

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

**JULY 5, 2007**

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  
Tom Bottomley  
Robert Burgheimer  
Craig Boswell  
Delight Clark

MEMBERS ABSENT

Vince DiBella  
Wendy LeSueur

OTHERS PRESENT

Lesley Davis	Thom Buhlen
Debbie Archuleta	Frank Warren
Mia Lozano Helland	Keith Mokrij
Monique Spivey	Vince Dalke
Rob Dmohowski	Al Cappello
Troy Axelrod	Glen Smith
Tony Bolotnik	Steve Stoaks
Sarah Kaus	Ladell Call
Elizabeth Ohep	Bill Stevenson
Tony Cooper	Dorothy Shupe
Tarik Williams	Randy Carter
Andrea Kahala	Jennifer Sandstron
Carson Coffelt	Doug Chapman
Clint Garner	Tom Roszak
Greg Woods	Others
Diane Woods	
Boyd Thacker	
Frank Gawdun	
Fred Woods	

1. Work Session:

**CASE:** Uncle Bob's self-storage  
1356 E Baseline

**REQUEST:** Review of expansion of an existing mini-storage facility

**DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Delight Clark:

- Concerned with parking

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Did not like the colors, the yellow and peach clash
- Change the peach to a tan

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Could they ground mount the mechanical units?
- Agreed the colors clash
- Concerned with the fence

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- Concerned with the lateral bars on the fence, they could be used like a ladder

**CASE:** Quail Run Industrial park  
4030 E Quenton

**REQUEST:** Review of an industrial park

**DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Delight Clark:

- Provide score lines on the rear

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Wants enough movement to create shade
- Provide landscaping to help screen and shade the west elevation
- Provide joints wherever there are color changes

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- Provide the cmu wall
- Articulate the screen walls and paint to match buildings

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Provide score lines on sides of building
- Provide more panel joints
- Cast reveals in the panels to break them up
- Like the colors
- Need good performance glass

**CASE:** Mt. Vista Medical Center day care  
10340 E Hampton

**REQUEST:** Review of a day care facility within the Mt. Vista Medical Center campus

**DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Delight Clark:

- Need shade on playground

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Materials will match hospital
- Appreciates the scale of the building
- Provide more shade for playground and equipment

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Appreciates the same material
- Make sure there is sufficient shade

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- Concerned that using all wrought iron fencing will be a security issue adjacent to streets

**CASE:** Sonoma Land Development Office Building

**REQUEST:** Review of an office complex

**DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Liked the colors
- Liked the stepping

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Likes that the stone has a place to stop
- Provide reveal screeds
- Liked the detail at the wainscot

**CASE:** Four Sons @ SanTan Crossing  
NEC Eastridge & Guadalupe

**REQUEST:** Review of a gas station and c-store

**DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- The columns seem spindly, dress them up to match the columns on building
- Need foundation base landscaping
- Very disjointed look between the c-store and the gas canopy

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Too much blue on the gas canopy
- Colors need to be more compatible
- Could the canopy be stepped?
- Likes the building
- Use some of the stone from the building to dress-up the gas canopy columns

Boardmember Delight Clark:

- Agreed the colors of canopy should change

**CASE:** Superstition Springs FLMS  
6555 E Southern

**REQUEST:** Review of a FLMS for Superstition Springs Mall

**DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Concerned with how it will affect the park n ride
- Could sign panels be recessed
- Liked the textured aluminum

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Appreciates that only the white letters will be lit, not the orange panel
- Proportion of top angled piece seems too thin
- Maybe the top cabinet could come down slightly

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- Liked the 1' difference of the panels

**CASE:** Carl's Jr.  
1015 N Dobson

**REQUEST:** Review of a fast food restaurant with drive-thru

**DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Appreciates the applicant designing for the center
- The entry tower needs to extend back

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Concerned with the color of the cedar shakes
- Likes the change in the roof elements

