

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CITY OF MESA**  
**MINUTES OF THE**  
**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**  
**MARCH 5, 2008**

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Utility Building, Community Room, 640 North Mesa Drive, at 3:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Tim Nielsen - Chair  
Wendy LeSueur – Vice Chair  
Tom Bottomley  
Robert Burgheimer  
Delight Clark  
Craig Boswell

MEMBERS ABSENT

Vince DiBella (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

Lesley Davis  
John Wesley  
Mia Lozano Helland  
Jeff Conkle  
Debbie Archuleta  
Joy Spezeski  
Jennifer Gniffke  
Rob Dmohowski  
Jessica Gore  
Jerry Fannin  
Kevin Kerbo  
John Kuhn  
Curtis Chong  
Al Robinson  
Kent Dounay

Keith Paul  
Dean Pisciotta  
Holly Forden  
Thaumas Ehrl  
Eric Williams  
Adam Vaurhltz  
Mark Howmrad  
Geoffrey Cox  
Greg Hitchens  
Ralph Pew  
Mike Scarbrugh  
Jeff Malmstone  
Geraldo Cook  
Spencer Arnett  
Others

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

### 1. Work Session:

**CASE:** Residence Inn  
10000 block of East Hampton

**REQUEST:** Review of 136 unit, 6 – story hotel

### **DISCUSSION:**

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Likes the stone at the pedestrian scale
- End elevations are the same; he liked the 5' recess
- The gray could be warmer to be more harmonious with the rest of the paint palette

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Replace the pink oleander with something that better complements the building

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Montecito Apartments  
307 S Hawes

**REQUEST:** Review of a 214-unit apartment complex

**DISCUSSION:**

- The tunnel effect of the box canyons has been improved
- Need to break up the blank wall at the north elevation
- Add some windows to the blank elevations
- What will the parking canopy design look like? They will be seen from the street and will be very prominent
- Take a second look at the colors. The light color will look like unpainted concrete.
- The colors look muddy
- Either use less stone materials or eliminate them completely
- The arches at the third floor windows should be changed to match the others.
- What is the view from within the complex? Elevations do not depict the entry areas to the individual units.

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Cracker Barrel  
NWC Signal Butte & Hampton

**REQUEST:** Review of a 12,192 sq. ft. restaurant

### **DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Delight Clark:

- Likes the revised colors

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- Concerned there may not be enough shade

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Galvalume roof is better
- Appreciates their changes
- All roof top equipment must be fully screened

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- The parapet appears thin, could they add more mass?

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Brakes Plus at Parkwood Ranch  
1106 S Signal Butte

**REQUEST:** Review of a 4,800 sq. ft. brake facility

**DISCUSSION:**

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- The materials are nice and rich

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Looks good
- Appreciates the orientation of the bay doors

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Offices at Parkwood Ranch  
NEC Southern & Crismon

**REQUEST:** Review of nine office buildings totaling 62,375 sq. ft.

**DISCUSSION:**

There was no one present to represent the case

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Navy Federal Credit Union  
4212 E Juanita

**REQUEST:** Review of a 4,030 sq. ft. financial institution

### **DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- Make sure the mechanical units are all completely screened
- Liked the perspective

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- There is a lot of south facing glass
- Likes the brick
- Brick is very expensive could it be better detailed so they get more for their money?
- Could do struck joints
- The windows should be a nicer element
- Should pull out the arc to create more of an overhang
- Could vary the height of the roof line and walls
- A combination of bark face and velour face brick would be very dramatic

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Could the canopy be one long arc like at the building
- Bring the gray thing out to shade the windows
- On the right elevation, the arc should look like one element that penetrates the building
- Liked the perspective more than the elevation
- Likes the "shoji screen" affect
- The struts should mimic the "shoji screen" look
- Would like an additional color of brick
- The base of the pole should be more substantial

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Could the sign be moved so it doesn't cover the glass clerestory
- Could do some rowlock
- This could be an outstanding building with a little revision

