

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
AUGUST 7, 2002

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Lower Level of the Council Chambers 57 East First Street, at 3:45 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

John O'Hara - Vice Chair
Randy Carter
Ann Schwaderer
John Poulsen
Robert Burgheimer

MEMBERS ABSENT

Chair Carie Allen (excused)
Jillian Hagen (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman	Jeff Will
Lesley Davis	Jim Griffin
Debbie Archuleta	Others
Charlie Scully	
Lesley Partch	
Rita Keelis	
Paul Gilbert	
Joe Goforth	
Roger Manning	
S G Ellison	

1. Call to Order:

Vice-Chair John O'Hara called the meeting to order at 3:57 p.m.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the July 10, 2001 Meeting:

On a motion by Ann Schwaderer seconded by John Poulsen the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

3. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 7, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR02-43 **“Retail Shops at NWC Southern & Higley”**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 5110 East Southern
REQUEST: Approval of a 16,104 sq. ft. shopping center
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 6
OWNER: Irwin Pasternack
APPLICANT: Irwin Pasternack
ARCHITECT: Irwin Pasternack

REQUEST: Approval of a 16,104 sq. ft. retail center

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

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Ann Schwaderer that DR02-43 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 the Preliminary Development Impact Summary Comments.
3. The canopy above the storefront windows on the east elevation to be non-combustible construction or 1 hour rated construction. Details to be approved by Building Safety Division staff during plans review.
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. 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.
6. 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.
7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is unique yet should complement the existing building on the site and the project approved to the northwest.

Recorded on Tape No.: 140 - 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 7, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR02-44 "Reelee – Retail Center"
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 606 East Main
REQUEST: Approval of a 8,917 sq. ft. retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: Reta Kellis, Reelee Inc.
APPLICANT: Lesley Partch
ARCHITECT: Lesley Partch

REQUEST: Approval of an 11,091 sq. ft. retail center

SUMMARY: Boardmember Ann Schwaderer declared a conflict of interest.

Lesley Partch represented the case.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was concerned that this building was too plain considering the proximity to Pioneer Park and the Town Center. He felt that this prominent site deserved something nicer. He was looking for different textures, different colors, breaking up the façade. He understood that this was a lower budget project but this is too important a site. In answer to a question from Mr. Partch, Boardmember Burgheimer responded that he understood that there are projects in this area that are worse than what is being proposed, but the role of this Board is to raise the bar and try to get new development at a higher level.

Mr. Partch argued that this is a small building with 8,900 sq. ft. of leasable area and they already have to put in new driveways, etc. He stated they did not want something that would conflict with the Temple and the Park.

Boardmember John Poulsen agreed that this is an important corner. He stated that the size and general shape of the building don't bother him, he felt that the building could be made nicer without spending a lot of money. He liked the porch theme, however it was a very plain porch. He suggested using pre-cast columns. He liked the height of the tower but it needed to be more than a box stucco tower. He understood that there was Dairy Queen and Arby's and the other projects in the area, but the Dairy Queen and Arby's would not be passed today either.

Mr. Partch wanted the Board to be specific in what they wanted. Did they want different colors, richer materials, more details, or variety in the parapet heights?

Boardmember John Poulsen liked all four of Mr. Partch's suggestions. He felt that this building would have been common a decade ago or even two decades ago. He confirmed that the tower is stucco, the recessed area back into the tower was stucco and, the only block is at the wainscot.

Mr. Partch stated that they were designing the building for the tuxedo industry, the wedding gowns, the flower shops, and the photographers, and they don't want a building that will take away from their product. He felt that if they do too much with the building it would detract from the products inside the building.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 7, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Randy Carter was most concerned with the color. He felt that for a building designed for weddings and tuxedos, it was not a very cheerful building. He felt that this corner is historically important. He did not feel that anything in this building relates to the area, the color, the materials, etc. He felt that making it brighter would make it more noticeable. He was concerned that the foundation landscaping did not relate to the entrances and would be stepped on by customers. He felt that this building could be built on any corner anywhere in the country; there was nothing unique about it.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated that what the Board was looking for was something contextual. Something that responds to the surrounding area. He stated that the Board is not there to design the building for them. They were trying to give them a sense of what direction to go.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt that this building was static and staid and he felt the architect needed to let his imagination run loose.

