

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
SPECIAL MEETING
OCTOBER 23, 2002

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Planning Division Conference Room, 55 North Center, at 4:35 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Carie Allen
Rob Burgheimer
John Poulsen
John O'Hara

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman
Debbie Archuleta
Sherman Cawley
Mike Reidy

MEMBERS ABSENT

1. Call to Order:

Chair Carie Allen called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m.

2. Design Review Case:

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 23, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR02-54 "Nextcare"
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 5
RELATED CASES: None
LOCATION: 1066 North Power
OWNER: Michael Reidy
APPLICANT: Cawley Architects
ARCHITECT: Cawley Architects

REQUEST: Approval of a 11,293 sq. ft. office building

SUMMARY: Sherman Cawley and Mike Reidy represented the case. Mr. Cawley distributed revised elevations for each of the Boardmembers. Mr. Cawley thanked the Board for accommodating them by having the special meeting. Mr. Cawley explained the main issues from the first meeting. He stated that with regard to the S.E.S. they had decided to leave the S.E.S. in the original location and screen it with a wall which would have a masonry base and an E.I.F.S. top to match the building. The wall would be 8' tall to completely screen the S.E.S. The main issue was the elevations of the building. The porte cochres at the three entrances were capped with standing seam roofs. The porte cochres were also raised to provide more articulation and variety to the roof line of the building. They devised a pier design which protrude 4" from the surface of the wall that are spaced to give a rhythm to the windows on the three visible sides of the building; they incorporated an arch feature into the wall of the building to provide variety through color change and shape change; they continued the masonry base. Mr. Cawley stated that they had tried to provide additional definition for the arched features that they were presenting for the walls by either recessing or projecting them to create a shadow line. They talked to the structural engineer to see if that portion of the wall could be thinner but that would not be possible with the stud construction they were proposing. They looked at having the lighter arched features project out to be the same thickness as the piers, they were concerned that having the arches project out would be disconcerting to look at and they would collect dust. What they were proposing was to use a pre-manufacture reveal. Mr. Cawley then showed the Board an example of the reveal.

Boardmember John Poulsen then confirmed that the wall plane would not change so the only shadow line would be from the reveal.

Mr. Cawley stated that the reveal would be at least $\frac{3}{4}$ inch deep and could be 1 inch high.

Boardmember John O'Hara confirmed that the reveal would have a gap in it.

Chair Carie Allen confirmed that the reveal is made of metal and is then painted.

Mike Reidy then explained that the "Fry Radius" they were proposing comes pre-manufactured and can be radiused at the factory, so they will be "perfect" arches.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer then stated that he had to leave the October 2, 2002, Design Review Board meeting prior to discussion of this case; however, he did not like the project as originally proposed, he felt that it was too flat. He still felt that the building was not of the same quality level as some of the other medical office building recently approved in Mesa. He appreciates the attempts to address that, but he still felt it was a box. He did not feel enough had been done.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 23, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember John Poulsen confirmed that the applicant is getting ready to do their foundation. He stated that he wanted the lighter, arched areas to be recessed. He wanted to see distinction and depth. He wanted depth, shadowing, and interest. He confirmed that the rear elevation would not have a masonry veneer wainscot. There would be a color change only. He did not like the use of color change only to add variety. He stated that what they were asking for would not cost a great deal of money. He didn't really expect the wainscot at the back, but he was concerned with the painted on wainscot. He was concerned with what the adjacent property owners to the west would see.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that the Board is trying to keep a level playing field for developers, and he understood that this is a simple building, however this is not the same quality level as other projects recently approved. He also did not feel that this project was of the same quality as other projects in this area. He wanted the building to move in and out. He appreciated the porte cochres.

Boardmember John O'Hara felt that the project could be approved with specific stipulations.

Chair Carie Allen agreed with the previous comments. She thought that the drawings looked nice but was concerned with what the building would actually look like built.

Boardmember Poulsen wanted the columns to come out further so that there wasn't a 4" pop-out coming down on a 4" column.

Mike Reidy then suggested popping the columns out 6" and the arches 4", but the Board was concerned the detail would create a dust ledge on top of the arches.

Boardmember John Poulsen then suggested bringing the columns out 6", have the wall above the arches come out 4" and leave the wall under the arches at zero.

Boardmember Burgheimer was concerned with what the neighbors to the west will be able to see.

Mr. Reidy stated that the wall ranges from 6' to 8' high. They also had staggered trees in the landscape setback.

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR02-54 be approved as presented October 23, 2002, 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 at the October 23, 2002 special meeting, except as noted below.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. **Provide a revised site plan which shows:**
 - **The sidewalk at the northeast corner of the building extended to the north property line. Maintain the existing landscaping planter.**
5. **Provide a revised design for the monument sign that complies with Chapter 14 and 19 of the Zoning Ordinance.**

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 23, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

6. **Provide a revised landscaping plan which:**
 - **Replaces “Petite Oleanders” screening shrubs with “Green Cloud Sage” arranged in a curvilinear configuration and spaced so they completely screen the parking area.**
 - **Replaces at least half of the “Shoestring Acacia” trees with a drought tolerant, evergreen species with a Willow Acacia.**
7. **Provide revised building elevations incorporating shade structures for the windows. Elevations to be approved by Design Review Staff.**
8. **Provide parking canopy elevations for approval by Design Review staff. Canopy color and fascia design should incorporate design features of the building.**
9. **All outdoor storage areas for materials, equipment, and service entrance section (SES) shall be fully screened from view by a masonry wall the same height as the utility cabinet.**
10. **Along the east, north and south elevations, the columns are to protrude out a minimum of 6” from the building, the darker painted areas above the lighter arched areas protrude a minimum of 4” beyond the lighter areas on each of the windows.**
11. **Provide mechanical scribing at the wainscot on the west elevation.**
12. **Provide a tree for the employee area north of the building.**
13. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
14. 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.
15. 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.
16. 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.
17. 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.
18. 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.
19. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
- 20.
21. Provide two half size color elevations, two full size and two 8-1/2 X 11 sets of revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 23, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 4 - 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The Board felt that the revised elevations with conditions were reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: SP142-1 (side A)

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

DA