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Very interesting
- Work with the overhangs to shade the glass
- Landscaping needs drama at the building
- Palo Verde is fine
- Replace the palm
- The landscaping should provide drama to match the building

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Health South Rehab  
NWC 56 Street & Baseline

**REQUEST:** Review of a 48,309 sq. ft. rehab hospital

### **DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The angle of the awning seems strange
- Not in favor of tilt for this project
- If they do want tilt use integral concrete rather than trying to cover it up
- Need to make a decision to use one material or the other

Tom Bottomley:

- The scale of the awning looks heavy; raise the awning slightly, one foot
- EIFS would look warmer and softer
- Tilt will look industrial
- Awnings need to be pre-finished
- The metal decking looks weak; make it a design element; it would be better in EIFS
- If they use metal decking should match building

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Enhance the design with reveals
- Show details of reveals on the follow-up submittal

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Warehouse Addition  
5524 E Baseline

**REQUEST:** Review of a 9,059 sq. ft. warehouse addition to an existing office use

**DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Provide an elevation from Baseline that includes the existing office

Boardmember Tom Bottomley;

- Stark
- Needs a 4-sided parapet
- Could the scale be brought down 3' to 4'

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Lowe's  
SWC Country Club & Kiowa

**REQUEST:** Review of a 137,933 sq. ft. home improvement store with a 31,179 sq. ft. garden center

### **DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Finish the back of the parapet
- Double arch doesn't look supported
- Likes the new colors

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Left side of north elevation is weak
- Should not look like a "set"
- Concerned with screening of the garden center
- Concerned with parking lot landscaping; the planters appear too small for plants to survive
- Show dimensions of planters on the follow-up submittal
- You can't make that planter work with a standard size parking stall
- The landscape buffer seems very barren
- Mechanical units are popping up; penthouse them rather than raising the height of the roof line

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- The rear of the parapet needs to be finished above the roof line

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Garden center sign appears to be floating
- Likes the new colors; burgundy is nicer than the red
- Texas rangers won't work in parking lot
- For the landscape buffer could use more trees and fewer shrubs
- At least 50% more trees

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Wachovia Bank  
2009 N Stapley

**REQUEST:** Review of a 3,988 sq. ft. bank with drive thru tellers

### **DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Likes elements of the building, but there may be too much going on for such a small building
- Could be simplified
- Colors are nice
- ATM will need shade
- ATM should be better integrated with the tower
- Maybe remove the pilasters
- Recessed windows are fine but simplify them and just recess them
- Show light fixtures on the follow up submittal

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- The teller canopy seems heavy
- Doesn't want the window frames to be the same as the block color
- Be careful using green it is a very strong color
- ATM needs a shade element

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Power Ranch  
6927 E Pecos

**REQUEST:** Review of three industrial buildings, totaling 236,240 sq. ft.

### **DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Delight Clark:

- Likes the materials

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- Internal drains are good
- Need more details of the reveals and how much the building steps in and out

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Could they do some mounding and berming?
- Likes the materials

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The plans and elevations need to be at the same scale
- Look at light fixtures to enhance the building

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

2. Call to Order:

Chair Tim Nielsen called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the February 6, 2008 Meeting:

On a motion by Craig Boswell seconded by Delight Clark the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

4. Design Review Cases:

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR08-09    McKellips Office**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 2554 E. McKellips Road  
**REQUEST:** Approval of a 1,877 sq. ft. office building  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 1  
**OWNER:** Spencer Arnett  
**APPLICANT:** Indigo Fox Designs  
**ARCHITECT:** Sunghoun Kim  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Mia Lozano-Helland

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 1,877 sq. ft. office building

**SUMMARY:** Chair Tim Nielsen abstained and turned the meeting over to Boardmember Rob Burgheimer.

Boardmember Craig Boswell stated the building is too tall, and asked if they could do a basement.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley stated as he remembered, the comments from the previous meeting were to break up the stripiness of the building and revise the mass. Instead they seem to have gone back to the original design. The building is still too tall and too vertical. He stated they needed to think out of the box. He thought they needed to divide the building and get away from the "chalet" looking front. He thought there was too much gingerbread tacked onto the building. The gable roof treatment is boring. He thought a parapet design would be better than the long gable. He suggested breaking the building into 1/3 and 2/3 proportions or 2/3 and 1/3; recessing windows, using simple blocked forms; and an additional color. He suggested wrapping the two entry features like a covered porch. He said it was a contemporary building with rustic elements tacked onto it. He suggested they vary the windows and recess them; maybe cover some windows. He was concerned the trellis would not shade the south elevation. The building lacks character.