Vice Chair John O'Hara agreed with the previous comments.

Rita Keelis, the property owner, then spoke. She stated that she grew up on that corner. She stated that she had been requested by staff to have a tower. If she had designed the building she would have designed it to look like the information center at the Temple. She felt that the information center was plainer than this building. She wanted to have a special building, however what they were seeing was a building which cost \$100 a square foot to build, did they want \$150 a square foot? She wanted to know specifically, what the Board wanted to see.

Boardmember Randy Carter suggested using pre-cast columns. He reiterated that the color needed to change.

Mrs. Keelis stated that the Temple is a very square design and painted white. There are no towers.

Boardmember Carter stated that there are intricate carvings on that building. He suggested using different shades of white if they chose to use white, or white and beige with a nicely coordinated roof color.

Mrs. Keelis asked if they could eliminate the tower. She felt that the tower dates the building.

Boardmember John Poulsen stated that the visitor center can get away with being a square because it is surrounded by large landscaped areas. Because this building is in a tighter space, on the corner, the building has to stand on its own. It can't be plain, flat and square. It needs the tower; the roofline needs to be broken up. He felt that the tower could be moved to the center of the building.

Boardmember Randy Carter stated that there are tricks that can be done to make the building softer and friendlier. He suggested using a light terra cotta color with more color in the roof. He suggested using arches to soften the building.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated that the Board is trying to give them ideas that won't cost more money, but the manipulation of proportions, the relationship of the elements and the

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 7, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

colors could help. He stated that this building can be simply stated and still be elegant. He stated that the Board understands they have a smaller budget but they don't have to sheath the building in marble to make it elegant. He suggested the owner look at buildings in the area and let the architect know what buildings and building elements she likes. He also suggested looking at historical photos of buildings that used to be along Main.

Boardmember Randy Carter suggested making the south and west elevations more attractive and maybe they would not need the covered walkway that wraps around the northwest corner of the building.

Vice-Chair John O'Hara asked if a 30-day continuance would be enough time for the architect to redesign the building.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR02-44 be continued to September 4, 2002

VOTE: Passed 4 – 0 – 1 (Boardmember Ann Schwaderer abstaining)

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

Recorded on Tape No.: 140 - 1 (side A and B)

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 7, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR02-45 **“CVS Pharmacy”**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Brown & Recker
REQUEST: Approval of a 12,000 sq. ft. drug store
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 5
OWNER: Gustine Properties, Inc.
APPLICANT: Kathi Walp
ARCHITECT: Rick McGee

REQUEST: Approval of a 12,000 sq. ft. CVS drug store

SUMMARY: Joe Goforth, Roger Manning, and SG Ellison represented the case.

Vice Chair John O’Hara confirmed that the Gustine Co. owns the vacant Smith’s grocery store. He confirmed that they are in negotiations to lease a portion of that store to a Fitness Works.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was concerned with how the proposed CVS would affect the leasability of the Smith’s store.

Mr. Goforth stated that The Gustine Co. is concerned with the viability of the Smith’s store and wants to be able to lease it out. He stated that they pushed the CVS as close to the corner as they felt they could, and by making the commitment that when the balance of the major tenant space is redeveloped, the architectural theme would be updated to match the CVS site. They had eliminated a pad at the southwest corner of the site.

Boardmember Burgheimer was concerned with the number of pharmacies being built at street corners. He confirmed that there is an Osco just to the west of this site. He was concerned with how these stores can be re-used in the future.

Mr. Goforth stated that that is a concern throughout the Valley. He stated that the hard corners are always the most valuable property. If this store goes dark someone will re-use this corner.

Boardmember Burgheimer confirmed that the store could be broken up and leased out to multiple tenants.

Boardmember John Poulsen was concerned that this building is basically a box, and with how far the pop-outs would project from the building.

Boardmember Ann Schwaderer was concerned with the box. She was also concerned with the east elevation.

Vice-Chair John O’Hara confirmed that there is a CVS under construction at Guadalupe and Sossaman.

