

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

SPECIAL MEETING

March 13, 2008

**3:00 p.m. Planning Conference Room
20 East Main**

A work session of the Design Review Board was held in the Planning Conference Room, 20 East Main, at 12:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Craig Boswell
Delight Clark
Rob Burgheimer
Wendy LeSueur
Tom Bottomley

OTHERS PRESENT

Debbie Archuleta
Lesley Davis
Mia Lozano-Helland
Jeff Conkle
Brenda Penner
Arnett Spencer

MEMBERS ABSENT

Vince DiBella
Tim Nielsen

CASE #: DR08-09 McKellips Office

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2554 E. McKellips Road
REQUEST: Approval of a 1,877 sq. ft. office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Spencer Arnett
APPLICANT: Indigo Fox Designs
ARCHITECT: Sunghoun Kim
STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of a 1,877 sq. ft. office building

SUMMARY: Boardmember Rob Burgheimer conducted the meeting.

Brenda Penner and Arnett Spencer represented the case.

Brenda Penner explained the changes to the elevations and the various options.

Boardmember Craig Boswell confirmed they were proposing to use one downspout on the west and one on the east elevation. He thought the building was moving in the right direction; however, he still thought it was too tall for the width.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur confirmed they were proposing a recess for the windows, and also that the accent around the windows was only a color change. The color band around the windows is not attractive. She suggested four simple windows that don't bisect the building; deleting the stone wainscot and carrying it up on the front instead; recessing the window more; and using the darker color as the wainscot. She thought the building looked like a duplex.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the revisions were better, and addressed things they were asked to do. He thought they were on the right track; however they were not quite there yet. He had questions regarding what exactly they were proposing because of the multiple options, and because the color elevations they brought to the meeting were different from the black lines submitted to staff. He did not like the red squares; he thought the downspouts were too basic; he still wanted to know what light fixtures they were proposing to use. Boardmember Burgheimer stated the Board had seen this project a number of times and shouldn't be that hard. He did not think it was the role of the Board to design projects; however, he wanted this done.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought the windows surrounds looked dated and the design was still too unresolved. He questioned the design of the front doors. The front entry looks awkward with the narrow door and wider window. There are too many dissimilar elements and no identity. He thought the windows needed to recess more. He confirmed they were proposing fixed pane windows with mullions. He agreed it was a small building, but he did not think the Board should lower their standards because of the size and the fact it had been reviewed so many times. He confirmed they were using ground-mounted equipment. He suggested using smaller punctuated windows at the top to provide more light.

Mr. Spencer stated he wanted to use unpainted scored block and rusticated a metal awning.

Boardmember Burgheimer then sketched an example of the direction he thought the Board was trying to give the applicant. The example showed a stepped roof with a cornice; smaller windows; a change in plane of 6" to 8"; constructed of masonry with one portion covered in stucco; a raised wainscot; and windows along the north with an obscure film instead of the glass block. He stated the obscure film could be at the lower portion only to allow more light without allowing visibility into the project to the north. He stated masonry could be very heavy on such a small building he suggested using 8 X 4 block so the building would not look so heavy. He suggested using some stucco and at least two textures of masonry such as ground face, and split face.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley agreed with the example sketch, which he thought, "broke the box". He agreed a portion of the building should be covered in stucco. He did not think they should wrap the windows. He suggested using residential windows and placing them at the very back of the masonry unit to provide maximum recess. He thought the two columns with a masonry base could work. He suggested sandblasted masonry to show more aggregate. He confirmed the mobile home park had asked that there be no windows on the north elevation and staff had suggested the applicant use something like glass block to provide light but not allow visibility into the mobile home park. Boardmember Bottomley thought obscure glass would be better. The narrow stone wainscot looks like a ribbon along the bottom, either use it in a larger format or remove. He did not think the applicant should use stone if they were going to use masonry.

Mr. Spencer stated this was a very small property in front of an old mobile home park.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur stated every building has the chance to be a jewel.

It was moved by Rob Burgheimer, seconded by Craig Boswell that DR08-09 be approved subject to the following conditions:

Work with staff on the following revisions:

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. Use three types of masonry, smooth, integral and textured.
 - b. Revise the canopy design so that is more technically feasible and so that water sheds away from the building.
 - c. Revise the window placement and organization; vary size and placement; muttons; divided light; glazing.
 - d. Break up the box by lowering one portion with the southeast corner being taller.
 - e. Be careful with use of accents like the corner squares, could use small tile squares.
 - f. Use integral roof drains.
 - g. Provide decorative light fixtures.
 - h. Scoring units for the masonry portion and the stucco portion of the building need to tie in together.

- i. Obscure the lower portion of the windows on the north.
 - j. Eliminate the stone
 - k. Recess the windows
 - l. All drawings submitted to staff are to be sealed and signed by Arizona Registrant.
 - m. Provide additional trees to the street frontage and adjacent property line landscaping to meet the amounts shown on the DIP site plan approval ZA05-31 (Condition 1.a).
 - n. Recordation of vehicular cross-access with parcels 141-08-015E (subject parcel) and parcel 141-08-001E to the north.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
 3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
 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 green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
 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: 5 – 0

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

DA