

**CITY OF MESA**  
**MINUTES OF THE**  
**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**  
**SPECIAL MEETING**  
**December 18, 2002**

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Planning Division Conference Room, 55 North Center, at 9:05 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Carie Allen

John O'Hara

John Poulsen

Rob Burgheimer

Randy Carter

Jillian Hagen

Laura Hyneman

Debbie Archuleta

Charlie Scully

Susan Stewart

Rich Sinnard

S.G. Ellison

Joe Barretta

John Reddell

Steve Harmon

MEMBERS ABSENT

Tara Plese (excused)

1. Call to Order:

Chair Carie Allen called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

2. Design Review Case:

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 18, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR02-62**                      **CVS Pharmacy**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**              Guadalupe and Crismon  
**REQUEST:**                              Approval of a 13,013 sq. ft. drug store  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**                District 6  
**OWNER:**                                 Ron Walker  
**APPLICANT:**                         Susan Stewart, L.E.A.D.S  
**ARCHITECT:**                          Richard Sinnard

**REQUEST:**              Approval of a 13,013 sq. ft. drug store

**SUMMARY:**              Susan Stewart, Richard Sinnard, Joe Barretta and S.G. Ellison represented the case.

Susan Stewart explained the changes that had been made to the elevations since the December 4<sup>th</sup> meeting. She stated that they have been working with the developer for the remainder of the shopping center and that developer will design the center to be compatible with what the Design Review Board approves for the CVS building, so that the two projects will have a unified theme. She explained that the landscape plan had been enhanced. She stated that they had tried to address each of the Board's concerns. They had increased the height of the wainscot to approximately 3'-4". The vestibule had been redesigned; they brought the arch in, the wrapped it with stone. They framed the vestibule, so there is a 6" difference between the plains, they hung metal awnings on the building sides. They removed the squares of stone and created columns with the stone leading up the building; the columns would be 1-1/2 feet out. The upper portion of the building was thickened, and was popped-out 8" with the columns 6". They introduced another color. The wall packs would be replaced with a lantern style, and the light shines down but not up. They were proposing two versions of the entry vestibule. Option A breaks up the roof line by stepping up the parapet at the vestibule. Option B does not.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed that the applicant's preference was Option B. The applicant explained that reason was that they did not want the parapet to be any larger, and they felt the break didn't seem to have any real purpose. They wanted a classic look. She stated that they could paint the recessed area the new darker color being proposed to tie in with the other recessed areas on the building.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated that he liked the inset in the darker color; he felt that painting the inset on the entry would help to highlight it. He appreciated the fact that they had tried to address the Board's concerns. He felt that this proposal was much better than the original proposal. He was going to make comments based on Option B because he actually preferred Option A; however, he did not want to design their building. He felt they had addressed the Board's concerns.

Boardmember Randy Carter preferred Option A. He felt that it identified the entrance. He felt that either one worked. He did want to see the darker paint for the inset. He warned the applicants that may be required to redesign the handicap ramp. He was concerned that Solid Waste would require them to include a double trash enclosure, which would change their site plan.

Boardmember John Poulsen thanked CVS for responding to the Board's concerns.

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 18, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Jillian Hagen stated she preferred Option B with the darker color in the recessed area.

Boardmember Carter confirmed the applicant had broken up the screen wall along Crismon.

Susan Stewart stated that when they submit the phasing drawing, they would include the 5' temporary landscape strip and 6" extruded curb around their property.

Vice Chair John O'Hara confirmed the "Jamesoro Gold" would be the new color. He liked the colors. He preferred Option B.

Boardmember Randy Carter wondered if it was possible to get color elevations that are closer to the actual paint samples than they have been getting.

Chair Carie Allen felt that the revised elevations were much better than the original. She thanked the applicant for their hard work. She felt that they were setting a good precedent for the area. She also preferred Option B.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen asked if the applicant would provide a meandering edge to the turf along Crismon.

Susan Stewart answered that the turf is existing, and she did not know if they were allowed to change it. They would be willing to change it if allowed.

**MOTION:** It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Randy Carter that DR02-62 be approved as presented December 18, 2002, with the following conditions

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the revised site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below. The applicant may use either Option A or Option B.
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. **Extend the landscape median on the west side of the building at the drive-thru lane so as to improve traffic flow in this area and to provide more landscape screening for the service area at the rear of the building. Submit revised plan to Design Review staff for review and approval prior to submittal of construction documents to the Building Safety Division.**
6. **Steel bollards at the building corners and at the drive-thru canopy should be painted to match the building in one of the colors as specified and not the bright yellow shown on the elevations.**
7. **Screen walls need to be revised on the site plan to allow some variation in plan at intervals of fifty (50) feet with either staggered sections or curved walls. Show this on revised site plan for Design Review approval prior to submitting construction documents to Building Safety division.**

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 18, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

8. **Provide a revised site plan for temporary phasing of corner parcel showing all required temporary improvements, including continuous concrete curb, minimum five (5) foot landscape strip along the undeveloped edge, and any temporary retention basins integrated into the site layout. Submit revised plan for temporary improvements to Design Review staff for review and approval prior to submittal of construction documents to the Building Safety Division.**
9. 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. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
10. 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.
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 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. 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 (poles) for pad sites are to match the light standards used within the shopping center.
13. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
14. 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 Board felt that the revised elevations with conditions were well-designed and a significant improvement over the original proposal.