Boardmember Randy Carter agreed with staff that the parking stalls should be decreased to 16’ and widen the concrete by 2’. His major concerns were with the east and south elevations. He was concerned with the thickness of the façade pop-out. He was concerned that there appears to be no change in plane between the pharmacy portion of the building where the drive-through is and the remainder of the building.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 7, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Mr. Manning stated that the arch feature projects 4" and the columns come out 8".

Boardmember Poulsen confirmed that the canopies along the south elevation extend out approximately 4' at the west end and then they extend out less as they go east.

Boardmember Carter wanted to see a minimum projection of 8" on the arches. He was also concerned with the dark color in the arch along the east elevation. He wanted more articulation between the pharmacy/drive-through section and the remainder of the building.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that the Board wanted to see the planes pulled out more so that the building doesn't look like a box with things tacked onto it.

Boardmember Carter was very concerned with the east elevation. He felt that that elevation would be very visible to everyone driving west along Brown.

Mr. Manning explained that the service and delivery areas are along the east elevations and the arch is screening those uses.

Boardmember Carter stated that he is concerned with the articulation of the east elevation. He felt that there were playful things that could have been done to the east elevation to echo what was done on the front. He suggested painting the wall a different color or using a smaller scale for the arch. He wanted more than 1-1/2' difference between the top of the arch and the band at the top of the building. He felt that the proportions were wrong. He wanted to see as much attention to detail on the east elevation as the other three elevations.

Boardmember Burgheimer agreed with Boardmember Carter that the east elevation was out of character with the rest of the building and looked like they gave up on the "back" of the building.

Boardmember Carter suggested lowering the arch so there was more room between the top of the arch and the top of the parapet; and changing the color of the arch to a lighter color.

Boardmember Poulsen wanted the depth of the pop-outs increased.

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Randy Carter that DR02-45 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 the Preliminary Development Impact Summary Comments dated.
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. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
4. **Eliminate the precast bumper stops and provide a poured in-place concrete curbing. Location of curbing to match bumper stop location so that bumper overhang space of 2.8' is not reduced and the length of the stall is the same as proposed but not less than 16' in length, with the result being a sidewalk width of 4.8' outside the column.**
5. **Replace the "red bird of paradise" used for screening along Recker Rd with "cassia" or similar non-deciduous shrub.**

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 7, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

6. **Revise the elevations changing the pop-outs from 4" to as close to 8" as possible but not less than 6" to add dimension to the building.**
7. **The applicant to work with staff to redesign the east elevation of the building. Changes to include lowering the arch, changing the color of the arch, and adding more interest to the east elevation.**
8. Provide additional non-deciduous shrubs between the sections for masonry screen wall to ensure a continuous screening device. The shrubs should be spaced 36 inches on center or in a double row, 6' on center in a triangular pattern.
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.
10. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. 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.
14. 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.
15. 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.
16. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
17. Provide two full size and two 8-1/2 X 11 sets of revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions addresses concerns raised about traffic conflicts and pedestrian access. Additionally, the building elevations have been enhanced to address concerns raised about buildings which are out of scale with the customer and detrimental to the visual quality of the adjacent development.

Recorded on Tape No.: 140 - 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 7, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR01-88 **“Dana Park Village 2A and 2B”**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC Val Vista and Baseline
REQUEST: Approval to modify a previously approved shopping center
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 2
OWNER: Triple Five Arizona Developers
APPLICANT: Saemisch DiBella Architects
ARCHITECT: Robert Saemisch

REQUEST: Approval of a changes to the building materials and color board for a previously approved retail center

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

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Ann Schwaderer that DR01-88 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 the Preliminary Development Impact Summary Comments dated July 17, 2002.
3. Compliance with all conditions of the previous Design Review Case (DR01-88) regarding the site plan and the landscaping.
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. **Domed roofs to be as represented on the colored elevation and color/material board legend located on the black and white elevations, SW #1665 “Gold Bleam” except as shown as “Turned Copper”. Call out on building elevation.**
6. 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.
7. 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.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is a unique proposal which is compatible with development on the site and in the neighborhood.

Recorded on Tape No.: 140 - 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 7, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR02-47 **“U. S. Forest Service”**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC Higley and Ingram
REQUEST: Approval of a 10,272 sq. ft. office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: HAM Forest, L.L.C.
APPLICANT: Will Architects & Company
ARCHITECT: Jeffrey Will

REQUEST: Approval of a 10,272 sq. ft. US Forest Service building

SUMMARY: Jeff Will and Jim Griffin represented the case.