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- Very interesting building

**CASE:** Culver's Butterburger Restaurant  
NWC Country Club & Baseline

**REQUEST:** Review of a fast food restaurant

**DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- The ladder has to be internal
- The rear elevation is too plain, it needs vertical elements
- Provide a recess or recessed tile, not just a painted square for the accents on the columns
- Too much blue
- Too stripy
- Emphasize the recess
- The parapet needs to be the same thickness as the columns below
- Not just a cantilevered cap

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Parapet is too thin
- Provide careful detail of outdoor dining roof
- Blue dominates the building and detracts from the building design
- There needs to be a change in plain or screen line where paint changes
- Explain the LED at the roofline; how will it be attached?

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- Keep the blade walls below the parapet line
- Liked that the outdoor dining was covered
- Provide details of the trash enclosures with follow-up submittal

**CASE:** West Main Station Village  
1350 W Main

**REQUEST:** Review of a mixed use retail, office, and residential use

**DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Could the train station element be used a few times along the Main Street frontage?
- Likes the loft look
- Concerned with the pink
- Likes the project

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Concerned with the pink, to pepto bismol
- Provide stucco screeds
- Agreed they should use the train station design within the project

Boardmember Delight Clark:

- Liked the idea of using Date Palms along Main
- Seems very flat along Main

Neighbors spoke:

- Colors should be distinctive
- Maybe different colors for different buildings
- Wanted Date Palms along Main 40' apart
- Not enough visitor parking spaces for residential
- Not enough parking for retail

2. Call to Order:

Tim Nielsen called the meeting to order at 5:45 p.m.

3. Election of Officers:

Boardmember Tom Bottomley nominated Tim Nielsen Chair, Rob Burgheimer seconded the nomination.

Vote: 4 – 1 Tim Nielsen nay

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer nominated Wendy LeSueur as vice Chair, Delight Clark seconded the nomination.

Vote: 5 – 0

4. Approval of the Minutes of the June 6, 2007 Meeting:

On a motion by Rob Burgheimer seconded by Tom Bottomley the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

5. Design Review Cases:

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR07-79 Chatham Medical Office**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 221 S. Power Road  
Lot 3 in Power Ranch Medical Village  
**REQUEST:** Approval of a 12,379 sq. ft. medical office  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 6  
**OWNER:** Chatham and Chatham LLC  
**APPLICANT:** Keith Paul  
**ARCHITECT:** Alfred Cappello  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Mia Lozano-Helland

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 12,379 sq. ft. medical office

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

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Craig Boswell that DR07-79 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 materials/color and elevation details for parking canopies.**
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 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.
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 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE JULY 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR07-80 Fry's Fuel Center**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** E of SEC McKellips & Stapley  
**REQUEST:** Approval of a 112 sq. ft. kiosk and a 3,956 sq. ft. gas canopy  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 1  
**OWNER:** Gabriel Howe  
**APPLICANT:** Elizabeth Ohep – Tait Associates  
**ARCHITECT:** Tim Virus  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Lesley Davis

**REQUEST:** Approval of 112 sq. ft. kiosk and a 3,956 sq. ft. gas canopy

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

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Craig Boswell that DR07-80 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. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
2. The source (or lens) of all exterior lighting shall be flush with the bottom of the canopy ceiling.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of a Substantial Conformance Incentive Permit (SCIP) and Special Use Permit from the Zoning Administrator or Board of Adjustment.
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.
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 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE JULY 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR07-81 CMC Steel**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 11202 E. Germann Road  
**REQUEST:** Approval of a steel manufacturing mill  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 6  
**PROPERTY OWNER:** TRW-VSSI  
**APPLICANT:** Commercial Metals Company  
**ARCHITECT:** Lisa Foreman, AIA  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Mia Lozano-Helland

**REQUEST:** Approval of a steel manufacturing mill

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

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Craig Boswell that DR07-81 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. **Compliance with all requirements and conditions of approval of the rezone, BIZ Council Use Permit and site plan review approved through case Z07-67**
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 5 – 0

