

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

JULY 2, 2003

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

Carie Allen - Chair (arrived at 3:52)
John Poulsen Vice-Chair
Robert Burgheimer (arrived at 3:54)
Randy Carter
Vince DiBella
Peter Berzins

MEMBERS ABSENT

Jillian Hagen (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman
Lesley Davis
Debbie Archuleta
Charlie Scully
Richard Dyer
Steve Peters
Dave Schukai
Steve Helffrich
Jim Vallas
David Kincaid

Bob Saemisch
Art Jordan
Bill Hunse
Tim Becker
Mike Richey
Emily Stowe
Others

1. Call to Order:

Acting Chair John Poulsen called the meeting to order at 3:42 p.m.

2. Introduction of new Boardmembers

New Boardmembers Pete Berzins and Vince DiBella introduced themselves

3. Election of officers

Randy Carter nominated Carie Allen as Chair and John Poulsen as Vice-Chair.

The vote was unanimous.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the June 4, 2003 Meeting as revised:

On a motion by John Poulsen seconded by Peter Berzins the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

3. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE JULY 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR02-64	BEMO
LOCATION/ADDRESS:	3062 N. Maple St.
REQUEST:	Approval of an office building with a related manufacturing/ warehouse building
COUNCIL DISTRICT:	5
OWNER:	Bluewater Group
APPLICANT:	Reddell Architects
ARCHITECT:	John Reddell

REQUEST: Approval of an addition to a manufacturing/warehouse building

SUMMARY: John Reddell represented the case. He explained the project had been previously approved, they were asking for an expansion. The office was under construction. He explained the building from the nearest point would be 80' from the property line. There was a 25' setback from the property to the canal. The canal was approximately 35' wide with a 15' setback on the west side. He stated the closest residence would be 100' or so away from that. They would be using the same building materials as previously approved. There was a 12' wall and landscaping along the canal right-of-way. This applicant had previously been required to increase the number of trees along their west property line and along the east side of the retention along the back. He stated the addition would be used for storage of raw materials.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed the building would be constructed of the BEMO fluted metal material.

Boardmember Pete Berzins confirmed the office building was approximately 80% complete.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed staff wanted the Shoestring Acacia replaced with Mesquite. He wanted to make sure the landscaping submitted to Building Safety would show Mesquite.

Chair Carie Allen asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak regarding this project. No one came forward.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that the Board needed to remove condition 6 from the staff report if unless they wanted the applicant to use a different building material or color.

The Board confirmed the office building under construction was the gray block shown on the color board. The building would not be the tan shown on the color elevation.

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Pete Berzins that DR02-64 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 JULY 2, 2003 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. **Revise site plan:**
 - **Reconfigure southwest corner of the drive aisle west of the building to provide a 25' wide landscape planter as required by Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance.**
5. **Revise landscaping plan:**
 - a. **Replace about 50% of the "Sissoo" trees on the north and south property lines with "Sweet Acacia" and "Evergreen Elm".**
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
9. 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. Light standards shall be a maximum height of 14' within 50' of the property line when adjacent to residential property.
10. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
11. Provide two half size color elevations, 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 6 – 0

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

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE JULY 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-30 **Webb Distributing**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 3457 East Main
REQUEST: Approval of a 36,276 sq. ft. sales building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: Webb Distributing
APPLICANT: **Jeff Swan, Swan Architects, Inc.**
ARCHITECT: **Jeff Swan, Swan Architects, Inc.**

REQUEST: Approval of a 36,276 sq. ft. sales building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR03-30 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 all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
5. **Maximum difference between two properties shall not exceed two feet. Verify that existing masonry wall height is not less than 6' measured on the residential side of the wall when final grading is complete.**
6. **Provide 15' wide foundation base on the north side of the building.**
7. **Monument signage to be approved by Design Review staff.**
8. The exterior light sources shall be shielded on side adjacent to residential property and shall comply with Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance.
9. Light standards (poles) maximum height is 25' in the interior of development, 20' within 50' of the perimeter; except when adjacent to residential development maximum height shall not exceed 14' within 50' of the property line.
10. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
11. Provide two half size color elevations, 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 6 – 0

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

MINUTES OF THE JULY 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

CASE #: DR03-48 **Krispy Kreme**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 6622-B E Superstitions Springs
REQUEST: Approval of a 4,248 sq. ft. doughnut shop with drive-through
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Superstition Springs Investors Ltd. Partnership
APPLICANT: Scott Tieken
ARCHITECT: Scott Tieken, Faust Howell Associates