Chair John O'Hara confirmed that the wood on the building would be treated and stained.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was concerned that the building does not have four sided architecture. He felt all of the attention seems to be on the south and east elevations and then it stops. He didn't feel that the stone needed to wrap around all four elevations; however, he did want some color changes or score joints, to wrap the building.

Mr. Will was open to making changes to enhance the architecture on the west and north elevations.

Boardmember John Poulsen confirmed that staff had suggested this building might be more industrial looking to be more compatible with the surrounding industrial park; however, the owner wanted this architecture. He was concerned with the west and north elevations. He noted that there was a canine run along the north elevation.

Boardmember Ann Schwaderer wanted to see a change in the color along the west elevation. She liked the color palette.

Boardmember Randy Carter had several concerns for the applicant: why does the stone wrap around to portions of the west and north elevations and then stop; The relationship of the parapet to the ridge; is the EIFS going to continue over the top of the parapet and what color will it be; the windows seem out of proportion to the building; the wing wall has one leg on it and seems to hang out there; the relationship of the wing wall to the rest of the building doesn't seem to match anything on the rest of the building; he suggested using a stucco wainscot instead of the stone that stops and starts; why is there a parapet wall in the middle of the east elevation with the mansard on either side of it.

Boardmember Burgheimer agreed that on the east elevation the relationship of the parapet to the ridge will be difficult to construct as proposed. He suggested raising the height of the gabled features. He questioned why the stone went to the roof line on the building section just to the east of the main entry tower on the south elevation.

Boardmember Randy Carter suggested widening the two gabled units so that they are better proportioned to the rest of the east elevation. He also suggested widening the windows. Mr. Will stated that the Forest Service was opposed to windows and making them wider would probably not be acceptable to them. Boardmember Carter then suggested making the

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 7, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

windows square and not have them go down to the wainscot, along with wider gabled features. Mr. Will stated that the gabled features are the width of interior rooms and it would be very difficult to widen them. Boardmember Carter suggested having the mansard continue across the east elevation. Mr. Will stated that the reasoning behind the parapet was to break up the massing of that elevation. Boardmember Carter felt that the gabled sections were out of proportion and suggested lintels.

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested introducing elements that make it look more horizontal.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman asked for direction regarding the windows.

Discussion ensued regarding the windows. It was decided the windows would be square. There was discussion regarding the columns and the wainscot. There was discussion regarding the height and proportion of the wing wall.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR02-47 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 the Preliminary Development Impact Summary Comments (July 17, 2002) for Development Engineering, Plan Review, Fire Department and Building Safety.
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. The Grading and Drainage Plan must be revised and approved by both Design Review Planning staff and Development Engineering prior to submittal of construction documents. In particular, Retention Basin #4 located immediately next to the west side of the proposed building does not meet standards and needs to be relocated. Other engineering and planning standards related to retention basins must also be addressed on the revised Grading and Drainage Plan and the Site Plan.
5. The location of the solid waste enclosure must be reviewed and approved by the Design Review, Development Engineering and Solid Waste staff prior to submittal of construction documents. The location of the trash enclosure may not be located in any required setback areas.
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. 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.
8. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
9. The shared driveway shown on the site plan requires a recorded cross access

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 7, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

easement to be included at the time of the subdivision request.

10. **The vertical, rectangular windows throughout the building to be reduced to a square as revised on the proposed elevations. Windows to be centered between the wood fascia and top of stone. Elevations to be approved by Design Review staff.**
11. **Reduce the stone height on the vertical gabled units, use a lintel of either wood or artificial stone instead. Elevations to be approved by Design Review staff.**
12. **Lower the break area wing wall with cutouts approximately 12" to 16". Elevations to be approved by Design Review staff.**
13. **Reduce the parapet height approximately 12" to 16" between the gabled elements.**
14. **On the south elevation, eliminate the stone on the tall parapet corner and replace with 3' high stucco wainscot. Stucco wainscot to continue around the building.**
15. **Eliminate the stone to the east of the entrance tower.**
16. Provide two full size and two 8-1/2 X 11 sets of revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions should be an attractive addition to this industrial area.

