

**CITY OF MESA**  
**MINUTES OF THE**  
**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

**June 1, 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  
Vince DiBella  
Randy Carter  
Tim Nielsen  
Robert Burgheimer (arrived 4:06)

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Dave Richins- Vice Chair (excused)  
Jillian Hagen (excused)

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Kim Steadman  
Lesley Davis  
Debbie Archuleta  
Mia Lozano Helland  
John Wesley  
Angelica Guevarra  
Gordon Sheffield  
Mani Shubra  
David Counts  
Richard Fe Tom  
Dwayne Griffin

Bob Saemisch  
Randy Todd  
Larry Nagaki  
Sean Lake  
Craig Boswell  
Russ Watson  
Gary Johnson  
Patrick Musser  
Rauf Moosavi  
Maeve Johnson Frontera  
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 May 4, 2005 Meeting:**

On a motion by Vince DiBella seconded by Randy Carter the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

3. **Design Review Cases:**

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 1, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR05-39**                      **Mt. Vista Medical Center**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**            1301 South Crismon  
**REQUEST:**                         Approval of a 452,000 sq. ft. hospital  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**            District 6  
**OWNER:**                             IASIS Healthcare  
**APPLICANT:**                     Perkins & Will c/o David Winfrey  
**ARCHITECT:**                       Thomas Reisenbichler

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 506,000 sq. ft. hospital and medical offices

**SUMMARY:** Mike Withey, David Counts, and Jennifer Urquardt represented the case. They explained the northwest area of the hospital would have a change in EIFS colors to break up the mass, and they added additional tree species to the parking area.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed the applicants were proposing to build a 3-story building that could be a 5-story building within a year. He thought the Board should approve two separate cases; one for the 3-story building and one for the 5-story option. He was concerned that the Board was not seeing what would actually be built if they added two additional floors. He thought it would be very difficult for the building to grow. He did not want a "hybrid" version of the 3-story rather than the 5-story version depicted in the renderings. He questioned how the entry tower could be enlarged from 3 to 5 stories without significant reconstruction and expense. He wanted to ensure that the score lines would remain.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed that if the sandstone were not used on the entire building it would be used on the front. He wanted variety in color.

Boardmember Randy Carter stated the sandstone has a lot of color variation; he was concerned that if they used cast stone the building would become monolithic. He thought that if they used cast stone they needed to still provide color variety so the building looks like the renderings. He wanted a stipulation that the inspectors in the field could verify that a mixture of cast stone was used. He did not like the rectangular windows shown on the black line drawings. He preferred the color elevations to the black lines. He wanted the cornice as shown on the rendering. He thought the reveal should be 2" to 4". He thought the louvers should be an accent color.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR05-39 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. Add relief to the north elevation of the patient floors. Staff to approve changes.
  - b. Balance the impact of the entry tower by emphasizing some of the horizontal elements, or reducing the height. Staff to approve changes.

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 1, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- c. Add variety to the trees in the parking field. Staff to approve changes.
  - d. Add pedestrian access to large turf areas, and develop them as parks. Staff to approve changes.
  - e. Provide pedestrian connections in the locations noted in Staff Exhibit 'A'.
  - f. If full-sandstone is not feasible, it may be replaced with a blend of 40% sandstone and 60% cast stone, in a pattern to be approved by staff.
  - g. Submit any proposed monument sign to Design Review staff for approval.
  - h. Submit any screening walls to Design Review staff for approval.
  - i. Submit specialty pavement materials to Design Review staff for approval.
  - j. **The hospital shall develop either a 3-story building as presented, or a 5-story building as presented. The building cannot be revised without going back to the Design Review Board. No hybrid of this building will be allowed (e.g. 4-story version).**
  - k. **The general character of the renderings be applied to the construction drawings. Provide details that create the shadow lines, etc. in the rendering. If there are any changes they must be brought back to the Design Review Board.**
  - l. **The applicant can use cast stone, but there must be a variety of color.**
  - m. **Provide square windows with surrounds as presented on the renderings.**
  - n. **Alternate color for the louvers at the large end walls; consider using the window frame colors.**
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
  3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
  4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
  5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
  6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
  7. Provide the following (to show compliance with conditions of approval for this case) to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application:

