

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
SEPTEMBER 4, 2002

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

John Poulsen – Acting Chair
Randy Carter
Robert Burgheimer
Jillian Hagen
Ann Schwaderer

MEMBERS ABSENT

Carie Allen
John O'Hara (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman
Lesley Davis
Debbie Archuleta
Charlie Scully
Richard Dyer
Mrs. Reelee
Les Partch
Roger Manny
Cameron Miles

Councilmember Rex Griswold
Councilmember Claudia Walters
Joe Goforth
Dick Miskiel
Greg Hitchens
Wade Pew
Steve Stetler
Others

1. **Call to Order:**

Acting Chair John Poulsen called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m.

2. **Approval of the Minutes of the August 7, 2002 Meeting:**

On a motion by Ann Schwaderer seconded by Rob Burgheimer the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

3. **Design Review Cases:**

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR02-44 **Reelee Retail Center**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 606 East Main
REQUEST: Approval of a 8,917 sq. ft. retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: Reta Kellis, Reelee Inc.
APPLICANT: Lesley Partch
ARCHITECT: Lesley Partch

REQUEST: Approval of an 11,091 sq. ft. retail center

SUMMARY: Boardmember Ann Schwaderer declared a conflict a conflict of interest.

Les Partch represented the case. He stated that he and the client had gone back out to the site to determine what direction they wanted to go. They looked at the surrounding area and decided to use elements from the Visitor's Center cattycorner to the site. The client particularly liked the symmetry, the raised portico in the center with the lower flanking wings, and the light colors. He stated they had also expanded the glass in the front so that the building is more open. They also incorporated some decorative features on the top of the raised portico that are vertical elements that come in and out about 2".

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thanked the applicant for the changes made to the elevations. He was concerned that the SES be screened, and that the dentils were shown as EIFS in one place and stucco somewhere else; he wondered what the building material would actually be.

Mr. Partch stated that the main building would be CMU with the stucco over it and then the front façade would be framed and the piers would probably be masonry and EIFS. Both would have the same sand finish.

Boardmember Burgheimer warned the applicant that the EIFS would never have the same texture as the stucco.

Boardmember Randy Carter liked the west elevation as proposed, however he understood staff's concerns regarding the north elevation. He agreed that the north elevation was very plain and that with the amount of traffic along Hobson and the visibility from Pioneer Park there needed to be more relief. He felt that the building was simple yet elegant with a feeling of height and lightness.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen confirmed that the landscape plan had not been revised to show the new building footprint.

Mr. Partch then gave the Board a revised color elevation that showed the walkway wrapping the north elevation as suggested by staff.

There was discussion regarding whether the covered walkway should wrap around to the north elevation or terminate midway on the west elevation. It was suggested that the palm trees continue along the west elevation. It was confirmed that on the north elevation the pop out

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

was only 16". There was discussion regarding using landscaping on the north elevation, possibly vines so that the plant material would reach a height of 5', with a decorative trellis. A reveal joint was suggested.

The property owner preferred using architecture to articulate the north elevation because landscaping would require long-term maintenance. She felt that the flatness of the building would be screened by the perimeter landscaping.

Acting Chair John Poulsen was concerned with how the proposed signage would affect the architecture of the building. He wanted the signage to be consistent for the entire building.

MOTION: It was moved by Jillian Hagen and seconded by Randy Carter that DR02-44 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development and described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans as resubmitted with the addendum, and exterior elevations submitted at the meeting which wrap the north elevation, except as noted below.
2. Compliance with the conditions of the rezoning case Z01-33 (Ord.# 3916, 8-6-01) which approved a change of zoning from R-2 to C-2.
3. Compliance with the conditions of the Preliminary Development Impact Summary Comments (6/13/02) for Development Engineering, Solid Waste, Fire Department and Building Safety Divisions.
4. **Redesign the west elevation and northwest corner to reinstate the covered walkway along the entire west elevation and include the wraparound element on the rear to extend at least two units on the north elevation.**
5. Ground mounted mechanical equipment, including electrical transformers, shall be fully screened from public view by sufficient landscaping in the form of shrubs equal to or exceeding the height of the mechanical units.
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. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with the Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance. Any light standards (poles) shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 20' height at the perimeter.
8. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
9. **Signage to be symmetrical around the building.**
10. **The S.E.S. to be screened from Main Street and painted to match the building.**
11. **Signage to be approved by Design Review staff.**
12. Provide two full size and two 8-1/2 X 11 sets of revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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

Recorded on Tape No.: 141 - 1 (side B) and 141 - 2 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR02-46 **Police Substation**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2505 South Dobson
REQUEST: Modification of the existing building, providing additional parking, a 7' high security wall, an electronic gate, 3 gates, parking lot lighting and new landscaping and irrigation.