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR07-82**    **Guadalupe Professional Center**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**    430 W. Guadalupe Road  
**REQUEST:**    Approval of a 25,818 sq. ft. office  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**    District 3  
**OWNER:**    Guadalupe Professional Plaza  
**APPLICANT:**    Ryan Grover  
**STAFF PLANNER:**    Mia Lozano Helland

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 25,818 sq. ft. office

**SUMMARY:** Boardmember Craig Boswell questioned why the center tower element was not shown on the north and south elevations. He confirmed the colors and glass were not changing, and the revised rendering was incorrect.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was concerned with the Mayan forms and the roman columns. He stated the Board had asked at the work session for the applicant to choose one design theme. He thought there had been misunderstanding regarding what the Board had asked for at the work session. He stated the Board was concerned with the form of the connection between the buildings, they had not asked that it be completely eliminated. The Board was also concerned with the window frames and placement, the light fixtures, etc. There were technical issues with the roof, the screening of the mechanical units, etc. He thought the elevations were diagramatic.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley liked the bridge, but not the thinness and proportion. He wanted a thicker canopy. He thought the columns looked very plain and too tall. He also thought they detracted from the building. He was still concerned with the window proportions. He thought there were too many vertical elements, and the base of the building had been lost. He was glad the striping at the base of the building, and the Roman columns were gone. He appreciated the real balconies. He did not think the wall washer lights would meet the Night Sky Ordinance.

Chair Tim Nielsen wanted to know where the stone columns were on the north and south elevations. He thought the proportions of the building would change dramatically when they started to work on the construction drawings. He thought the elevations were too schematic. He did not think the buildings could actually be built as shown. There would be no room for mechanical equipment, or roof trusses.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer agreed the elevations were schematic. He stated the Board needed to see details of the stair well; what it would be made of, where are the hand rails? What happens at the top of the stair? He thought the rounded form at the stone tower was awkward.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR07-82 be continued to the August 1, 2007 meeting:

**VOTE:** Passed    5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE JULY 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR07-83 Dana Professional Plaza**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 160 North Power Road  
**REQUEST:** Approval of a 15,414 sq. ft. office building  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 5  
**OWNER:** Dana Professional Plaza  
**APPLICANT:** Dream Catchers  
**ARCHITECT:** Thomas Bottomley  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Mia Lozano Helland

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 5.414 sq. ft. office building

**SUMMARY:** This case was removed from the consent agenda due to a conflict by a Boardmember.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Craig Boswell that DR07-83 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 a 30' building and landscape setback from the right-of-way on Power Rd. or gain the approval of a DIP.**
  - b. **Provide a 20' building and landscape setback from the right-of-way on Albany and Akron Streets or gain the approval of a DIP.**
  - c. **Provide a 30' building setback and a 15' landscape setback from the adjacent OS property or gain approval of a DIP.**
  - d. **Provide a 20' building and landscape setback from the adjacent R1-8 property or gain the approval of a DIP.**
  - e. **Provide a 30x30 entry plaza area or gain the approval of a DIP.**
  - f. **Provide a 10'x30' loading space or gain the approval of a DIP.**
  - g. **Provide 75 parking spaces for medical office use or gain the approval of a DIP.**
  - h. **Provide a 24' wide landscape island between adjoining parking canopies and a min. 8' wide center landscape island or gain the approval of a DIP.**
2. Approval of a Development Incentive Permit by the Board of Adjustment or Zoning Administrator for all requested code modifications and compliance with all Board of Adjustment or Zoning Administrator requirements associated with that approval.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

6. 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.
7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
8. 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 Bottomley abstained)

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR07-84 Pecos Business Park**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** East of Mountain on north side of Pecos Road  
**REQUEST:** Approval of a 4.46 acre industrial park  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 6  
**OWNER:** Justin Dupuy, Braided Cord  
**APPLICANT:** Dream Catchers Planning & Design  
**ARCHITECT:** Randy Carter  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Mia Lozano-Helland