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The project with conditions is very well designed and should be an enhancement to the community.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 1, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR05-40**                      **Samurai Sam's Taco Time**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**              3041 E McKellips  
**REQUEST:**                              Approval of a 2,998 sq. ft. fast food restaurant with drive-thru  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**                District 1  
**OWNER:**                                Wayne Wyatt  
**APPLICANT:**                         Chris Neal  
**ARCHITECT:**                         Robert Briggs

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 2,998 sq. ft. fast food restaurant

**SUMMARY:** This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Chair Pete Berzins wanted it stated in the record that the Board was approving the mural as an element of the architectural design, and not as signage.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Randy Carter that DR05-40 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. Existing landscaping has not been shown on the landscape plan. Please provide a revised landscape plan that includes the existing right-of-way landscaping. Tree and shrub counts must meet code-required quantities and additional trees to meet minimum code requirements as outlined in the "Site Standards" section of this report.
  - b. Provide decomposed granite on the rear undeveloped phase of this site. As shown on the landscape plan, a temporary 5' landscape strip is required adjacent to this pad.
  - c. Incorporate additional plant materials on the south and east sides of the building as well as in the landscape island adjacent to the drive-through lane.
  - d. Provide a pedestrian path that crosses the drive aisles connecting the sidewalks. This pathway is to be a decorative surface such as a decorative concrete surface or pavers.
  - e. Revise the landscape palette to replace the Eucalyptus and Pine trees with other species.
  - f. All perimeter landscaping shall be installed with the first phase of development.
  - g. **The mural is an architectural element, not signage.**
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 JUNE 1, 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 4 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** With conditions this project is reasonably well designed

Recorded on Tape No.: 1

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 1, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR05-41**                      **Southwest Ambulance**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**              1835 S Extension  
**REQUEST:**                              Approval of 4 buildings and wash bays totaling 137,170 sq. ft.  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**                District 3  
**OWNER:**                                Millett Family Properties  
**APPLICANT:**                         The Architecture Company  
**ARCHITECT:**                         The Architecture Company

**REQUEST:** Approval of 4 buildings and wash bays totaling 137,170 sq. ft.

**SUMMARY:** This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Andrew Brefit and Richard Fe Tom, represented the case. They explained the revisions that have been made since the Board's preliminary review of the case. They stated they were in the process of value engineering the project and thought it was best to continue the case, so that if minor changes were needed the Board would be reviewing what they were actually going to build.

Boardmember Vince DiBella liked the project as proposed.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed they were willing to replace the chain link with steel tube. He liked the awnings and the gabion wall.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed the awnings would be either curved or sloped, they would not curve into the wall.

Chair Pete Berzins appreciated the changes that been made.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR05-41 be continued to the July 6, 2005 meeting:

**VOTE:** Passed 4 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** To allow the applicant time to value engineer the project.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 1, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR05-42**                      **Family Enrichment Center**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**              805 N Country Club Drive  
**REQUEST:**                              Approval of a 22,022 sq. ft. building with one and two-story components  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**              District 4  
**OWNER:**                                First Christian Church  
**APPLICANT:**                        Pew & Lake  
**ARCHITECT:**                         Saemisch DiBella

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 22,022 sq. ft. building with one and two story components

**SUMMARY:** This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Boardmember Vince DiBella recused himself. Bob Saemisch was present to represent the case.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tin Nielsen that DR05-42 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. Approval of any proposed freestanding signs by Design Review.
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 (Vince DiBellas abstained)

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** This project with conditions is well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 1, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR05-43**                      **Dana Park Lot 5D**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**            3510 E. Baseline Rd.  
**REQUEST:**                            Approval of a 4,557 sq. ft. restaurant retail use  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**            District 2  
**OWNER:**                                First Regent of Arizona  
**APPLICANT:**                        First Regent of Arizona  
**ARCHITECT:**                         Saemisch DiBella Architects

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 4,557 sq. ft. restaurant/retail use

**SUMMARY:** This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Vince Dibella recused himself. Bob Saemisch was present to represent the case.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR05-43 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. Parking lot landscape islands adjacent to the building shall be at least 8' wide as required by code.
  - b. The raised parapet on the south elevation needs to be widened to the west to so that the proportions are more symmetrical.
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 (Vince DiBella abstained)

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** For the reasons stated on the record which include

Recorded on Tape No.: 1

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 1, 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:** Liz Gaston and Chumita Hurd represented the case. They stated the Freeway Landmark Monument Sign was designed to match the approved monument signs. They were willing to work with staff to redesign the sign. They explained that originally they were proposing two signs, one at the west end of the project and the other at the east end. They were now proposing only one sign in the middle of the project so there would be less impact on the residential properties to the west.

