters in thickness to project, both, forward from the plane of the entry face, *and* to the rear, to provide a pilaster that is equal in depth to its width.
- b. Note the dimensions of pilasters and other projections to show how far they project from the plane of the building. Also, confirm that stone veneer is applied to all exposed sides of pilasters, piers, etc (not just those shown in the elevations) for a three-dimensional effect.
- c. Remove the stone from the central pilasters at the rear (east). Also, raise the stone at the building entrances on the front elevation.
- d. Add variation to the spacing and dimension of pilasters at the center of the rear (east) elevation.
- e. Coordinate pilasters (as shown on elevations) with doors and planting areas shown on plans.
- f. Raise the two large planters that flank the front of the building and apply stone veneer.
- g. The two triangular raised planters at the main entry should be split-face CMU, painted to match the building base.
- h. Add trees to the three tree wells in front of the building.
- i. Reduce the height of the tall thin wall at the east end of the garden center, and tie it into the design of the adjacent north fence/wall of the garden center.
- j. The Garden Center elevations (fronting Southern Ave and Ellsworth Rd) need more design. Provide a solid band of wall at the top of the garden center fences (where they appear on the N, S, E, & W sides) to screen stacked merchandise, and to tie into the thin fin wall at the rear of the garden center. Hide the shade structure and incorporate the two "green house" structures into the design of the project.
- k. All foundation base requirements must be met including the 30' x 30' entry plaza unless a variance is approved by the Board of Adjustment (refer to BA05-018).
- l. Provide a temporary 5' landscape strip with metal edging band adjacent to undeveloped parcels. Continue the metal band across drive accesses. Provide decomposed gravel on undeveloped parcels. All of these measures apply unless construction of that project commences prior to final inspection of this project.
- m. Incorporate more irregular, naturalistic topography around the perimeter of the retention basin on the south property line.
- n. Revise the monument sign elevations to more closely match the design of the front entrance element of the Lowe's building with a similar gable detail and multiple piers with a thickness that matches or exceeds the depth of the sign. Details to be approved by Design review Staff.
- o. All height restrictions must be observed unless the Design Review Board approves the exceptions noted above.
- p. **Modify the main entry feature to make it more prominent.**
- q. **Provide more variety in the color choices.**
- r. **Revise the north elevation at the garden center to make the pilasters and fencing higher than the truss line.**
- s. **Work with staff to provide decorative light fixtures for the building.**
- t. **Provide additional stone on the entry columns.**

MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- u. **Provide decorative elements on the top of the colonnade.**
 - v. **Provide vision slats or perforated panels at the garden center.**
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
 3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
 4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
 5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
 6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
 7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project with conditions is reasonably well designed.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-37 **Pierpont Business Court**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC Baseline & 48th Street
REQUEST: Approval of 134,122 sq. ft. of office/warehouse
condominiums
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Frank Richards
APPLICANT: Steven Nevala
ARCHITECT: Sherman Cawley

REQUEST: Approval of 134,122 sq. ft. of office/warehouse condominiums

SUMMARY: Boardmember Randy Carter abstained. This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually. Staff explained that the applicant would revise the floor plan to show at least an 8" pop-out.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Dave Richins that DR05-37 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 modifications (if any are required by the Board) to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division.
2. Show at least an 8" pop-out on the floor plan.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
6. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
8. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 4 – 0 – 1 Randy Carter abstained

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project with conditions should be a nice addition to the first phase.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

other parts of the City, such as West Main Street.

Chair Pete Berzins confirmed the landscaping would probably be installed within the next few months, but no buildings were being proposed for at least a year.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer did not think the Board should be reviewing this case prior to any review of the site plan or interior landscape plans. He agreed it was not a good idea to combine evergreen and desert plants.

MOTION: It was moved by Jillian Hagen and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR05-38 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. Plants revised per Az Dept of Water Conservation approved list.
 - b. Revision of ground cover symbols for clarity.
 - c. Remove the Stone Pine from the palette.**
 - d. Work with staff to develop a more consistent theme of both trees and shrubs.**
 - e. Provide a minimum of six (6) different tree species.**
 - f. Review mature size of trees and shrubs.**
 - f. Any future site improvement plans to include this approval.**
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. 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 7 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The Board was simply reviewing right-of-way landscaping.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: Mt. Vista Hospital
Southern & Crismon

REQUEST: Approval of a 5-story hospital and medical office buildings

DISCUSSION: Boardmembers Dave Richins and Vince DiBella abstained. David Winfrey, David Collins, and Joe Leadnee represented the case.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Likes what they are doing
- Likes the style
- 5 story tower a concern
- Liked the materials
- Concerned with southern sun exposure on west side.
- Shade/recess windows
- Low e-glass doesn't work well for curtain glass in AZ, it will crack
- Try banding of windows on medical office buildings
- Be careful with future fly zone for helicopters

Boardmember Jillian Hagen:

- Liked the direction it's going
- North side of medical office building looks like a prison, very sterile
- Need additional tree species in the parking lot
- Turf areas should be more pedestrian friendly/park area

Boardmember Randy Carter:

- Height of central tower seems out of scale
- Reduce tower to be more "sheltering"
- Could corbels be more dominant

MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: Samurai Sam's/Taco Time
3041 E McKellips

REQUEST: Review of a 2,998 sq. ft. fast food restaurant with 3 tenants

DISCUSSION: There was no one present to represent the case.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: Pollack Retail Center
SWC Recker & Brown

REQUEST: Approval of a 12,600 retail center

DISCUSSION: No one was present to represent the case

MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: Southwest Ambulance
500 block W Baseline

REQUEST: Approval of 137,170 sq. ft. of administrative and support operations

DISCUSSION: Kory Dingle, Chris Anderson, and Scott Long represented the case

Boardmember Randy Carter:

- More detail on the south elevation of the gray portion of the administration building
- Wants vertical elements
- Suggested vertical rip rap
- Additional definition of rear elevations
- Show inside the courtyard and view from Baseline
- He was concerned with the use of cool grays with warm browns

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Concerned with chain link around the enclosed area

Boardmember Jillian Hagen:

- All the texture is the same
- Too smooth
- Push the material a little more
- Too flat
- Maybe cover the curved wall with vines
- Buildings could be a family of colors

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Bay doors need attention
- Design of west elevations need more thought

MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: Family Enrichment Center
805 N Country Club

REQUEST: Approval of a 22,022 office and classroom building

DISCUSSION: Bob Saemisch represented the case:

Boardmember Jillian Hagen:

- Peach color should be the ivory as shown on the rendering

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Concerned with play ground next to housing
- Agrees peach color should be more ivory

Boardmember Randy Carter:

- North elevation will appear flat from the residences

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The shade structures look thin and spindly, maybe a thicker banded piece

MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: Dana Park Lot 5D
3510 E Baseline

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,557 sq. ft. retail addition

DISCUSSION: Bob Saemisch represented the case, and explained the tower element would come back farther, the cornice will be deeper and there will be a window on the rear

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- The raised tower element on the south elevation seems out of proportion

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Thought the parapet element on the south could be wider

MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: City of Mesa Water Treatment Plant
NEC Signal Butte & Baseline

REQUEST: Approval of a retention basin, pump station, and water treatment plant

DISCUSSION: Gordon Haws and Jim Pembroke represented the case

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Seem to be going to great lengths to screen very simple project
- Very simple pattern
- Maybe use high-tech public art
- Don't use the standard screen wall like McKellips and Gilbert
- Use creative landscaping

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Why glass block when there are no workers who need natural light
- Pay attention to interplay of hardscape and soft surface
- Put more money out on the street, no one will see the building

Boardmember Jillian Hagen:

- Maybe a water feature
- Don't spend money on glass block

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Talk to EVIT welding class about creating features for the wall

Chair Pete Berzins:

- The metal art work should be something water based

MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

5. Other Business:

Fee Increases:

Planning Director, John Wesley explained the proposed fee increases:

Boardmember Dave Richins thought redevelopment sites should be tiered so redevelopment sites pay a smaller fee.

Mr. Wesley explained that small infill sites often take more staff time than larger projects

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated the fees Mesa charges are very low. He thought the Planning Division could be self-sufficient. He thought the City should charge the rear cost of the projects.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen cautioned staff to be careful, it is a fine line. He agreed that more complicated projects should pay more and "real" in-fill projects should get some leniency.

Chair Pete Berzins thought the City was afraid to take the jump to the real cost, but the reality was we are not charging enough.

Boardmember Dave Richins stated the City can't cost recover everything they do. The City can't lose site of service and benefits of the development to the City. He thought development should pay for itself, but a one-size fits all approach doesn't work.

Boardmember Burgheimer agreed but stated the City needs to have enough staff to do the job.

Changes to Design Review application:

Staffmember Debbie Archuleta explained staff was proposing minor changes to the application packet to address concerns expressed by the Board at previous meetings: The requirement for 10 color elevations for the packets would now be for 11 X 17 so the Boardmembers can actually read the elevations. The application checklist would now require "**All building elevations to be drawn at the same scale. Minimum scale 1/8th. (Use north, south, east, west, not front, rear, sides)**"

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer asked what staff would do when large shopping centers, apartments complex, etc. come through and say they can't fit the whole thing on a 24" X 36" sheet at 1/8th. Boardmember Randy Carter suggested staff require additional sheets for individual buildings, and then allow one sheet with the entire center at a smaller scale if needed.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was also concerned with applicant's who submit renderings with few actual details. He asked staff to request additional sheets in order to make the elevations easier to read, and not so crowded. Boardmember Burgheimer also asked that the section that states all drawings are to be signed and sealed by an Arizona registrant, be revised to say by an Arizona registrant in the related disciplines, i.e. landscape architect, civil engineering, etc.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Chair Pete Berzins wanted to ensure the Board would not hear the case unless it was a complete submittal.

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested the photos of existing site be labeled to show looking south, east, etc.

Boardmember Richins wanted more photos. If the case is for a pad site within an existing retail center he thought the Board should have photos of the existing center.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da