REQUEST: Continue the case to the August 6, 2003 meeting

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

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR03-48 be continued to the August 6, 2003 meeting

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The applicant requested additional time to revise the elevations.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE JULY 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR03-38 be continued to the August 6, 2003 meeting

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: To allow the applicant time to address the Board's concerns.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE JULY 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-39 **Higley Retail Shops**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 3450 N Higley
REQUEST: Approval of 10,000 sq. ft. multi-tenant retail shops
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: 3450 N Higley L.L.C.
APPLICANT: Paul Almond
ARCHITECT: Paul Almond

REQUEST: The case be tabled.

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

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR03-39 be tabled.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The applicant requested additional time to explore different options.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE JULY 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-49 **Greco Office Complex**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: The 7500 block of East Broadway Road
REQUEST: Design Review Board approval for two-building office development.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Louis Greco
APPLICANT: Vince DiBella
ARCHITECT: Vince DiBella, Saemisch-DiBella Architects

REQUEST: Approval of two 7,837 sq. ft. office buildings

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda because the applicant is a new Boardmember. Vince DiBella recused himself from all discussion and voting. Bob Saemisch was present to represent the case. The Board had no comments regarding the project.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-49 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 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. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
5. **Replace wood fence along property line with minimum six (6) foot high masonry wall.**
6. **Retention basins to be installed as per Chapter 15 requirements with irregular contouring and integrated landscaping. Retaining walls may be incorporated into the basin design, as per ordinance, to allow adequate volume.**
7. **The landscaping along the east property boundary is adequate as shown with the consideration of existing plants on the abutting property.**
8. 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.
9. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
10. Provide two half size color elevations, 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.

MINUTES OF THE JULY 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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

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

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE JULY 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-50 **Augusta Ranch Market Place**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC Crismon and Baseline
REQUEST: Approval of a 11.53 acre shopping center
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: A.R. Development
APPLICANT: A & C Properties Inc.
ARCHITECT: Design Plus Architectural Ltd.

REQUEST: Approval of an 11.53 acre shopping center

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

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR03-50 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 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 sites are to be individually owned in the future.
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, 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 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is compatible with commercial development in Augusta Ranch.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE JULY 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-51 **Maytag**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 300 West Southern
REQUEST: Approval of a 61,491 sq. ft. warehouse/office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: O'Lonely Enterprises Inc.
APPLICANT: Architectural Team Three
ARCHITECT: Architectural Team Three

REQUEST: Approval of a 61,490 sq. ft. warehouse/office building

SUMMARY: Bill Hunse and Jim Vallas represented the case. Mr. Hunse stated they had met with neighbors and the neighbors liked the building.

Boardmember John Poulsen felt the building looked nice, his only concern was this use in this location. He suggested stepping the walls on the east beyond the truck doors.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt the building would look better built than it did as rendered. He confirmed that the squares on the north elevation would be a reverse in texture, and the building in front was built of masonry. He agreed with staff's concerns about the blankness of the west wall and the need for landscaping along the west property line. He wanted some vertical articulation on the west elevation.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed the aggregate would be standard mix, sand blasted. He confirmed the roof drains would be internal. He felt the horizontal bands accentuate the horizontality of the buildings. He was concerned with the flatness of the building. He felt the building was too industrial looking for this area. He suggested doing a vertical inset on the west elevation. He felt the building needed to be softened with color, texture, and materials. He stated the building was a very large box and it needed to be articulated. He suggested they look at the Staples and the Best Buy at Alma School and Southern. He suggested adding a panel wall along the west.

Boardmember Pete Berzins felt that vertical elements would only accentuate the size of the building.

Boardmember Randy Carter was concerned with the top portion of the building, which would be visible to traffic along Country Club. He felt the 36' height and 306' length would be a very visible presence in the area.

Chair Carie Allen was concerned with the industrial look of the building in a residential and retail area.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR03-51 be continued to the August 6, 2003 meeting.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 1 (Vince DiBella voting nay)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: To allow the applicant time to redesign the project.

