

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
SPECIAL MEETING
June 16, 2004

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Planning Division Conference Room, 55 North Center, at 8:00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Carie Allen
Vince DiBella
Randy Carter
Pete Berzins
Rob Burgheimer
Jillian Hagen

Laura Hyneman
Debbie Archuleta
Lesley Davis
Charlie Scully
Mike Reidy
Sherman Cawley
Michael Jorgensen
John Wesley

MEMBERS ABSENT

Tim Nielsen (excused)

1. Call to Order:

Chair Carie Allen called the meeting to order at 8:11 a.m.

2. Design Review Case:

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-35 **Baseline Office Center**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC Baseline and East Valley Auto Dr.
REQUEST: Develop 64,070 sq. ft., two-story office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Michael Reidy
APPLICANT: Michael Reidy
ARCHITECT: Sherman Cawley

REQUEST: Approval of a 64,070 sq. ft. two store office building

SUMMARY: Mike Reidy, Sherman Cawley, and Michael Jorgensen represented the case. Mr. Cawley explained that at the June 2, 2004 meeting the Board expressed concern regarding elevations especially the east elevation and asked that the applicants look at two elevation solutions, one was to recess the glass on the ground floor, the other was to provide additional articulation to the east side with projections, vertical elements, etc. Since the June 2, 2004 meeting they had made changes to the building elevations by recessing the ground floor windows on the east elevation, and had added additional trees. They were proposing three clustered, Sissoo trees between each of the palms along the street. Mr. Cawley brought three elevations; one showed the original proposal, the second showed the windows recessed, the third showed the recessed windows and the additional, clustered trees. Mr. Cawley stated it was their preference to maintain the integrity of the structural system and the integrity of the upper wall surface so they selected recessing the glass. He showed the Board a drawing of the detail of the railing system on the interior elevation of the building. He showed the Board a sample of the concrete building material and bronze glass. He explained that the concrete panels would be sandblasted. He explained that the rhythm of the window mullions would be the same on the outside of the building as it was on the inside of the building.

Boardmember Vince DiBella wondered why the recessed windows had not been continued around the building.

Mr. Reidy stated that it was his decision in answer to the Board's concerns with the "football field length" east elevation.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated he had not been at the June 2, 2004 meeting. He was glad the case was continued because he had concerns with the elevations. He thought the site plan changes were much better. He did not want to introduce any new ideas and make the process more complicated. He felt the recess was important; however, he felt the rendering did not show it well. He felt the building was flat and cardboard looking. He wanted to see more color even with the aggregate, which he felt was very nice. He thought the bronze would not give it enough punch. He suggested some concrete panels be different colors. He thought colored glass could help. He did not like the use of palm trees to improve the look.

Boardmember Vince DiBella wanted the recessed windows to continue around the base of building. He clarified that they chose not to do a break in the building which was their choice. He confirmed the reveals were $\frac{3}{4}$ " deep.

Mr. Cawley stated the building was pre-cast, not tilt panel; the panels would have a sandblasted finish.

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember DiBella thought the bronze glass was too close to the color of the building, but he could approve it if the applicant wanted it.

Boardmember Pete Berzins stated he liked the building as originally proposed. He appreciated the compromise of the recessed windows and understood it would reduce the leaseable square footage. He stated either blue or bronze glass was OK. He felt the changes were subtle enough to maintain the integrity the owner wanted.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen thought the recessed windows helped the building, but felt they should continue around the building. She still felt the building was too flat for its size. She thought the building looked industrial. She understood the palm trees exist in the overall development. She thought there wasn't any rhyme or reason to their placement and they did not reinforce anything in the building. She suggested clustering the palms at the corner, and eliminating them at the south side of the building. She thought the building color was very neutral and too subtle.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed the use of the pre-cast panels with a vertical panel between the glass and a spandrel above. He suggested casting the panels in different colors.

Mr. Cawley stated he was concerned the building would look checkered. He felt that glass and mullions were the best way to achieve color differentiation.

Boardmember Carter wondered if another tree species could be used to enhance the building.

Boardmember Hagen stated that palm trees were appropriate in this case because they give the most height. She suggested the corners be punctuated with a grove massing.

Boardmember Burgheimer confirmed the returns were proposed to be glass with a soffit.

Chair Carie Allen agreed with Boardmember Berzins. She thought the bronze glass would match the building too closely. She thought that if the windows were to be recessed they needed to be recessed all the way around. She did not think the recessed windows would make that much difference. She did not like the rhythm of the trees. She felt that for the type of building and location, this design was fine.

Boardmember Burgheimer agreed the building looks industrial. He stated that they could do a lot more with pre-cast panels than they were proposing. He stated that the center piece or the spandrel piece could be a different color. He wanted to see a return piece, not just a glass return. If it were a 2' deep pre-cast piece it would emphasize the recess.

Mr. Cawley stated they could easily use EIFS. He stated this would be a condo project so they don't want to change the depth of the bays. He stated Mr. Reidy wanted a single-loaded building so the surface quality was very important.

Boardmember Burgheimer felt the lighting of the building could make a difference. He confirmed they would be using pole lighting in the parking areas and sconces attached to the building. Boardmember Burgheimer felt that nice fixtures could help the rhythm of the building.

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Mr. Cawley stated they would not be using shoebox fixtures.

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested the retaining walls could be a different material to break up the industrial look.

Mike Reidy then spoke. He thanked the Board for the special meeting. He stated he hoped they could approve the building with definitive conditions. He stated he was willing to continue the recess of the bottom glass all the way around the building, use a solid return, and revise the landscape plan. He stated they could do anything with landscaping they were told to do. He stated he would like to get definitive direction at this meeting and then work with Design Review staff. He stated he had originally suggested the blue glass but then as he had driven around the community looking at other buildings he was not happy with the look of blue glass. He was willing to use whatever color the Board wanted.

Boardmember Carter stated that the Board has worked to improve the quality of projects being built in the City and he was concerned this building was going backward from what the Board has seen in the last two to four years. He did not feel they had met the intent of the Design Guidelines.

Boardmember Hagen thought the inside of the building had a better feel in the massing and the contemporary feel than the outside.

Boardmember DiBella stated he had allowed Mr. Reidy's decision to apply for "at risk" plan review to influence his decision regarding this project. He stated he would not allow that to happen again. He stated he could support the building but felt it could be better.

Boardmember Berzins stated he does not look at buildings the same as the architects on the Board. He did not feel the building would be bad to the general public driving down Baseline Road.

Chair Allen agreed with Mr. Berzins. She thought Mr. Reidy had been very good about making the changes the Board had asked for. She felt it was the Board's responsibility to please the general public and she thought this building did.

Boardmember Carter thought the single-loaded corridor was driving the building design. He stated the Board makes smaller buildings do much more than this very large building is proposing.

Mr. Reidy stated they have been working on this project since February and had tried to address the Board's concerns. They had made a lot of changes to the site plan and building. They had worked with staff and relied on their response and rebuttal. He stated they had reveals and recessed windows, he felt it was articulated.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated staff had worked with Mr. Reidy on the site plan for this project and at the end of each of the meetings she had said she hoped the elevations were coming along as well. Mr. Reidy had done what he thought he was asked to do. Maybe the Board needs to look at how this case was handled, and make changes in the future. She confirmed with Mr. Reidy that he was willing to recess the first floor windows 2' around the building.

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR04-35 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 approved by Design Review staff prior to submitting for construction permits:
 - a. Provide three (3) additional trees along the Baseline frontage to ensure at least twenty-eight (28) total trees, including the five (5) palm trees allowed as substitution for the street landscaping.
 - b. Locate the fan palms and sissoo trees adjacent to the Baseline elevation in a symmetrical arrangement so as to provide formal accents to the building design.
 - c. Provide typical elevations with color and material information for site walls, retaining walls, and screen walls.
 - d. Provide elevations of parking canopies with color and material information.
 - e. Show locations of building signage and ensure that any attached signs are designed with integral raceways.
 - f. Provide light fixture cut sheets.
 - g. Recess the glass on the ground floor 24" around the building and provide a solid return.
 - h. Return to the Board with revised elevations, which address the Board's concerns.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Fire Cods, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
5. 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.

Boardmember Burgheimer wanted the Board to review and approve the following changes at a future meeting:

Different glass substrate; blue, bronze, green, or coated. Consider introducing a second color panel for the concrete spandrel piece. Revised site walls in a different material or the new color. Revised landscape plans. Consider a different mullion pattern.

Mr. Cawley stated the glass could be different colors, or some coated and others not.

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Berzins was concerned that changing the colors would make the building look checkered.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated he was only suggesting they study their options. He did not feel the bronze glass was the right color.

Chair Carie Allen confirmed that Boardmember Burgheimer wanted the applicant to come back before the Board to approve the color changes, the choice of glass color, the landscape revisions, and the possible mullion changes. He wanted them to be able to get their permits and start construction while the review these changes. She confirmed that he was not requiring them to change the color of block or saying which color the glass should be.

Mr. Reidy asked when they could come back to the Board. The Boardmembers stated whenever they were ready. Mr. Reidy stated he needed to have a decision regarding the spandrel color soon because there was a lead time in ordering the panels.

Boardmember Berzins was concerned that if they come back with the changes proposed and the Board still doesn't like the changes, what would happen. He felt the Board needed to be definitive in what it wanted.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that he was trying to get the Board to agree that they could accept the massing, but how they handle the mullions and the substrate could enhance the building.

Boardmember Hagen confirmed Boardmember Burgheimer was approving the building massing as it was but wanted changes in color.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that if the spandrel and the EFIS were a different color it would have a different read.

Boardmember stated she was clear at the June 2, 2004 meeting that she felt the massing needed to be more consistent between the courtyard side and the outside of the building, so she was not in support of the building.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 1 (Jillian Hagen voting nay)

Mr. Reidy confirmed that the Board wanted the 2' recess to continue around the building as he offered.

Boardmember Carter suggested that for the glass issue they could show three versions; the color glass as a uniform piece, another one with a coating on the three foot strip; then a third one with the wainscot at the bottom in a different tone.

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested they introduce some more horizontals in the aluminums.

Boardmember Hagen suggested the strengthen the simplicity and horizontal masses. She stated the inside felt better because they had strong linear pieces.

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 16, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that on the inside they had the play between the rails and the solid concrete, which she thought Boardmember Burgheimer was saying the mullions could provide for the outside.

Boardmember Burgheimer agreed that was where he was going.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: Although the Board felt the project could look better, they approved it to allow the applicant to move the project along so he can get permits.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

DA