Recorded on Tape No.: SP143-1 (side A)

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 18, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE NUMBER: 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 a 20,449 sq. ft. office/warehouse project

**SUMMARY:** John Reddell and Steve Harman represented the case.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman explained that DR02-64 was a new case. This project was located within "The Commons Industrial Park" which requires administrative approval by the Design Review Planner, and review by "The Commons" architectural review panel. This project received administrative approval in July 2002; however, when the actual construction drawings were completed the size of the buildings went from just under 20,000 sq. ft. to 20,449 which requires Design Review Board approval. She explained that the business fabricates and distributes metal roofing and siding products. This building would showcase their materials. In order to meet the Design Guideline requirements for metal buildings the architect incorporated masonry elements into the design of the building. She explained that staff was concerned with the choice of tree species, especially along the west property line adjacent to residential. She had also asked for additional variation of tree species along the side property lines.

John Reddell stated that the association had requested an additional tree at the trash enclosure and they asked for the front wall on either side of the building to be raised to 8'. Mr. Reddell explained that BEMO USA is a metal product business that is a division of Kovak Roofs. They wanted to showcase the material. There would not be any manufacturing of the metal at this site. The metal would be shipped in, in rolls; there would only be a rolling press inside the building. The building is used mainly for storage of the material to be rolled. The building would be center scored block, galvalume and siding system. All the building materials would be natural; they would not be shiny, they would weather. Regarding the warehouse building, the top of the screen wall along the west property line is approximately 14' higher than their finished pad. There would be certain sections of the building that would stand out. They used the rounded/arched roof and high windows to add architectural interest.

Vice Chair John O'Hara confirmed that the buildings would be shades of gray. The applicant would be using integral block and galvalume. He liked the architecture of the building. He confirmed that the use should be quiet. There would be no stamping or pounding of equipment; the flat metal would be rolled through a press. There would be no dust or vibration.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was concerned that the trucks not drive along Val Vista. It was determined that the logical truck route would be Greenfield. It is also possible to enter the area from Virginia to the north.

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 18, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Jillian Hagen was concerned that the colors were so monochromatic. She would prefer to see more depth in the building through the use of colors. She was concerned with the way the trees were proposed: one type of tree in straight rows. She wanted to see groupings and mixtures of trees. She was concerned with the use of Sweet Acacia as a screening tree. She felt that it was too short to be used as a screening tree and would be more effective as an accent tree.

John Reddell explained that there are very specific requirements for the placement of trees along the west property line. There is a row of trees 20' on center on the other side of the canal, and they were required to plant their trees 20' on center off-set from the existing trees.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that due to the requirements for landscaping along the west property line, any groupings would need to be accomplished with additional trees, or possibly staggering.

Boardmember Hagen felt that they could stagger in and out of the retention area. Her biggest concern was the use of only one tree species along each property line.

Boardmember John Poulsen was concerned with the height and color of the building. He confirmed that the building was 35' at the tallest point, it was setback 184' from the closest point on the west property line, and it sits below the canal 14'. He confirmed that the building would be gray cmu with gray/silver galvalume siding, which is recessed. He understood that this building is in an industrial subdivision, it's below the canal, and he felt that the trees should be an adequate buffer.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt that what they had done with the manufacturing area was nice. He would like to see some color added to the front, office portion of the building. He suggested using red mullions. He understood that they were already in Plan Review and had received administrative approval for the building.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer felt that the colors were acceptable since it was a manufacturing building. His concern was why the building was 35' tall.

Steve Harman explained that they would have an overhead crane inside the building, and they needed as much hook height as they could get. He stated that at this height their hook height was only 20'-6". They need to be able to pick up the bundles and place on flat bed trucks. He confirmed that the building was occupying type F2 and the construction type 5N (non-combustible).

John Reddell explained that the roof varies from 30' to 35' at the top of the bow. The crane has to sit below the eave section and it has a rail it sits on. He confirmed that the air conditioning would be evap coolers that roll around inside. They did not want to cool the entire building so the coolers roll around with the worker. Boardmember Burgheimer was concerned that if the building were sold in the future the new owners would add mechanical equipment to the roof. He wanted to ensure that if units were added in the future they would be properly screened.

Mr. Harmon stated adding roof-mounted equipment would cause structural problems.

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 18, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by John Poulsen 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.
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 landscaping plan:**
  - a. **Use the Sweet Acacia as accent trees and use another fuller tree for screening.**
  - b. **Use additional trees to create groupings or; stagger the trees.**
  - c. **Tree quantities along the east property line should be at least one tree per 25' of street frontage.**
5. All screening trees along the west property line to be 24" box.
6. Raise masonry wall to 8' high along its eastern side.
7. 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. 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 Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
11. 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.
12. Light standards (poles) for pad sites are to match the light standards used within the shopping center.
13. 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.
14. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
15. 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 DECEMBER 18, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**VOTE:** Passed 6 - 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The Board felt that the building was fairly well designed for the use.

Recorded on Tape No.: SP143-1 (side A)

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta  
Planning Assistant

DA