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

MINUTES OF THE JULY 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-53 **CSK Auto**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2707 South Ellsworth
REQUEST: Approval of a 7,000 sq. ft. auto retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: AR Development
APPLICANT: TRK Architecture
ARCHITECT: Martin Umberger

REQUEST: Approval of a 7,000 sq. ft. auto retail building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR03-53 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 all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. **The landscaping plan needs to be revised to incorporate a minimum of two additional trees along the arterial street to comply with section 11-15-3(A) of the Zoning Ordinance.**
5. **Any existing landscaping that is not thriving shall be replaced and any existing landscaping that may conflict with line-of-sight requirements will be relocated to a nearby location that does not pose a conflict.**
6. **The location of any freestanding signs must be in compliance with the approved Comprehensive Sign Plan for "Ellsworth Crossing" (BA00-50). The design of the freestanding sign must be enhanced and comply with section 11-14-3(E) of the City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance. Details of the revised sign design to be approved by Design Review Staff.**
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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

MINUTES OF THE JULY 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

of the Zoning Ordinance.

10. 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. **Maximum light standard height for new fixtures located within 50' of residential uses shall be 14'.**
11. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
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 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is compatible with commercial development in Augusta Ranch.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE JULY 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

8. Provide two half size color elevations, 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 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is well designed and a nice change to their prototype.

Recorded on Tape No.: 2 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE JULY 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-55 **Wal-Mart Neighborhood Market**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2858 South Hawes
REQUEST: Approval of 39,690 sq. ft. grocery store
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Patrick McGroder, Hawes and Guadalupe Ltd. Partn.
APPLICANT: Enda Melvin
ARCHITECT: Chris Rhea

REQUEST: Approval of a 39,690 sq. ft. grocery store

SUMMARY: Steve Peters, Enda Melvin and Dave Schukai represented the case. Mr. Peters stated they had taken their design theme from the development at Sossaman and Guadalupe. They were using a tile roof, and they added more EFIS along the front and sides, they added EFIS between the pilasters, and added pilasters. The colors were darker and redder. They added cultured stone.

Boardmember John Poulsen felt the building was generally attractive. He suggested raising the corner and changing the entry and the roof. He suggested using a covered walkway to the entrance to the building.

Boardmember Vince DiBella was generally in support of the building.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer did not feel there had been enough change from the others. He did not think this building was as elegant as previous submittals. He did not like the mission/bell tower piece. He felt they needed to go in a different direction. He thought the elements were competing. He wanted them to look at the totality of the building design.

Boardmember Pete Berzins felt the roof lines need to change. He wanted to see the previously approved stores.

Boardmember Randy Carter did not like the mission tower element. He prefers the standing seam metal roof. He was concerned that the cap on the top of the dark (wainscot) element starts and stops as it moves around the building. He suggested abandoning the metal canopy and having a covered walkway in the middle of the front elevation. On the left elevation, the "tower element" was too short. He felt the towers were too squat. He felt the corner element at the drive through entrance area needed to be raised to break-up the roofline.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer felt the building had the appearance of being a big box with things stuck onto it. It needed to be broken up with forms.

Chair Carie Allen felt this building was too busy, and needed a general theme. She felt the elements don't relate to each other.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR03-55 be continued to the August 6, 2003 meeting.

MINUTES OF THE JULY 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: To allow the applicant time to revise the elevations.

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

MINUTES OF THE JULY 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-57 **Guadalupe Station**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Guadalupe & Ellsworth
REQUEST: Approval of a 9,240 sq. ft. retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Southern DEVCO
APPLICANT: Steve Helfrich
ARCHITECT: Steve Helfrich

REQUEST: Approval of a 9,240 sq. ft. retail building

SUMMARY: This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually. Staffmember Laura Hyneman read two additional conditions that were added after the Board received their packets.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR03-57 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 all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Trim color to be either Benjamin Moore #451 or Benjamin Moore #458. Color selection to be approved by project architect, Steve Helfrich and property owner, Southern Devco.
5. Landscaping plan to match the landscaping plan approved with the administrative approval attached to Design Review Board case DR03-08.
6. Replace tree and shrub species shown on the landscaping plan between Ellsworth Road and the parking lot with trees and shrubs identified in the approved Design Guidelines for "Southeast Corner Ellsworth Roads and Guadalupe Road". Revised landscaping plan to be approved by the Design Review staff.
7. 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.
8. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
9. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set 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 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE JULY 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE JULY 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-58 **Coyote Landing**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: Northeast of NEC of Southern & Crismon
REQUEST: Approval of a 256 unit apartment complex
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Quail Run Apartments
APPLICANT: Broadbent & Associates
ARCHITECT: Tom O'Neill

REQUEST: Approval of a 256 unit apartment complex

SUMMARY: David Kincaid represented the case and stated they had received the staff report and were willing to meet the conditions with the exception of the treatment of the fascias and the use of concrete crosswalks where pedestrian walkways cross drive aisles. They wanted to stripe it and paint it. Mr. Kincaid confirmed that staff had received revised elevations from the architect. Mr. Kincaid stated that they had made changes from the original product through the Planning and Zoning process, therefore they had taken the project as far as they could go for the type of project that it is.