COUNCIL DISTRICT: 3
OWNER: City of Mesa
APPLICANT: Dick Miskiel, Todd & Associates
ARCHITECT: Dick Miskiel

REQUEST: Approval to modify the existing building; provides additional parking, parking lot lights and landscaping.

SUMMARY: Steve Stetler represented the case. He stated that the wall design would be revised to have a two-foot band across the top. The wall would be lighter on top.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen confirmed that a revised landscape would be required to be submitted and approved by either her, or the Design Review staff. She agreed with the revisions to the wall.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed that there would be landscaping up to the wall.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed that the wall would be 7' from the pedestrian side and less from the Police side; that there will be holes in the wall where the scuppers are; and that the storm water flows across the sidewalk. He wanted the scuppers placed under the sidewalk so that the water no longer flows across the sidewalk. He felt that this was an opportunity to correct the existing condition

Boardmember Jillian Hagen confirmed that the scupper is 16" and will be under the wall.

Vice Chair John Poulsen confirmed that there is only one scupper.

Boardmember Burgheimer was also concerned that the split-faced wall would be "tagged". He wanted to see the wall treated for "anti graffiti".

Boardmember Jillian Hagen suggested planting vines next to the wall, specifically bougainvillea.

Vice Chair John Poulsen was concerned that the lake level is very close to the sidewalk and he wondered if a scupper below the sidewalk would be high enough from the lake level.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR02-46 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

2. Compliance with the Preliminary Development Impact Summary Comments.
3. **Revise the footprint of the site wall: provide curved corners in the fence where the wall is closest to the lake. Fence corners closest to the parking area can remain square. Revised plan to be approved by Design Review staff.**
4. **Provide a revised wall elevation with special attention paid to the detail at the fence corners and step-downs in the wall height. Elevations to be approved by Design Review staff.**
5. **Provide a refined landscape plan with identification of specific plant selections. Plan to be approved by Design Review staff .**
6. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with the Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
7. **Review the water flow over the sidewalk and mitigate the water from flowing over the sidewalk.**
8. **Provide vines along portions of the wall to deter graffiti of the wall.**
9. **The lighting pattern be reviewed by Design Review staff so that there are no shadows cast on the sidewalk for people to hide in.**
10. **Wall to be as explained at the meeting with a 2' band at the top in a lighter shade.**
11. Provide two full size and two 8-1/2 X 11 sets of revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

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

Recorded on Tape No.: 141 - 2 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR02-48 **Glover Office Building**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2444 East Southern
REQUEST: Approval of a 8,008 sq. ft. office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 2
OWNER: Troy Glover
APPLICANT: Cameron Miles
ARCHITECT: Cameron Miles

REQUEST: Approval of two 4,004 sq. ft office buildings

SUMMARY: Cameron Miles represented the case.

Boardmember Randy Carter stated that the Board's concerns were primarily with the north and west elevations. He confirmed that the applicant was willing to add the sill detail and continue the stone. Boardmember Carter agreed with staff that the stone needed to be more textural. He confirmed that the Sanitation Division has approved the use of roll-out barrels. He warned Mr. Miles that Building Safety may not approve of his proposed handicap ramps.

When asked about fire radius, Mr. Miles stated that the radius barely meets the fire truck requirement but the ladder can overhang the curb.

Boardmember Carter felt that the columns were stark. He confirmed that the owner had not yet decided on the type of doors to be used at the entrance.

Boardmember Ann Schwaderer was concerned with the flatness of the stone. She suggested using a different paint color on the columns.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen felt that the project didn't appear to have an entrance. She felt that a change in color should help. She confirmed that the windows would have bronze mullions.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer agreed that the building needed a different color. He would like the entry better delineated.

Acting Chair John Poulsen confirmed that there are no pop-outs on the building. He suggested using 6" pop-outs on the windows. Mr. Miles agreed to add 6" pop-outs to the north and west windows.

Boardmember Carter warned the applicant that the exit doors on the south and east do not meet ADA standards.