Recorded on Tape No.: 140 - (side A)

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 7, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Other Business:

City of Mesa employees John Gendron and Patrick Murphy spoke to the Board regarding the creation of a Redevelopment Committee.

John Gendron explained the history of redevelopment in the City of Mesa. He explained that the Downtown Development Committee (DDC) was established in 1990. The DDC serves as both the Planning and Zoning Board and the Design Review Board for projects within the Redevelopment District.

The proposed "Redevelopment Committee" would be made up of 2 current members of the Planning and Zoning Board, 2 current members of the Downtown Development Committee, and 1 current member of the Design Review Board. The Redevelopment Committee would review cases in area established as "redevelopment areas" outside the Town Center.

He explained that the Ordinance establishing the Redevelopment Committee had been reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Board, was scheduled to be heard by the Downtown Development Committee later in August, and then by City Council in September.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed that there currently are no additional redevelopment areas, the City Council wants the Committee established first.

Patrick Murphy stated that one area being looked at would be along the future light rail corridor.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer likes the structure of the Committee and the fact that the members would come from the existing Boards.

Boardmember John Poulsen felt that this was a good idea. He stated that Mesa's future was in redevelopment and it was good that the City was preparing for that ahead.

It was moved Rob Burgheimer and seconded by John Poulsen that the Design Review Board supports this proposal and agrees that the Committee should be made up of existing members of the Planning and Zoning and Design Review Boards, and the Downtown Development Committee.

Vote: 5 – 0

Board Retreat

Staffmember Laura Hyneman asked the Boardmembers if they would like to have a retreat. She stated that there was one submittal for the October meeting, so the retreat could be after the meeting or at a different time. She would like the Board to let staff know their concerns, what additional information would they like included in their packets.

Boardmember Randy Carter thought that the retreat would be a good way for the Board members to discuss where they are coming from and what their wishes for Mesa are. He felt it was important for the Boardmember to feel comfortable enough to state their real opinions and

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 7, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

not feel that each case needs a unanimous vote.

Boardmember Burgheimer agreed that each Boardmember will have their individual issues. He liked the idea of getting together to discuss the Board member's roles, so that they don't have to repeat the same things over and over.

Boardmember John Poulsen stated that he is concerned with the number of pharmacies being approved. He was concerned with the difficulty of re-using these structures in the future.

Boardmember Randy Carter wondered how the Board regards prototypes.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer feels there needs to be limits on how many prototypes should be allowed. He was concerned that CVS has plans to build 15 stores in Mesa. He felt that each site should be looked at as unique.

Boardmember Randy Carter is tired of seeing the Walgreen's and Osco's prototypes being built all over the City. He did not feel cities such as Santa Barbara or even Queen Creek would allow the number of prototypes being built in Mesa. He wished they had a clear vision from Mayor Hawker, the City Council, and Planning and Zoning on where they area going.

Staffmember Hyneman suggested that during the retreat they could discuss a joint meeting with the Council.

Boardmember Carter confirmed the issue of church review should be scheduled on an agenda in the next few weeks. Boardmember Carter is concerned that there are some churches that are being built all over the City.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that he had discussed the issue with Mayor Hawker and he did not feel the Mayor was open to review of churches. He stated that the Mayor was concerned with religious freedom. He stated that he had expressed to the Mayor that this issue is not about religious freedom it is about design issues. The site planning and design need to be reviewed. He stated that churches become abandoned also, and the possible re-use of buildings is a concern. He did not feel that this Board would try to micro-manage and say that someone could not have a steeple, etc. He felt that it was important to let the Mayor and Council understand that what the Board would be looking at would be basic zoning principals, planning principals. Churches create a great deal of traffic and how that impacts the surrounding neighborhood should be thought out.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman felt that it is important to let the Mayor and Council know that the language of the Ordinance can be worded so that the review is not discriminatory.

Vice-Chair John O'Hara asked the Boardmember to make a decision regarding the retreat.

It was determined that the retreat would be after the October meeting.

There was discussion regarding whether the Board could look at the applications earlier in the process so that they could give direction to staff so that some of the issues could be resolved prior to the meeting.

Boardmember Carter stated that it would be helpful if they received larger submittals.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 7, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested having the applicants submit site photos.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da