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 4.46 acre industrial park

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

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Craig that DR07-84 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. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
3. 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.
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 to match the primary building color.
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 Bottomley abstained)

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR07-85 Pecos Gateway**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 8743 East Pecos Road  
**REQUEST:** Approval of three new office/warehouse buildings  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 6  
**OWNER:** Pecos Gateway LLC  
**APPLICANT:** Tim Rasnake, Archicon  
**ARCHITECT:** Vince Dalke  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Rob Dmohowski

**REQUEST:** Approval of three new office/warehouse buildings

**SUMMARY:** This case was removed from the consent agenda by citizens who wished to speak.

Ladell Call stated he had a project east of this one. He thought the buildings looked like a Home Depot. He wanted trees with leaves, and a tile roof not metal.

Keith Mokrij stated he was not displeased with the project; however, he was not pleased with it either. He did not think the elevations were four-sided. He thought the buildings were too plain. He stated this was a growing area and the Board needed to set a standard. He wanted more articulation and pop-outs. He wanted stucco buildings not tilt. He did not want the project to look industrial.

Bill Stevenson said he new the area wanted a higher standard. He thought the buildings were too plain. He stated these buildings would be what you see when you fly into Williams Gateway Airport. He thought the stone was too small and stated he would rather they just took it off.

Doug Chapman stated he was on the Queens Park Council. He did not want a project of this size. He wanted the buildings to look like custom homes. He stated he did not want a rock pit with trees.

Staffmember Rob Dmohowski explained the changes since the work session.

Vince Dalke represented the case and stated the elevations the Design Review Board saw at the work session are the same ones that were presented throughout the Planning and Zoning and City Council process. He explained the applicant had zoned 120' along the south portion of their project O-S and it was shown as landscaping. He stated the General Plan for this area is Light Industrial. The buildings have movement and stepped roofs. The building were only 31' tall. He stated he was willing to work with the neighbors regarding the choice of trees within the 120' landscape area.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed the applicant had changed the sloped roof elements and the roof would slope back 10'; there would be 6' and 3' steps along the building frontage; the entire frontage would have shade from deep overhangs. The sides have a 2' step. The rear screenwall had a 4' jog and was 8'-8" tall on a 4' berm. The buildings would be 169' from the property line.

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought the project was trying to be residential and industrial at the same time. He thought the architecture looked dated. Too much exposed tilt. The glass helped. He wanted the orange stripe eliminated. He thought the liner looked like stamped concrete. He suggested more stone, higher up.

Boardmember Craig Boswell confirmed there would be trees around the retention basin, but not at the bottom of it. He stated this was an industrial building in an M-1 zone. He thought the landscape buffer was excellent.

Chair Tim Nielsen agreed they had improved the project. He thought it needed more warmth. He thought the painted tilt would be plastic looking. He wanted to see richer materials.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated that M-1 next to residential is never a good idea. He thought the project was acceptable for M-1. He stated there needs to be consistence along arterials. This project is consistent with what the Board sees for industrial uses. He agreed it could be better, but the Board has to be fair. He would like to see stucco elements in front, stone columns, and steel. He stated painted tilt looked industrial. He was concerned with the materials. He thought the standing seam roof was fine. He would like exposed aggregate and stain rather than paint.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Craig Boswell that DR07-85 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. The screen wall adjacent to Pecos Road shall vary in height from thirty-two inches (32") to forty inches (40") and shall be offset or staggered in plan by at least twenty-four inches (24") at intervals of fifty feet (50') maximum.
  - b. **Work with staff to develop three other material changes, such as: real brick, stone, sand blasted aggregate; more base stone material.**
  - c. **Provide decorative light fixtures.**
  - d. **Revise the orange color and tone it down.**
  - e. **Work with the neighbors on the tree type.**
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

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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 5 – 0