Acting Chair John Poulsen confirmed the applicant was willing to add an additional color for the protruding arches.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen confirmed that there would be berms located in the break in the screen wall along the south elevation. She also confirmed that there would be lawn in the front retention basin and the applicant was proposing decomposed granite in the rear retention basin. She wanted to see landscaping in the rear retention basin.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR02-48 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
2. Compliance with the Preliminary Development Impact Summary Comments.
3. **Enhance the elevations of the carport structures. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.**
4. **Extend the cap of the wainscot around all sides of the building or provide a sill detail under the windows on the rear elevations that matches the wainscot cap. The stone shall be extended under the first window on the rear elevations before it terminates. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.**
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. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
6. All outdoor storage areas for materials, equipment, and service entrance section (SES) shall be recessed or fully screened from view by a masonry wall the same height as the utility cabinet.
7. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
8. Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened by a parapet wall equal to or exceeding the height of the mechanical units. To the extent permitted by law, satellite dishes shall be fully screened by a parapet wall. Ground mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened from public view by a combination of a decorative wall and dense landscaping. The screen wall shall be equal to or exceed the height of the mechanical units.
9. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
10. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with the Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
11. Screen all parking areas and vehicular circulation aisles adjacent to the public right of way. The screen walls along the street frontage should be varied in alignment, broken up with naturally contoured berming and staggered dense shrubs to achieve a continuous screen of no less than 36 inches above the highest adjacent grade.
12. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
13. **Arches on three sides of building to be painted a third color.**
14. **Provide the sill detail which is above the stone and 6" pop-outs on windows on north and west. Revised elevations to be approved by Design Review staff.**
15. **Proposed stone to be replaced with a stone having more texture. Details to be approved by Design Review staff.**
16. **Provide decorative doors. To be approved by Design Review staff.**

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

17. **Berming to be provided between the screen walls, along Southern Avenue.**
18. **Provide additional landscaping in the retention basin located at the rear of the lot.**
19. Provide two full size and two 8-1/2 X 11 sets of revised 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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is a simple project that should not detract from the residential character of the area.

Recorded on Tape No.: 141 - 2 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR02-49 **Copper Peak Bar and Grill**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC Baseline and Stapley Drive
REQUEST: Approval of a 7,437 sq. ft. restaurant with outdoor seating
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: Denali National Trust
APPLICANT: Greg Hitchens
ARCHITECT: Hitchens Associates

REQUEST: Approval of a 7,437 sq. ft. restaurant with outdoor seating

SUMMARY: Greg Hitchens represented the case. Mr. Hitchens stated that the applicant wanted clear or white neon to illuminate the copper color. Mr. Hitchens stated that the lighting consultant had not presented a sample of clear or white.

Boardmember Randy Carter stated that he would not vote in favor of white neon on the building.

Mr. Hitchens stated that he did not want to use amber because the site is near a traffic signal and amber is used in traffic signals.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated that you can get a very bright "blue white" or there is also a yellowish, warm color.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed that there would be illumination under each awning, at the entries, and above the doors. He confirmed that the applicant had not considered ground-mounted lights. Boardmember Carter was concerned that a line of neon would not enhance this building and would detract from the composition of the building.

Mr. Hitchens stated that the owner's concern was that the color of the building would not be noticeable at night, and he wanted the copper to be noticed at night.

Boardmember Carter felt that the neon broke up the building and did not enhance it. He stated that if the choices were white, clear or amber, he would say no neon or come back at a future meeting to have the neon presented to the Board.

Boardmember Hagen felt that the building seemed more elegant than neon. She suggested enhancing the landscaping with lights.

MOTION: It was moved by Jillian Hagen and seconded by Ann Schwaderer that DR02-49 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
2. Compliance with the Preliminary Development Impact Summary Comments (July 17, 2002).

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
4. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
5. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with the Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 20' height at the perimeter.
6. **Any neon or other similar exterior building illumination shall be required to come back through the Design Review Board as a separate application. Applicant will be required to present a sample of the lighted neon to the Board.**
7. Fire risers and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
8. Provide two full size and two 8-1/2 X 11 sets of revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 4 – 0 (Boardmember Burgheimer left prior to the vote)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions should complement the architectural style of nearby commercial development.

Recorded on Tape No.: 141 - 2 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR02-51 **CVS Pharmacy**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC Southern and Greenfield
REQUEST: Approval of a 12,000 sq. ft. drug store
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Gustine Properties Inc.
APPLICANT: Carter + Burgess
ARCHITECT: Rick McGee

REQUEST: Approval of a 12,000 sq. ft. drug store

SUMMARY: Roger Manning and Joe Goforth represented the project.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was concerned that the building will be much flatter than it appears on the elevations. He did not want to see more boxes on corners.