Boardmember Pete Berzins confirmed that staff requested concrete walkways to better delineate where pedestrians cross the drive aisles.

Boardmember John Poulsen did not feel the Board could adequately evaluate this project based on the submittal from the applicant. There were many questions that were not addressed on the plans. When staff suggested the roof pitch be revised the applicant should not have gone to 4/12 everywhere, they should have gone to 5/12. He did not feel an 8" rough sawn fascia with a 3" shingle mold was acceptable for an apartment complex of this size. He confirmed the plywood would be visible from underneath and would just be painted. He confirmed there would be 16 buildings and 256 units. On the front and back elevations the posts between the railings, from the roofline to the ground are very thin. He felt the elevations had no articulation. He also felt they look like something that was built in the 1970's, and was very bland. He was concerned that they would not endure.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt that low-income shouldn't mean boring; they deserve as much design excellence as you would normally see. Outside the floor plans of the units; he felt the buildings were very large and the only articulation for the building was the four tower-like elements. Without a lot of cost it appeared the balconies could be incorporated into the gable or hipped areas. He wondered why the gables were so low. He felt the sides of the buildings were boring. He stated the site plan made the units appear like barracks. He agreed they looked like they were built in the 70's or earlier. He felt the buildings could be improved without spending much money. He suggested a double gable.

Mr. Kincaid felt the landscaping would buffer the buildings. He stated they had worked through the site planning process to design the site layout.

Boardmember Carter applauded the open space area in the middle of the site, however, the buildings are lined up like box cars so you will see the same elements over and over again. The buildings need to be more articulated, and visually enhanced. He could understand the site plan, although he would have preferred to see buildings going in different directions and

MINUTES OF THE JULY 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

creating courtyards. He believed the elevations needed assistance to bring up the level of design quality. It looked too much like a low-income housing project and he felt people deserve more.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer also had an issue with the site plan; he felt it looked like barrack housing. Why were some cocked and some going straight north/south? As you drive through the project you would see several buildings at a time. Just because they are low income does not mean they have to be bad design. He felt there was a great deal of potential for this project, but this would be very boring. He felt there was an opportunity to add color. He understood they could not spend a lot of money but there needed to be design energy and thought. He felt the clubhouse should be the jewel of the project and it wasn't. He thought there was too much going on, on that building. He suggested using color to enhance the buildings because that wouldn't cost any more.

Mr. Kincaid stated that through the neighborhood participation process the neighbors had stated they did not want color.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that you could use color without using bold color. He wanted to see all of the elevations and how the proposed colors would be used. There was no way to tell from the colored elevations or the color board where the different colors would be used. He understood the mission of the project, but it lacked creativity energy. He felt the north and south sides of the buildings should be different based on solar orientation and views. He felt it would look like row housing. He wanted orientation of the buildings adjusted to make the complex more interesting.

Mr. Kincaid was concerned that they would be required to go back through the Planning and Zoning Board.

Boardmember Burgheimer wanted the fronts and backs to be different. Could they be differentiated by color tone? Maybe the neighbors don't want a lot of color, but the shades could be changed.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated they were proposing three different colors schemes.

Boardmember Randy Carter stated they need to see color elevations that accurately represent where they put the colors. He was concerned that the buildings would be one color with a different color for the pop-outs and the third color for the railings. He wanted the tower elements to be in different colors to break up the elevations.

Boardmember Burgheimer wanted the buildings oriented for solar control and for views of the mountains. He liked the interesting spaces at the angled buildings.

Mr. Kincaid stated they wanted a north/south orientation and they abut the high school so all you would see would be the bleachers.

Boardmember Burgheimer was concerned that when buildings are directly across from each other they create a privacy issue. He did not want the units to look straight into another unit or porch.