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR07-86    NewPort Industrial Plaza**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**    3300 block of south Power Road  
**REQUEST:**                Approval of an Industrial/Office condominium complex  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**    District 6  
**OWNER:**                    Frank Warren  
**APPLICANT:**            Thom Bohlen, Oracle Arch. & Planning  
**ARCHITECT:**             Thom Bohlen  
**STAFF PLANNER:**        Mia Lozano-Helland

**REQUEST:** Approval of an industrial/office condominium complex

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

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Craig Boswell that DR07-86 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. **Compliance with the conditions of approval for Z07-76.**
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    5 – 0

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR07-87 Fiesta Lofts**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** NWC Grove & Extension  
**REQUEST:** Approval of 457 residential units and 20,286 sq. ft. of retail  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 3  
**OWNER:** TR Alma Partners  
**APPLICANT:** Reese L. Anderson, Pew and Lake, PLC.  
**ARCHITECT:** Fujikawa Johnson Gobel  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Lesley Davis

**REQUEST:** Approval of 457 residential units and 20,286 sq. ft. of retail

**SUMMARY:** Reese Anderson and Tom Roszak represented the case. Mr. Anderson showed the Board an elevation of how the mechanical units would be screened. He stated they would provide Date Palms.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed the project would not be phased. He thought the project was very bold, and stated he liked it much more than Fiesta Towers. He thought this project was more practical. He thought the Board should see the final detail for the material. He stated the material could not be stucco or EIFS. He liked the colors.

Mr. Roszak stated they wanted to make a statement with the colors. He stated they would not use dryvit or EIFS.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought the bronze screening for the mechanical was a good move. He confirmed the balconies would be either glass or metal, they would not be a mix of both materials. He was concerned with the noise of the mechanical units. He did not want the applicant to use wall paks. He wanted the applicant to be very careful with the screening device details. He appreciated the Date Palms. Regarding the parking Mr. Roszak stated they were now proposing live/work units and retail so they would only be 13 parking spaces short for the retail. Boardmember Bottomley thought the white was too stark a contrast to the other colors. He confirmed they were proposing to provide at least one sculpture. He stated the detailing, including color transition, for this project would be very important.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen was very concerned with the streetscape and people scale. He thought the richness of the landscape materials would be very important.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Craig Boswell that DR07-87 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 color/material specifications for the buildings to match what has been represented on the color/material board. Details to be approved by Design Review staff.

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- b. Revise the mechanical screening so that they are better integrated with the design of the building. Details to be approved by Design Review staff.
  - c. Work with staff to revise the landscape plan and replace the Mexican Fan Palms in the plant palette with Date Palms.
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. Design Review approval of any modifications to the elevations per the Alternative Site Plans dated 4/27/07.
  5. 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.
  6. 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.
  7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
  8. 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 5 – 0

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR07-88    The Human Bean**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**     1136 S. Greenfield Road  
**REQUEST:**                Approval of a 454 square foot drive-thru coffee shop.  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**     District 6  
**OWNER:**                    Greenfield Southern NW Investors LLC/Henry Lam  
**APPLICANT/ARCHITECT:** Robert Pearce, Pearce Studio Design  
**STAFF PLANNERS:**        Monique Spivey, Lesley Davis

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 454 sq. ft. drive-thru coffee shop

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

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Craig Boswell that DR07-88 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. Bollards and railings to be painted a building color other than "Cool Bright Red". Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.
  - b. Eliminate the "Cool Bright Red" from the building and replace that color with one of the colors from one of the adjacent projects. (DR04-46 or DR03-04).
  - c. Provide a revised light fixture that is an architectural fixture to match or be compatible with what was approved for the adjacent retail (DR04-46 or DR03-04).
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. Provide a Letter of Approval for this project from the Greenfield Court Architectural Review Board to submit with your Construction Documents.
6. Trash enclosures and gates must be compatible with what has been approved in the adjacent retail center (DR04-46).
7. All signage must comply with requirements established in Chapter 19 of the Zoning Ordinance or Comprehensive Sign Package approved by the Board of Adjustment.
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.
9. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
10. The revised colors and materials board shall also provide manufacturer, color name and ID number corresponding below or above sample.

