

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
DECEMBER 7, 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

Tim Nielsen – Acting Chair
Vince DiBella
Tom Bottomley
Robert Burgheimer

MEMBERS ABSENT

Dave Richins (excused)
Pete Berzins (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

Kim Steadman	Don Pratt
Lesley Davis	Trish Flower
Debbie Archuleta	Tim Becker
Mia Lozano Helland	Shawn Clow
John Wesley	Sean Lake
Laura Hyneman	Jeff Kost
Brandice Elliott	Glen Wood
Michael Roth	Ted Watson
Mani Davis	Paul Donovan
Gordon Haws	Gary Brinkley
Dan Brock	Michael Nielsen
Bill Heller	Others
Liz Gaston	

1. Work Session:

CASE: Chili's
1857 S Signal Butte

REQUEST: Approval of a 5,881 sq. ft. restaurant

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Shape close to prototype
- Battered walls match center
- Liked the fanciful nature of the striped awnings
- Likes the disruption of the stone massing

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Agreed the striped awnings were OK

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Was OK with the chili pepper
- Thought the green colors conflict
- Confirmed the forest green is corporate, the olive is from the center
- Could modify the color placement
- Liked the battered walls
- Liked the transom windows
- Forest green is too dark

CASE: 101 Broadway Holdings
South side of Broadway east of Price

REQUEST: Approval of a 9,697 sq. ft. office warehouse building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Liked the integral block
- Arched canopies need more articulation and detail where they engage the columns

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- More articulation of the arches
- Could use red color for trim on arches

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Man doors and roll up doors should be darker
- Look at using red in window frames

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Concern with attached signage
- Agree with concern regarding the arches
- Question on lighting; fixtures should be an element of design

CASE: Mini-storage
W of NWC Brown & Recker

REQUEST: Approval of an 83,513 sq. ft. mini-storage with office and residence

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Too many materials
- Could eliminate the stone and use masonry on the office
- Masonry looks more solid and lasting

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Make sure colors are correct on revised elevations
- Building should be pulled forward
- Too much going on, put attention on the corners

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Storage roof is not a traditional standing seam
- Concerned with different materials on office and storage units; tile roof on office, metal on storage
- Concerned with rear elevations of storage; needs additional detailing
- Could use masonry and add patterning for the office

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Concerned with roof pitch
- Canopy form fights roof line
- Building needs articulation; too blank
- Tile roof choice looks dated
- Lose the stone

CASE: COM Fire station 215
Williams Gateway Airport

REQUEST: Approval of expansion of an existing fire station

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Questioned choice of rust color

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Rust color could look like a primer coat to some people

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Likes colors
- Looks aeronautical

CASE: Hickey Jeep Co.
6743 E Main

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,538 sq. ft. retail shop

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Need some dynamics to the building
- Different patterns of masonry

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Looks very retail

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Should be edgier
- Needs more detailing
- Looks very average or even below average
- Should be rough, tectonic
- Use of industrial materials requires more design. Otherwise the building will look cheap.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Needs more contrast
- This looks low budget
- Overnight storage is only fencing?

2. Call to Order:

Vince DiBella nominated Tim Nielsen as acting chair Tom Bottomley seconded the motion.

Acting Chair Tim Nielsen called the meeting to order at 4:40 p.m.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the November 2, and November 14, 2005 Meetings:

On a motion by Vince DiBella seconded by Tom Bottomley the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

4. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-94 Monte Vista Village

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 9133 E Baseline Road

REQUEST: Design Review approval for a single-tenant building (HiHealth) at Pad I; within Monte Vista Village

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6

OWNER: Weingarten Reality Investors

APPLICANT: Patricia Flower, KDRA

ARCHITECT: Kurt Reed Assoc.