Staffmember Gordon Sheffield stated the Planning and Zoning Board had reviewed the sign for location and height. He stated the Planning and Zoning Board had questions about the design. Mr. Sheffield showed the Design Review Board some entry features from the shopping center that staff suggested they try to match.

Chair Pete Berzins thought the sign was too tall for eastbound traffic. He confirmed the drop in grade from the original location to the location proposed now was about 8'. He suggested moving the sign farther east. Mr. Sheffield stated that if the sign were moved to the east it would have to be taller to be seen by west bound traffic.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed the location and height had been approved by Planning and Zoning Board.

Chumita Hurd was concerned that if the sign were moved to the east, traffic traveling east would not have enough time to exit the freeway safely.

Boardmember Vince DiBella stated he had been at the Planning and Zoning Board meeting the night this case was discussed. He agreed with that Board that the sign needed to be as unique as the center.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed there would be no electronic message board. He thought the small amount of stone at the base was not enough to anchor such a tall sign. He thought there should be a more substantial anchor. He suggested a wing wall or more stone. He also suggested using the diamond pattern or crown molding from the center. He thought the sign should tie in more with the center architecture.

Boardmember Randy Carter thought the sign was unremarkable. The little pieces of stone did not work. He suggested not having columns, but having a solid base; maybe a curved top; canted stone 25' up with that flared out at the base. He questioned why a shopping

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 1, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

center of this size needed a Freeway Landmark Monument Sign. Staffmember Gordon Sheffield explained that they met the criteria for a regional commercial shopping center along the freeway that is a development on 30 acres or more. Boardmember Carter suggested they blend the architectural features of both sides of Signal Butte.

Chair Pete Berzins was concerned that the spaces allotted for the monument anchors were larger than the center name. He thought the legs were spindly, and the sign did not tie into the center. He was also concerned that the color of the top of the sign was not the same as the color used along the tops of the buildings. He thought a Freeway Landmark Monument Sign should identify the center not the anchors.

Liz Gaston then told the Board they had a revised sign to present to the Board. The Board liked the fact that the revised sign had a larger proportion of the sign devoted to the shopping center name, and the curved top. They did not like the fact that the opening at the base of the sign was even larger than the original.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR05-44 be continued to the July 6, 2005 meeting.

**VOTE:** Passed 4 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** To allow the applicants time to redesign the sign to better incorporate architectural features of the shopping center.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 1, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

### 5. Preliminary Review of Design Review Board cases:

**CASE:** Bed Bath and Beyond  
SWC US 60 and Val Vista

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 32,000 sq. ft. retail building

**DISCUSSION:** Bob Saemisch represented the case.

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Questioned why parking changes direction in Phase 3B

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Suggested using metal grill work at the entry to soften the expanse of glass

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The rest of the center has a higher level of design
- Thought the coining was too much
- Maybe a trellis piece in front

Boardmember Randy Carter:

- The expanse of glass and signage seems very blockish
- The glass area is too large – break up the entry
- Even the large AJ's is more vertical and intimate
- The tile doesn't blend well
- The design does not blend with the elegance of the rest of the center

Tom Bottomly:

- The remainder of the center uses arches well

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 1, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Wood Patel Expansion  
1855 N Stapley

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 10,127 sq. ft. expansion to an existing office building

**DISCUSSION:** Larry Nagaki and Randy Todd represented the case

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- This is their chance to take a plain building and make it shine
- Encourages applicant to use more interesting design elements

Boardmember Randy Carter:

- Suggested they change color
- This building should try to integrate with the interesting building next door

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Would like to see them spice up the building
- Could they do something bolder?
- Floor to ceiling glass is a problem for office use

Tom Bottomly:

- It looks like an addition
- Suggested they step it up, or integrate color changes

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 1, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Comfort Inn & Suites  
651 E Main

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 12,832 sq. ft. hotel

**DISCUSSION:** Mani Subra represented the case

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Rounded corners at the porte cochere don't work
- Wainscoting should be a different material

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The architecture should respect the temple and the historic significance of the area
- Color scheme is too strong
- Too orange
- Different material break at wainscot, esp. on the north elevation facing Main
- Vertical elements between the windows could pop-out
- Combine the roof elements of the porte cochere and the office

Boardmember Randy Carter:

- Update the colors
- Building is too flat
- The north elevation does not work
- Questioned the 3:12 pitch
- Proportional changes
- Smoother cornice
- Vertical elements
- A more artistic touch
- Change the cornice
- Show the "pass-through" area between the hotel and office at the correct height

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 1, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Dobson Plaza  
66 S Dobson

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 7,527 sq. ft. retail building

**DISCUSSION:** Dwayne Griffin and Nate Rogers represented the case

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Why split face only on corners?

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- What is the theme?
- Building sends mixed messages
- Body colors and entries are not good

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Provide photos of existing center
- Too much going on
- Not well proportioned
- Simplify it
- Colors don't harmonize
- Navy blue with peach doesn't work
- Looks like a set
- Pieces not assembled well
- Redesign the entire front

Boardmember Randy Carter:

- Boring
- Colors bad
- Roofs don't compliment the building
- Too blockish
- Looks like 70's or 80's
- Proportions of columns, roofs and windows don't work
- Look at the Safeway not the Albertson's
- This case will set the precedent for the remodel of the center
- Express the block
- Use integral color
- Maybe cantilevered awnings

Tom Bottomly:

- Slope of hipped roofs a concern
- Proportions are very odd; why not 1/3 2/3
- Use of material and where it is used
- Too much going on

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 1, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Recker Office  
1314 N Recker

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

**DISCUSSION:** Gary Johnson represented the case.

Boardmember Randy Carter:

- All four sides are the same
- Boring
- Why 2:12 pitch?

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Where is the entry?
- Doesn't feel like an office
- Needs variety
- Why floor to ceiling windows for an office?
- Feels like retail
- Don't be afraid to use color

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Major entry should be more prominent
- How does lobby work?

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Street side needs to pop
- Too much glass
- Break up elevations
- Desks go up against windows

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- No direction
- There should be a street side
- Where is the entrance?
- Darker color at wainscot level
- Reveals intersect through stone

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 1, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Lindsay Groves Market Place  
SWC McKellips & Lindsay

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 72,458 sq. ft. retail project

**DISCUSSION:** Maeve Johnson and Russ Watson represented the case.

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Could entry feature be wider?

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Bring a sample of screen material to next meeting

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Make roof element come out farther
- Colors 5 & 6 are very similar need to be separated on building or be more variety

Boardmember Randy Carter:

- Concerned with metal screen
- Very small entry elevation needs to project out 3'
- The trellis work sits back from the column
- Show the score lines

Tom Bottomly:

- Asymmetry is very interesting

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 1, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Sautee Restaurant  
Dana Park Village

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 6,806 sq. ft. restaurant

**DISCUSSION:** Rauf Moosavi represented the case.

Boardmember Randy Carter:

- Concerned with how brick will look through the stucco
- Provide more benches or maybe a screen wall with seating
- Provide screen wall so children won't run onto Val Vista

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 1, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Wienerschnitzel  
S of SEC Higley & Southern

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 2,000 sq. ft. fast food restaurant with drive-through

**DISCUSSION:** Jesse Macias and Patrick Busser represented the case.

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Doesn't like the round "corporate" awning

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Four sided tower should be taller
- Striped awnings are signage
- Trash dumpster location is very bad

Boardmember Randy Carter:

- Turning maneuver very concerning
- Striped awnings is bad
- Awnings should be longer, beyond the window, and come down farther
- No round awning
- Tower needs to be taller
- Wants cap above the stone
- West elevation too flat
- Pilasters on east and west elevations
- Roof the entry tower with a single arch, not the intersecting pieces of arches

Tom Bottomly:

- Revise the awnings

## MINUTES OF THE JUNE 1, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** QuikTrip  
14715 S Power

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

**DISCUSSION:** Craig Boswell represented the case and said this is the same as University and Extension.

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Doesn't like the emulated EIFS trying to match scored block
- Do something completely different at entrance

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- These buildings are nice but we've seen too many of them
- Take the tile off rear and do something different at the entrance
- Very long and linear

Boardmember Randy Carter:

- Why such long windows when they are filled with the backside of candy racks?
- Maybe a curved metal entrance

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 1, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta  
Planning Assistant

da