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

11. Provide one revised colors and materials board which includes a glass sample, 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 5 – 0

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

### Other Business:

DR06-64 Banner Children's Hospital  
1400 S Dobson

Chair Tim Nielsen declared a conflict and turned the meeting over to Boardmember Rob Burgheimer.

Boardmember Burgheimer asked the applicants to explain the changes that were being proposed.

The applicants explained that due to cost overruns and the need to eliminate the basement due to a recent flood study they were proposing to: Eliminate the curtain wall and replace it with a stucco wall with punched windows for the patient rooms; replace 50% of the stone with stucco; eliminate 50% of the screen wall and replace it with berms; reduce the number of palms by 29; replace the stainless steel towers with ceramic and reduce their height 17'; and replace the interior courtyard with some of the square footage lost with the elimination of the basement.

Boardmember Craig Boswell confirmed the punched windows would be like the existing hospital, and that they would, in the future, repaint the rest of the hospital to match this addition.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley confirmed they were keeping the museum and the train but they would be inside. He thought the stucco elements might actually add additional variation and be fine. He confirmed they would be concentrating the Date Palms at entries and walkways, and reducing them in the parking lot. He thought that the revisions might draw more attention to the curved entry and the peel-away. He confirmed there would be two colors of stucco on the tower and the ancillary building.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated he thought the punched windows would be better for the patient rooms and this would be a more functional idea. He wanted to see the ancillary building, and the revised landscape plan. He confirmed the horizontal details would still be there at the corners.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Delight Clark that DR06-64 be revised as follows:

1. Approve the curtain wall being incorporated into stucco
2. Replacing 50% of the sandstone with stucco
3. Approval of the changes to the towers

The ancillary building, the revised landscape plan, the revised screen wall details and berming to come back to a future Design Review Board meeting.

**VOTE:** 4 – 0 – 1 (Chair Tim Nielsen abstained)

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

DR07-64 Sandstrom Industrial  
465 S Robson

Staffmember Lesley explained the drawings submitted the morning of July 5<sup>th</sup>. She stated there would be no exits along the east elevation of the large building; there would be cross access to the adjacent property to the south eliminating the dead end parking; the applicant would be applying for a variance to allow zero lot line along the north property line, which would allow room for foundation base along the entrance to the building; there would be only one user in the larger building; there would be a gate from the parking lot to the retention area along the east elevation; a majority of the retention would be underground. She stated they had also revised the elevations and had addressed the Board's concerns.

The applicant then stated he did not want to provide cross-access to the adjacent property unless he had to.

Chair Tim Nielsen appreciated the changes to the elevations. He confirmed there is already a building along the north property line; and that this building would be office at the south end and warehouse for the rest of the building. He also confirmed the glass would be recessed 8" and the buildings would be painted masonry with stone at the base. He thought the buildings could be split face at the entries.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley liked the direction the project was going. He wanted to see masonry and stone. He wanted the gate to be as tall as possible. He confirmed the placement of the colors, and that the glass would be tinted and the storefronts would be anodized bronze.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer did not think the cross access was crucial.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-64 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 **revised site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations.**
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all conditions of the Board of Adjustment for any variances to Code.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
5. Compliance with all requirement of the Zoning Case (Z07-020).
6. 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.
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.
8. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within

## MINUTES OF THE JULY 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

the building.

9. Provide two half-size color elevations to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0

DR07-75 Review of changes to Retail Center  
Southern & Stapley

Staffmember Lesley Davis explained that the Board had asked to see the revisions made on this project after the June meeting. She explained the changes that been made to address the Board's conditions of approval. She stated staff was support of the changes with the exception of the painted wainscot on the La Curacao. The Board agreed the blue wainscot needed to be removed.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta  
Planning Assistant

da