REQUEST: Approval of a 6,00sq. ft. retail building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR05-94 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. Compliance with the conditions of approval in case #BA05-036.
 - b. Stepping of at least 6" shall occur at the change of exterior EFIS wall color/form on all elevations.
 - c. Any window treatment that would have the effect of spandrel glass will require the review and approval of staff.
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.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 4 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The building is designed to blend with the surrounding center.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-95 Greenbrier Marlborough
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Baseline & Superstition Springs
REQUEST: Approval of a 9,670 sq. ft. retail/office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Eamon Roche
APPLICANT: Dream Catchers
ARCHITECT: Randy Carter

REQUEST: Approval of a 9,670 sq. ft. retail, office project

SUMMARY: This case was moved to December 12, 2005

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR05-95 be continued to the December 12, 2005 meeting

VOTE: Tom Bottomley abstained

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: Due to a conflict of interest the Board did not have the necessary quorum to hear this case.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-96 Falcon Jet Center
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 5030 E Falcon Dr
REQUEST: Approval of a 36,807 sq. ft. office / fabrication hanger
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: City of Mesa
APPLICANT: VLJ Aircraft
ARCHITECT: Oracle

REQUEST: Approval of a 36,807 sq. ft. office fabrication hanger

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Tom Bohlen represented the case.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was concerned with the amount of white used on the building. He thought the colors were bland. He confirmed the glass was tinted bronze and the railings were medium bronze. He thought the building needed more color. He also thought the building should be more high tech, not so industrial. He suggested using a kynar finish, and a different substrate of glass.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought the details of the buildings were lost in the lack of color variation. He suggested the overhead doors be a slightly different color. He thought the panels were OK, but thought they could be gray to look like a shadow.

MOTION: It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR05-96 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.
 - a. **Awnings to be treated with more of an accent color.**
 - b. **Overhead doors to be a different, darker color.**
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.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 4 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is reasonably well designed.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-97 Valero
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 9135 E Guadalupe
REQUEST: Approval of a 3,358 sq. ft. convenience store and a 4,576 sq. ft. gas canopy
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Valero
APPLICANT: Architekton
ARCHITECT: Joe Salvature

REQUEST: Approval of a 3,358 sq. ft. convenience store and a 4,576 sq. ft. gas canopy

SUMMARY: Tim Holeman and Justin Gubler represented the case.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed the trellis was lattice 12" on center, and that the caps on the columns were concrete. He liked the cantilever. He thought the trellis should be a different color.

Boardmember Vince DiBella thought the building was too orange. He thought the convenience store form and shape were OK. He thought it would be difficult for the surrounding shopping center to building to this design. He confirmed the trellis comes out 8'.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley confirmed the teal roof color was the same as their sign. He agreed the trellis should be a bolder color, but thought the change should be subtle, not teal. The gas canopy should be more articulated. He thought it needed to be broken with 4" to 8" insets. He suggested the insets be painted a darker shade. He suggested they use reveals between the beams on the trellis to create a shadow line.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was concerned that the 11" X 17" color elevations were significantly different from the 24" X 36" color elevations. He agreed the gas canopy needed to be broken up. He was concerned that the changes to this project could detrimentally affect the proposed shopping center; in particular the removal of the stone, the pre-cast, and the roof tile. He agreed the changes to the trellis should be subtle, and that the gas canopy looked sparse.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR05-97 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. Specify materials/finishes of horizontal banding on tower element. To be approved by staff. The Board approves the tower element as an architectural feature and not as national branding or signage.
 - b. Replace wall pack with a fixture that meets code. To be approved by staff.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- c. Provide architecturally integrated screening of outdoor items that will be replacing the foundation base landscape under shade device on west side of north elevation (pedestrian walk area). Foundation base landscaping must still meet code. To be reviewed and approved by staff.
 - d. **Refine the color of the trellis. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
 - e. **Rework the detailing of the trellis. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
 - f. **Look at revising the color of the glazing. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
 - g. **Work with Design Review staff on a detailing element to break up the gas canopy.**
 - h. **Submit a revised color board to Design Review staff.**
 - i. **Work with Design Review staff on a monument sign.**
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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is reasonably well designed.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-98 LTAC of AZ Health & Technology Park

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 5905 E Still Cir.
REQUEST: Approval of a 65,400 sq. ft. medical facility
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: A. T. Still University
APPLICANT: The Alter Group
ARCHITECT: Butler Design Group