Mr. Manning explained how the pop-outs on the building would work. Starting with the windows and working out; the arch is 4" out from the window; the next plane is out 4"; the element that encloses it 2"; the masonry pilaster and the wainscot is out 2"; the difference between the arch and the gray base (south elevation) wainscoting is 2". In the rear there is an 8" recess.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer appreciated the changes and variety in each of the CVS submittals. He felt that there was enough similarity to recognize but they were not the same thing over and over. He felt that the east and west sides were still a little flat. He was concerned that there was only a 2" difference between the two orange shades.

Boardmember Ann Schwaderer agreed the west elevation could be improved. She was glad to see the changes between this project and the proposed store at Brown and Recker.

Boardmember Randy Carter stated that it appeared the handicap parking spaces were 16' with a 2' separation from the columns. There needs to be more than a 2' separation. He confirmed that the reveal on the south elevation will go through the building as shown on the full size elevation; and that the cantilevered roof at the entrance steps back 8" and the molding comes out to the edge.

Vice Chair reiterated that the Board's concerns were the depths of the pop-outs, and the relief of the different layers.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Ann Schwaderer that DR02-51 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
2. Compliance with the Preliminary Plan Review Team comments relating to Fire, Building Safety and Development Engineering.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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. If the subject parcel is developed prior to the development of the adjacent properties, there shall be a temporary installation of extruded six (6) inch vertical concrete curbing with abutting landscaped area to be a minimum of five (5) feet in width along the undeveloped edge of the adjacent properties.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with the Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 20' height at the perimeter.
7. Screen all parking areas and vehicular circulation aisles adjacent to the public right of way. The screen walls along the street frontage should be varied in alignment, broken up with naturally contoured berming and staggered dense shrubs to achieve a continuous screen of no less than 36 inches above the highest adjacent grade.
8. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
9. **Increase the depth of the pop-outs of the dark area from 2" to 4" to 6". Then adjust everything out from there.**
10. **Provide 32" in front of the handicapped parking spaces between the columns and the curb.**
11. Provide two full size and two 8-1/2 X 11 sets of revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is significantly different than previously approved CVS Pharmacies and should be an attractive addition to this general area.

Recorded on Tape No.: (side A)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR02-53 **Auto Service Shell Building**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 920 East Southern
REQUEST: Approval of a 12,340 sq. ft. auto repair facility
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 4
OWNER: Leighton Roberts
APPLICANT: Leighton Roberts
ARCHITECT: John Reddell

REQUEST: Approval of a 12,340 sq. ft. auto repair facility

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

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR02-53 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
2. Compliance with the Preliminary Development Impact Summary Comments dated July 17, 2002.
3. **Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the buildings are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership. A PAD overlay zone will need to be approved by City Council. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.**
4. **Provide additional landscaping along the east property line. Revise the landscape plan to show 37 trees and 99 shrubs. Provide at least two species of tree in this area.**
5. **Provide additional landscaping along the north property line. Revise the landscape plan to show 11 trees and 42 shrubs. Provide at least two species of tree in this area.**
6. **Provide additional landscaping along the west property line. Revise the landscape plan to show 21 trees and 60 shrubs. Provide at least two species of tree in this area.**
7. **Provide additional landscaping along the south property line. Revise the landscape plan to show 9 trees and 36 shrubs.**
8. **Retention basin design must comply with Chapter 15.**
9. **Detached, monument sign and attached signage to be approved by Design Review staff. Sign area not to exceed code requirements.**
10. **Provide a sidewalk to Southern Avenue on the east side of the entrance drive. Revised plan to be approved by Design Review staff.**
11. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

building color.

12. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with the Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
13. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 20' height at the perimeter.
14. Screen all parking areas and vehicular circulation aisles adjacent to the public right of way. The screen walls along the street frontage should be varied in alignment, broken up with naturally contoured berming and staggered dense shrubs to achieve a continuous screen of no less than 36 inches above the highest adjacent grade.
15. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
16. Provide two full size and two 8-1/2 X 11 sets of revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is reasonably well designed and the buildings will not be visible from Southern.

Recorded on Tape No.: 141 - 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Staffmember Laura Hyneman explained to the Board that the applicants for "Watermill Express" DR02-40 had filed an appeal with the City Council. The case was scheduled to be heard by the Council Monday, September 9, 2002.

At the City Council study session scheduled for Thursday, September 5, 2002, the Council would be discussing possible Design Review Board review of churches.

Staff reminded the Board that there will be a retreat following the October meeting and asked them to think of items they would like to discuss at that retreat.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da