Boardmember Vince DiBella agreed the eave lines are too thin, the fascias are too thin. The

MINUTES OF THE JULY 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

pop-outs pinch the fascia and make the whole element look unstable and thin. He felt there were opportunities within the current design that could have made the project better. One suggestion included the use of color; there was a lot of push and pull in the plan that could be enhanced by the color. He agreed with previous comments.

Boardmember Pete Berzins agreed with previous comments. He felt the project looked like row housing, and the three buildings at the north end would be looking directly at the stadium bleachers. He wanted to see variation.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that what they were talking about would not mean spending a lot of money. They were not asking for stone or expensive building materials. They were asking for creativity.

Chair Carie Allen then stated she was not surprised the neighbors did not want bright colors. She understood the desire for north/south orientation. She did feel the buildings need to be improved.

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Pete Berzins that DR03-58 be continued to the August 6, 2003 meeting

He suggested the following:

Rework the site plan so it doesn't look like row housing, and so the residents aren't looking directly at their neighbors, and so the three northern most buildings are not looking directly at the bleachers.

Change the roof pitch back to a 5/12 pitch especially on the gables and hips.

Study the use of colors

Provide a rolled fascia

Address the clubhouse design and tie it into the other buildings

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed needed to be redesigned to provide more creativity and variation.

Recorded on Tape No.: 2 (side B) and Tape No.: 3 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE JULY 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Other Business:

Discussion of DR03-48, Krispy Kreme at 6622-B East Superstition Springs.

Laura Hyneman explained that Krispy Kreme had requested comments from the Board regarding proposed elevations for their site at 6622-B East Superstition Springs. She stated that Bob Bacon was present to discuss the elevations.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed this was a new prototype, one was all EFIS the other was brick. He stated the concern at the previous meeting was that the original proposal was not at the same character level as the other restaurants in that area. He felt they were moving in the right direction. He was not willing to choose between the EFIS or the brick he felt that the material choice was up to applicant. He felt that adding the wainscot and different building materials helped the building. He still thought the building could be more. He wanted the building to express the wonderful product on the inside. He thought the raised portion could pop-out or be a different material so that the building would not be so flat.

Boardmember John Poulsen was concerned that the raised portion was at the rear of the building so the impact would be diminished.

Mr. Bacon felt that the raised element was an attempt to break up the building by stepping up and breaking the roofline.

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested pulling the raised element out and instead of putting the cornice on the top, it could pop-out and the cornice could die into it.

Mr. Bacon suggested that since they were dealing with brick and EFIS they could combine the two and have brick at the bottom for a portion and then have EFIS for a portion.

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested maybe one element is all brick and there are EFIS pieces that come into it. He confirmed the canopies were different from the previous submittal. He felt they were more dynamic.

Chair Carie Allen stated she preferred the brick building, and did not feel that every building needed to have a wainscot.

Mr. Bacon suggested taking the brick up to above the windows, he also suggested changing the color of the brick so there would be more than one color.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that the objections the Board had to the previous building was not that the building was stucco but that there was a lack of character and interest. He felt that using brick was a way to enhance it.

Chair Allen confirmed that the Board did like the brick building.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt the building was still flat. He liked the articulation at the front of the building, but felt the transition at the entrance was awkward. He felt there were

MINUTES OF THE JULY 2, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

opportunities to break up façade in the area where the logo was. They could pop it out one foot and pop it up above the parapet. He agreed they had come a long way from the original proposal but felt they still needed more relief to the straightness of the parapet.

Boardmember Burgheimer agreed the parapet line needed to be broken. He felt the location of the signs was similar to a 50's diner look. He suggested that could be the overall design theme. He felt they could play up the art deco look.

Boardmember Carter felt the building was much better than the original, but he did want articulation at the top of the parapets.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated there was a "ladro grande" brick by Phoenix Brick that is the same size as block and would be more economical than traditional brick.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that the number of signs as presented would exceed the sign code, however she stated the Board could suggest the signs add to the diner feeling of the project so the applicant could justify the additional signage

Boardmember Burgheimer felt the window line was very rigid, he suggested making some windows bigger.

Boardmember Carter confirmed that the area of the building that was raised was the warehouse portion of the building and everything would come in on palettes. He suggested breaking the façade at that location; it could come out or go in. He felt the transition as shown would be awkward.

Mr. Bacon thanked the Board for taking the time to give then direction.

Recorded on Tape No.: 3 (side A)

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant