

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

APRIL 4, 2007

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Lower Level of the Council Chambers 57 East First Street, at 2:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Dave Richins- Vice Chair
Tim Nielsen
Tom Bottomley
Robert Burgheimer
Wendy LeSueur
Vince DiBella

MEMBERS ABSENT

Pete Berzins (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

Kim Steadman	Vince Dalke
Lesley Davis	Susan Stewart
Debbie Archuleta	Lisa Foreman
Mia Lozano Helland	Robert Gomez
Monique Spivey	Edmir Dzudza
John Wesley	Brent Kendle
Jim Hash	Mike Krentz
Dennis Price	Michael Kinion
Bret Almquist	Ko Yu
Joe Diemer	Others
Matthew Sargent	
Mike Kleer	
Thomas Hunt	
Jeremy Jones	
Sherry Anderson	
Todd Decker	
Tom Martin	
John Forash	
Jim Larson	
Doug Himmelberger	
Dave Udall	
Mike Ammons	
Marge Kinder	
Zach Lauterbach	

1. Work Session:

CASE: Industrial Buildings
824 W Broadway

REQUEST: Approval of two industrial buildings

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Agreed with staff that the trash should be relocated

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Agreed the trash should be relocated

CASE: Office Warehouse shell building
7131 S 89 PI

REQUEST: Review of an office warehouse shell building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- The stucco color is too close to the color of the split face, should be more contrast

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Thought there were too many shrubs that get large very quickly
- There should be mid size shrubs at the entry

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- The split face color could be darker

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The Tierra brown is darker than it appears on the elevations
- Show an angle from the street that shows how far back you can see the door on the roof

CASE: Durga Gateway Lot 8 and Lot 7
7222 S Atwood

REQUEST: Review of an industrial shell building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Could the triangle be lattice like

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Concerned with the roof elevations
- Wants the triangle elements to stay
- Maybe they could eliminate the triangles on the rear but keep the ones on the front

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The triangles redeem the building
- They need to do something interesting

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Liked the spacing of the windows

CASE: In-N-Out Burger
1859 S Signal Butte

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

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Palm trees are corporate
- Red canopy seems out of place

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Burgundy would be better color choice
- All of the parapets need to be four-sided
- Maybe add an additional 1' step in the roof elements

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Do the parapets need to be so tall?
- Pretty plain building
- Use a nice light to add interest to the building

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Concern with stacking distance
- How will cars leave parking stalls when drive thru lane backs up

CASE: Arco AM/PM
2751 E University

REQUEST: Review of a raze and rebuild of a gas station

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Very plain
- Needs bolder elements, especially at the entry
- Could they add color?
- Cornices need to be finished

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Stucco base will get beat up a lot
- The Board needs to know what the building will look like if the sign panels are not allowed

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Glass color should add interest

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- The materials and colors don't meet what has been done by other gas stations in the last few years

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- The blue stripe is LED
- Don't change to decals on the canopy, use the LED shown

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Should add a cornice to tie in with the buildings on the other corners
- Could they do the corners in a different color
- Use reveals not score joints
- Use decorative lights, not wall-paks

CASE: Carl's Jr.
SWC Greenfield & Juanita

REQUEST: Review of a fast food restaurant

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Nice building
- Likes the platinum color of the metal element

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Need to provide foundation base

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- The entry could be popped out more

CASE: Marvel Building & Masonry Supply
NEC Pecos & 222 Street

REQUEST: Review of a

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Could they do something to showcase the masonry
- This looks ordinary
- Suggest pushing the blocks in and out
- Use integral block
- Light fixtures and decorative downspouts could add interest

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Could add interest by using running bond or stack bond

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Would like more canopies

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- They could use block that has a change in plane at accent points
- Likes the canopy

CASE: Aquila Superstition Springs Medical Office Park
96 St & Hampton

REQUEST: Review of two medical office buildings

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Better than the previous application for this project
- The stone makes the building
- Make sure they really can do the stone and don't use stucco
- Need to use large pieces not little 12" X 12" pieces
- The details of the window mullions and the top of the stone will be very important
- The shape of the metal pieces very important

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- The mullions will be inside

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Concerned the glass not be spandrel
- Doesn't think the window system works
- Only vertical elements will stand in front of glass

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Landscape plan needs to be specific, show which plants are going where

CASE: Comerica Bank
925 N Dobson

REQUEST: Review of a bank at Riverview

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Looks great
- Same materials as Riverview
- Look like it belongs
- Concerned mechanical equipment and plumbing vents may ruin the clean lines of the roof
- The roofline is very nice as shown
- Show the light fixtures on the follow-up submittal

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- The mesh matches the roof
- Could they back light the mesh?

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Looks like a church

CASE: Walgreen's
1130 W Southern

REQUEST: Review of a drug store with drive-thru

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- They don't have to match the center
- Would like this to step up the look of the center
- Could they use a different material under the windows?

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- There is a lot of white

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Area under windows look like bricked up service bays

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- The arch is awkward, it's not roman or flat
- Lower the white on the other arch
- The brick is heavy and uninviting
- Could they introduce another color?

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Have picked up on the shapes ad forms of the existing
- Really likes the Walgreen's at Main and Recker
- Could they use these materials and look more like that store?

CASE: Shops at Parkwood Ranch
NWC Southern & Signal Butte

REQUEST: Review of a shopping center

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Likes the variety of awnings

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Likes the new stone proposed

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Make sure the plants are contract grown or they could have trouble getting them

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Very Nice colors
- Likes the variety
- Look at back lighting the windows on shops A
- Pad A windows seem too large, could they be smaller?
- Downspouts should be decorative

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Likes the supports on the cantilevered roofs
- If they use back lit windows don't use fluorescent tubes, use soft lights

CASE: Force Office Building
NEC Raftriver & Thomas

REQUEST: Review of an office building

DISCUSSION:

An adjacent neighbor spoke regarding the project. He thought the architecture should match the residential neighborhood across the street or be Tuscan. He did not want any access to Raftriver because children on the south side of Thomas walk to school along Raftriver. He also objected to a two-story building.

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Likes variety
- Stated QuikTrip put textured concrete and flashing lights at the driveway to the store at University and Extension to warn drivers there was a school crossing

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Liked the change in stucco material
- Would like another material
- Thought there needed to be access to the site from Raftriver

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- They need access
- Likes the nautical theme
- This looks like an office
- There are already different architectural styles in the area
- Maybe instead of the one element getting thicker the other elements could be thinner

CASE: Riverview Point Phase I
SWC Bass Pro and Alma School

REQUEST: Review of two office buildings

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Understands this will be different from the rest of Riverview
- These buildings are simple and more modern
- The buildings look industrial
- Very flat
- Very long
- Look at glazing materials, trim walls, changes in plane
- Window frames should be high tech
- Go look at office project at nwc Stapley and Baseline
- Doesn't have to match the rest of Riverview
- Suggest an interesting connection piece between the two buildings
- Maybe use sand blasted panels or cast in aluminum reveals
- Likes the idea of metal panels
- If the palm trees do stop at the entertainment district they don't have to continue them, otherwise they need to continue through this project

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Likes some of the colors
- These are not class A office buildings
- Not the same quality as what is along the 101 corridor or on the Salt River reservation
- Liked the supports on the awnings
- Need more at the entries
- Likes the site plan
- Need richer materials

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Entries seem weak, should be more identifiable
- Columns are nice but should be in a different plane
- Colors very reserved, should be more vibrant

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Concerned with proportion of entries
- Needs more interest and movement
- The entry node at Alma School and throughout the project should be palms

- Palm trees make a real statement

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Entry is weak
- Buildings need stepping
- Colors need more contrast, maybe some deeper or brighter
- Forms are too basic
- Will look dated very soon
- Needs to be enhanced
- Maybe metal ribbed siding
- Pay attention to shadow lines
- Could the bend be a wedge?
- Maybe some panels are sandblasted and some are not
- Consider butt glazing, instead of 4-sided, just 2-sided – either vertical or horizontal

CASE: Stockwell 11 & 12
6945 and 7029 S 89 Pl

REQUEST: Review of an industrial building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur

- Would like the windows to be recessed

CASE: Costco and adjacent industrial buildings
Sossaman & Hampton

REQUEST: Review of a Costco store and three industrial buildings

DISCUSSION: Regarding the Costco

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Should use a modern looking stone
- More horizontal
- The center expanse is very long, could there be another element to break up that portion?

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Thinks the west elevation should also be broken up

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Stone seems a little out of place or maybe it should be more horizontal

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- The parking lot tree is small and gray and doesn't have much canopy
- Pine trees don't work with the rest of the palette
- Suggests Palo Verde or Mesquite
- Look at the heights of the shrubs if they grow too tall the maintenance people will trim them too much

DISCUSSION: Regarding the industrial

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Could they find one color for both projects
- Maybe the field color and then different accents
- Could the masonry or the site walls be the same?

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Agreed they could introduce elements from Costco to tie them together
- The same canopies, but maybe not red

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- They seem disconnected with the Costco
- Introduce the metal panels from the Costco

CASE: Hyatt Place Mesa Riverview
Bass Pro Drive and Alma School

REQUEST: Review of a hotel

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Should pad site be tied into Cinemark?
- Strengthen the pedestrian connections to Cinemark and entertainment district

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Nice articulation of Mesa Stone
- Use stucco reveal screeds to provide interest and tie into wedge
- Palm trees would help break up the building

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Should have a strong landscape statement at the round-a-bout

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Needs more detailing
- Look at scoring
- Maybe awnings or canopies
- Likes the wedge idea but not that fact it is not real and doesn't seem to fit the building
- Could roof forms tie in with the wedge?

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- The glass element is very thin
- Sign is out of place, should be better integrated

CASE: Tesco/Fresh and Easy
Sossaman & Southern

REQUEST: Review of a grocery store and shops

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Concern with the depth of the awnings

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Could do bolder forms and shapes without all the colors

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Striking colors on building, not in harmony with landscape palette
- Pine trees don't work
- Suggests Ironwood instead of Swan Hill Olive
- No petite pink oleander with the colors on the building
- Agave is very sensitive to frost
- Landscape palette should have more structure
- Landscaping should provide an entry statement
- Work with the project across the street (south of Hampton)

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Likes the simple ness of the Tesco rather than the fussiness of the shops building
- They don't work well together
- The green is very strong
- Doesn't like the autumn color, it will look pink
- The cornice should be removed
- Be mindful of the slivers behind the slopes

2. Call to Order:

Vice Chair Dave Richins called the meeting to order at 6:23 p.m.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the March 7, 2007 Meeting:

On a motion by Tim Nielsen seconded by Vince DiBella the Board unanimously approved the minutes as revised to reflect Boardmember LeSueur's attendance.

4. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-33 Mesa Ridge
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2725, 2701, 2661 N Ogden
REQUEST: Approval of three office/warehouse buildings totaling 34,643
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Charles Klees
APPLICANT: Michael Monroe
ARCHITECT: Vince Dalke
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of three office/warehouse buildings totaling 34,643

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley did not think the applicant had adequately addressed the Boards comments from the work session.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the buildings could be better articulated; however, they were in an industrial subdivision and would not be visible McDowell or Greenfield.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR07-33 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.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements established in Chapter 15 of the City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance.
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.
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 at least one week prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 - 1 (Boardmember Tom Bottomley voting nay)

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-34 Ellsworth Crossing
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 9135 E Guadalupe
REQUEST: Approval of an 74,174 sq. ft. retail center
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: VDG Guadsworth LLC
APPLICANT: Jeff Looker
ARCHITECT: Jeff Looker
STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of an 74,174 sq. ft. retail center

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR07-34 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. **Color changes on building elevations to be a 3/4" reveal, not a paint line.**
 - b. **Provide manufacturer and color of steel canopy over the storefront at west end of north elevation.**
 - c. **Provide location of order-placing speaker with at least 40' long stacking distance between order-placing speaker and entry to the drive-thru lane. 11-15-6(C)5.**
2. Design Review Board approval of future pad sites remaining on site.
3. Design Review approval of 44' – 10" high front façade of health club located at center of north elevation and 40' – 0" high front façade of major located at east end of north elevation.
4. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
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 and painted to match the primary building color.
8. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
9. 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.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

CASE #: DR07-35 Tutor Time

LOCATION/ADDRESS: N of NWC of Crismon & Baseline
REQUEST: Approval of a 25,749 sq. ft. daycare building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Tutor Crismon Group
APPLICANT: David Cardenas
ARCHITECT: David Cardenas
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of a 25,749 sq. ft. daycare building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR07-35 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 provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Finish the backsides of the parapets that project above the lowest building height and return cornices. Details to be reviewed approved by Design Review staff.
 - b. Coordinate with the adjacent development to the north to connect the pedestrian path, near the northwest corner of the building near the trash enclosures, across the drive aisle.
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.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

CASE #: DR07-36 Plaza del Sol

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1511 S Mesa Drive
REQUEST: Approval of an 11,701 sq. ft. retail center
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: Rosa & Venancio Macias
APPLICANT: Robert Gomez
ARCHITECT: Robert Gomez
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of an 11,701 sq. ft. retail center

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley was concerned that the applicant had not addressed any of the Board's comments from the work session. Staffmember Lesley Davis stated the Board's concerns were conditions of approval.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the scale of the canopy and sign area was out of proportion. He thought the signs would overwhelm the area above the canopy; and there was not enough distance between the cornice and the roof of the canopy.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR07-36 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. Revise the rear elevations to incorporate additional detailing to address the Board's concerns raised in the 'Work Session'. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.
 - b. Revise the sign areas to be more in line with allowable signage per Chapter 19 of the Zoning Ordinance. Revise the design of the monument sign to be more compatible with the building. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.
 - c. **Develop the proportions of the canopy and increase the area above the canopy. Detail to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.**
 - d. Incorporate an additional color or replace an existing color to be used as an accent color. A revised color/material board will need to be provided for the file. All proposed materials and colors are to be included. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.
 - e. The design of the riprap in the retention areas must be natural in appearance with no visible grout and utilize a stone that has a natural appearance in the landscaping. Details to be reviewed and approved by

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Design Review staff.

- f. Provide vertical and horizontal staggering of the screen walls in accordance with §11-15-4 of the Zoning Ordinance. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. An Administrative Site Plan Modification must be approved by the Planning Director to accommodate the revised site plan since Z04-94 was approved.
4. Compliance with all requirements established in Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance unless a Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit (SCIP) is approved by the Zoning Administrator or Board of Adjustment for deviations to those standards.
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
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 and painted to match the primary building color.
8. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
9. 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 – 1 (Boardmember Tom Bottomley voting nay)

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 37 **Shops at Legacy House Phase II**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 5747 E. McKellips Road
REQUEST: Approval of a 30,816 sq. ft. retail center
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Western States Lodging
APPLICANT: Dennis Price
ARCHITECT: Richard Sinnard
STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of a 30,816 sq. ft. retail center

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR07-37 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.
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 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-38 Coury Offices
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1750 S Mesa Dr. or 308 W Coury
REQUEST: Approval of a 17,000 sq. ft. office
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: Coury Ave., L.L.C.
APPLICANT: Brent Kendle
ARCHITECT: Brent Kendle
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of a 17,000 sq. ft. office

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley, thought the building should have an additional color.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR07-38 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. **Provide an additional color. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.**
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 established in Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance unless a Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit (SCIP) is approved by the Zoning Administrator or Board of Adjustment for deviations to those standards.
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 revised half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible site plans, landscaping plans and revised elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff at least one week prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-39 Broadway Condominiums

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1759 E Broadway
REQUEST: Approval of a 6 condominium units at a density of
 20.9 du/acre
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: Michael Watson
APPLICANT: Edmir Dzudza
ARCHITECT: Edmir Dzudza
STAFF PLANNER: Jim Hash

REQUEST: Approval of a 6 condominium units at a density of 20.9 du/acre

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR07-39 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. **Conditioned on the approval of the Developmental Incentive Permit for the submitted site plan case (BA07-008) through the Board of Adjustment**
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 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-40 Retail at MacFrugal Plaza

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1230 S Mesa Drive
REQUEST: Approval of a 3,975 sq. ft. retail/ restaurant building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: Red Mountain Retail Group
APPLICANT: Bill Osborne
ARCHITECT: Bill Osborne
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of a 3,975 sq. ft. retail/ restaurant building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR07-40 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.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. This approval is contingent upon variances approved through a Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit (SCIP) from the Zoning Administrator or Board of Adjustment.
4. Replace missing or non-thriving plant material on the east side of the screen wall along Mesa Drive.
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
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 and painted to match the primary building color.
8. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
9. 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 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 41 Office Plaza

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 4437 E Southern
REQUEST: Approval of a 10,400 sq. ft. office
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: SJ Development Group
APPLICANT: Lisa Foreman
ARCHITECT: Lisa Foreman

REQUEST: Approval of a 10,400 sq. ft. office

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR07- 41 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. Designate on plans an employee area within the courtyard area separated from vehicular drives, which includes outdoor furniture.
 - b. The pedestrian sidewalk starting at the northwest corner of the site shall provide a clear and unobstructed width of 5'-6" a distance of \pm 140 feet to the south with connection to the sidewalk which extends \pm 174' to the east. Re-adjust landscape trees and shrubs in the sidewalk shown on landscape plan and site plan (submittal 2), with changes notated accordingly.
 - c. Revise monument sign elevation notes referring to the base details. Indicate 4" sandblasted CMU to match building base.
 - d. Notate the word "Keynotes" above details (1-36) on site plan.
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 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-42 Falcon View Lot 10 Shops
LOCATION/ADDRESS: McKellips & Recker Roads
REQUEST: Approval of a 6,496 sq. ft. retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: CTW Retail Partners
APPLICANT: Liz Gaston
ARCHITECT: Larson Associates

REQUEST: Approval of a 6,496 sq. ft. retail building

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley had some concerns regarding the color palette. Staffmember Mia Lozano-Helland explained the colors matched the existing shopping center.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-42 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.
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 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-43 **Mid Mesa Medical Building**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 3155 E Southern
REQUEST: Approval of an 11,600 sq. ft. two-story medical office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: LGE Corporation
APPLICANT: Steven Nevala, Cawley Architects
ARCHITECT: Paul Devers, Cawley Architects
STAFF PLANNER: Monique Spivey

REQUEST: Approval of an 11,600 sq. ft. two-story medical office building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR07-43 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.
2. Review and approval of a Development Incentive Permit (DIP) from the Board of Adjustment.
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.
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 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-44 Juanita Medical Campus

LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Juanita & Vineyard
REQUEST: Approval of five medical offices totaling 76,904 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: LGE Design Build
APPLICANT: Michael Krentz
ARCHITECT: Mike Edwards
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of five medical offices totaling 76,904 sq. ft.

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR07-44 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 revised color/material board that includes specifications and samples or photo brochures of the block, glass, and storefront, light fixtures, etc. Details to be reviewed approved by Design Review staff.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Provide landscaping in compliance with Chapter 15 of the City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance.
4. Provide parking lot screen walls in accordance with Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance. Additional screen walls are required adjacent to parking spaces that side on the public street.
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
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 and painted to match the primary building color.
8. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
9. 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 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Presentation by Gordon Sheffield, Zoning Administrator, regarding the Zoning Ordinance Update: *Issues and Options Working Paper*

Staffmember Gordon Sheffield gave a power point presentation explaining the progress of the Zoning Ordinance update.

Mr. Sheffield explained there has been five months of public input, highlighted by a series of Stakeholder's Interviews held in September 2006, and a Community Workshop held in December 2006. The consultant for this project, Dyett and Bhatia of San Francisco, has also interviewed City staff and made presentations to the Planning and Zoning Board and the General Development Committee of the City Council. The results of this work have been summarized in the *Issues and Option Working Paper*.

Six citizen advisory boards and committees are involved in the development of recommendations and possible changes; the Planning and Zoning Board, Design Review Board, Downtown Development Committee, Historic Preservation Committee, the Economic Development Advisory Board and Housing Advisory Board. The Board of Adjustment is also being kept apprised of the progress of the Update project, but because they are a quasi-judicial board, with have limited if any participation in the development of new policies.

Some issues identified by Dyett and Bhatia's research include: 1) organization of the zoning ordinance, particularly with regard to making things easier to find; 2) inefficiencies in processing requests; 3) zoning ordinance related barriers to infill development; 4) raising the overall design quality of projects built in Mesa; 5) a lack of housing variety; 6) an imbalance in the ratio of houses to jobs; and 7) enabling rules for sub-areas to address neighborhood needs.

Sheffield directed notice in particular to a few issues that pertained directly to the types of cases seen by the Design Review Board. For example, the *I&O Working Paper* calls out the fact that the design guidelines are "one size fits all," requiring relatively the same standards for multi-family, office, commercial, industrial uses, as well as exactly the same items for the different contexts and neighborhoods throughout the entire City. The *Working Paper* includes a recommendation that there should be different standards for different land uses and for different neighborhoods/areas of the City. To help address some of the organizational concerns the code should include more graphics and tables in the Code.

Some inefficiencies being noted included cases in which the Planning and Zoning Board and Design Review Board had "overlapping" reviews. He also mentioned that in-fill projects should have more predictable standards, and that part of the problem being identified is that the zoning code does not include urban oriented guidelines or standards. It does have rigid, suburban oriented buffering standards that makes it difficult to build on "infill" sites. Developing infill standards would help make DIP cases more predictable.

He then asked the Board if they had additional issues that should be addressed.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer did not think it was necessary to notify neighbors for all projects. He questioned why a project that is a use by right should have to notify

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

neighbors, and why applicants should have to notify the same neighbors all the way through every process.

He agreed that if-fill projects are important, but thought that redevelopment sites should have incentives also.

Staffmember Sheffield stated that the citizen participation and notification processes will be reviewed during the Update discuss. He noted that staff general considers the term "infill" in a broad context, which would include redevelopment projects.

Boardmember Burgheimer thought that parking requirements should be looked at for urban sites, especially when they are near light rail and busses.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought that Engineering standards need to be revised for in-fill projects.

Staffmember Sheffield stated that might have to be addressed by a separate project, as engineering standards are outside the scope of the Zoning Ordinance Update project.

Boardmember Vince DiBella thought site planning could be addressed through Design Review Board.

Staffmember Sheffield stated there were seven recommendations, which include:

- 1) Making Zoning Easier to Understand and Use;
- 2) Streamlining Development Review and Approval;
- 3) Addressing Infill Development;
- 4) Achieving a High Level of Design Quality;
- 5) Promoting Housing Variety and Choice;
- 6) Supporting Economic Growth; and
- 7) Strengthening Area-Specific Regulations.

The *I&O Working Paper* includes 33 sub-recommendations that are classified under these seven major headings. Some of the sub-recommendations to be considered include

- More review by staff
- Allow more by-right uses
- Clarify rules regarding when Design Review, Planning and Zoning Board or the Downtown Development Committee is responsible for the review of a case, and to eliminate overlapping reviews
- Consider merging two or more of the Boards. Sheffield mentioned that this recommendation has been already discussed with the DDC, and they would prefer that the DDC be kept as a separate review panel for downtown-related cases.

There was a concern from Design Review Board members that having one Board doing only downtown and one Board doing the rest of the City would not work. There would need to be created additional boards advising on additional areas. However, the question then would be how the develop a consistent voice from these various advisory Boards in developing new policies.

Boardmember Vince DiBella stated Mesa is the only city that sets and keeps deadlines for filing planning related applications. Most cities leave you in limbo for months until all the

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

related issues have been addressed and then the staff is willing to place you on an agenda.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated the danger of combining the Design review Board and the Planning and Zoning Board is that the Planning and Zoning Board tends to have political considerations and there could be "deal making" that takes place rather than reviewing a case strictly on compatibility standards. The DRB has been fairly successful in avoiding politically related issues during their reviews..

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought that breaking down the development review process into manageable parts makes a lot of sense. It allows the P&Z Board to review for land use, and allows the Design Review Board to focus on design and aesthetic issues. In his opinion the DRB was objective and looked only at what's best for community.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Appeals of Administrative Design Review:

Bass Pro Shop: The project was represented by Mark Tuttle and Steve Phillips

Mr. Tuttle showed the Board photos of the building taken at different times of day to show how the sun changes the look of the building. He stated they had made some revisions to the building as it was being constructed. They had used a heavy stucco texture and questioned whether they needed to paint the bands or just let the sun provide the change. They did not want to do the faux finish because they thought it would look blotchy on such large areas. Adding the accent color would require maintenance of the paint.

Staffmember Kim Steadman stated it was staff's belief that the building did need the accent color for the bands to break up the large elevations. He stated staff did agree that using the faux finish may not be needed. It could look uneven on such a large surface.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought the rear elevation looked like a tall gymnasium with reveals. He thought it needed the break up of the color change. He did not think the reveals would be perceived from a distance.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur supports the staff decision. The contrast in color was needed.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought that from a distance the color change would be needed. He thought the color change would help the overall theme of the building.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought they should have done a test panel with the faux finish. He agreed they needed the paint change for the reveals, but also thought they needed the faux finish.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur did not understand the color samples. The yellow color approved by the Board was not what they had painted.

The applicant agreed, they did not paint either of the stucco colors approved by the Board.

Staffmember Kim Steadman stated that one major difference on the Bass Pro project is that they have done more on some portions of the building that was approved. He agreed the color was not as approved by the Board.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated he had a procedural issue with the fact they had changed the color of the building. He questioned what color they would use to paint the reveals, since the color samples staff had would not work with the actual color of the building. He thought the Board would also need to approve the change in color.

MOTION: It was moved by Boardmember Tim Nielsen seconded by Boardmember Wendy LeSueur that:

1. The Board allow Bass Pro to work with staff on a color for the reveals.
2. Allow them to delete the faux finish.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

3. Allow the color change for the base color as it exists.

VOTE: Passed 4 – 0 Boardmember Vince DiBella abstained. Vice-Chair Dave Richins left prior to this discussion.

Other Business:

Mary Kronhouser of Form 5 architecture explained that Watermill Express was interested in building in the City. She explained that a Watermill Express application had been denied by the Board in July of 2002, and the denial had been upheld by the City Council. One of the issues at that time was whether the structure was a vending machine or a building. She stated that kiosks had their own address, their own utilities and a man door, therefore they were a building.

Ms. Kronhouser explained that because they are a franchise it would be difficult to redesign, so they were trying to cover it up. They could look at different colors or materials. She showed the Board some examples of how they could cover up the structure.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen stated the examples presented takes it a step beyond pop architecture. It is almost a sculpture. He questioned how many they would want to see. He thought this was a creative approach.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur was not in favor it them. She thought they had become sculptures and would take away from the centers.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen stated the materials and colors would need to tie into each center. There would need to be landscaping.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley appreciates the abstractions. He stated they reminded him of the creative bus stops throughout the City. He questioned how the customer comes in contact with the structure. Would the screening endanger the customer by hiding them from view. He liked the sculptural aspect and thought they were going in an interesting direction.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur thought they might work depending on where they were placed. They would need to be a structural element. She was concerned that the structural element was still just hiding a dated blue and white structure. What is inside should be interesting also.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought the structure should be as nice as the sails.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur agreed the structure should be enhanced, not just hidden. They need to tie into the center they are being placed in.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da