REQUEST: Approval of a 65,400 sq. ft. medical facility

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR05-98 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. Revise the pedestrian connections to the north and south to provide a texture change in compliance with the approved AZ Health and Technology Park Design Guidelines. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review Staff.
 - b. Parking canopies shall include enhanced design details to ensure compatibility with the overall site development. Submit parking canopy designs to Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.
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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project meets the design standards of the Zoning Ordinance.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-99 Falcon Commerce Center
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1703 North 46th Street
REQUEST: Approval of a 22,845 sq. ft. office warehouse
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Blaine Mills
APPLICANT: Tanya Poirier
ARCHITECT: Paul Devers

REQUEST: Approval of a 22,845 sq. ft. office warehouse

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR05-99 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. Remove Acacia Redolens 'Desert Carpet' from the list of landscape plant materials and replace with an appropriate substitute.
 - b. Reduce the percentage of retaining wall used around the retention basin perimeter to a maximum of 25%.
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 revised landscape and grading/drainage plans 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: The project meets the design standards of the Zoning Ordinance.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-100 Power Brown Retail Building II

LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC Power & Brown
REQUEST: Approval of a 5,759 sq. ft. retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Glenwood Development Co.
APPLICANT: Bollinger & Cardenas
ARCHITECT: David Cardenas

REQUEST: Approval of a 5,760 sq. ft. retail building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR05-100 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 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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project meets the design requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-101 Gin Properties

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 206 & 214 N Power
REQUEST: Approval of a 4,056 sq. ft. office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Gene Gin
APPLICANT: Shawn Clow
ARCHITECT: Gerald Deines

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,018 sq. ft. office building

SUMMARY: Shawn Clow represented the case.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was concerned with the detailing around the windows. He suggested using mullions to make the windows appear square. He thought the fascia was thin and skinny, and the band was too heavy. He suggested the band be brought down. He thought the 50/50 proportion of the building was bad; the wainscot did not anchor the building; the thick band and the thin fascia were not good. He did not like the choice of roofing material. He questioned the three glazing pieces and then the false one used on the middle element. He thought the wainscot should come up above the windows. He thought the dentals were a waste of money, and suggested a prairie school look. He thought there should be more shadow lines.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley was not impressed with the design. He did not like the reveal work around the windows. He thought the canopy element in the center looked heavy. He thought the buildings themselves should be more interesting. He thought the window detailing; the tile choice, and the colors were all bad. He thought the stucco was cheapening the building.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought the dentals were a lot of money with not much impact and stated they would be a maintenance issue. He thought the building needed massing. He agreed muttons on the windows would introduce interest. He thought the windows should engage into the stone. He thought the columns for the tower element were spindly. The roof tile was muddy.

Boardmember Vince DiBella agreed with previous comments.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer asked if the changes could be resolved through Design Review staff.

Boardmember Vince DiBella stated the Board had made similar comments at the work session in November and the applicant had not addressed any of their concerns. He thought the cases needed to be continued.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR05-101 be continued to the January 4, 2006 meeting:

VOTE: Passed 4 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The Board felt there were too many concerns with the project for them to not see it again.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-102 Gold Metal Swim

LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Power & Elliot
REQUEST: Approval of a 13,858 sq. ft. swim school and a 8,210 sq. ft. shell building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Michael Troy
APPLICANT: Jeffrey Wogan
ARCHITECT: Jeffrey Wogan

REQUEST: Approval of a 13,858 sq. ft. swim school and a 8,210 sq. ft. shell building

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

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated for the record he thought this was a very creative project.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR05-102 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. Provide missing Materials/Colors information on all sheets.
 - b. Monument sign approved per new sheet: Revision November 18, 2005. Incorporate the information from new sheet onto revised full-size drawings.
 - c. Retention basin slopes must be in compliance with Zoning Ordinance Section 11-15-3-D-3.
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.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 4 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: Very interesting integration of site design and building. Good use of form, color and materials.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 7, 2005 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Other Business:

Staffmember Mia Helland explained that the applicant for Flynn's Flooring had requested changes in color and materials. She presented the Board with a revised color/material board. The Board unanimously approved the color/material changes.

Applicant to submit revised drawings as follows:

- 1 - 24" X 36" colored print of all four elevations, coordinated with revised color board.
- 2 - half scale color reductions of building elevation
- 1 - 8 ½ X 11 reduction of the building elevations.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da