Boardmember Craig Boswell would prefer a single story building. He thought the site was too small for the height, and the scale was too much for the footprint.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the design professional should be at the meetings, there seemed to be a disconnect between what the Board was saying and what was being rendered. He thought the issues were: scale and proportion, and how they were handling individual elements. He agreed the building would be better if it were a single level. The slight pitch of the roof and the very pitched entry feature did not work together. He suggested they look at the windows; do they have the same function? Vary the windows, why are they all the same size if the mezzanine is only half of the second floor? The height of the glazing seems to be driving the 50/50 proportion of the building. It is a very small building; don't put a lot of "things" on it. The building is too symmetrical; it should be Asymmetrical, but balanced. He thought the color was very bright, which was not helping the proportions. He suggested a dark base, with medium accent colors above that and a light color at the top; however he cautioned them to be careful not to make it stripy. The

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

storefront seems too tall for the building size.

Boardmember Delight Clark stated she did not know how they could design a 2-story building on such a small site and have it be in scale. She thought the roof and the entry element needed to be more *cohesive or complementary*.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Clark Boswell and seconded by Delight Clark that DR08-09 be continued to March 13, 2008:

**VOTE:** Passed 4 – 0

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

**CASE #: DR08-12 Circle K**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 2030 West Southern Ave.  
**REQUEST:** Approval of a Convenience Store/Fueling Station  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 3  
**OWNER:** Circle K  
**APPLICANT:** 3K1 Consulting Services, Inc  
**ARCHITECT:** A&S Engineering, Inc.  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Mia Lozano-Helland

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 4,450 sq. ft. convenience store with a 5,458 sq. ft. gas canopy

**SUMMARY:** a Boardmember removed this case from the consent agenda due to a conflict

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Delight Clark that DR08-12 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. Screen parking and drive aisles from the street with a masonry wall to be reviewed and approved by staff.
  - b. Provide elevations and gate details including material and colors for the trash enclosure.
  - c. Provide elevations, materials and color of proposed site wall.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
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 green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
5. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
6. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

**VOTE:** Passed 4 – 0 – 1 (Boardmember Boswell abstained)

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

**CASE #: DR08-13 Sun Valley Plaza**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 7464 East Main Street  
**REQUEST:** Approval of an office/retail building  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 5  
**OWNER:** Main & Sossaman LLC  
**APPLICANT:** Gerald M. Cook  
**ARCHITECT:** Gerald M. Cook  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Jeff Conkle

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 8,947 sq. ft. office/retail building

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

**MOTION:** It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Craig Boswell that DR08-13 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.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
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 green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0

## MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

### Other Business:

Review of a multi-family project south of Broadway, across from Reed Park

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer questioned why they were using stone. He suggested using that money to create more massing, and use varied colors to make stucco work. Maybe a modern building. Vary the plane and the roof parapet. It is a box, but it can still be a very good box. He questioned whether they could get relief from the parking requirements so they could shift some buildings and make the project more interesting.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought the color was too bright. He suggested not using the pop out on every window. He thought the building needed variety; treat the windows differently. May shed forms instead of hipped. Could they do one color palette for two of the building and another palette for the third?

Chair Tim Nielsen suggested the buildings shift. Could they park a half level down then build on top of the parking?

Lesley Davis and John Wesley updated the Board on the Falcon Field design guidelines by. There was discussion of a future meeting between the Design Review Board and Falcon Field staff.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta  
Planning Assistant

da