

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

OCTOBER 4, 2006

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Lower Level of the Council Chambers 57 East First Street, at 3:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Pete Berzins - Chair
Dave Richins- Vice Chair
Tom Bottomley
Robert Burgheimer (left at 5:00)
Tim Nielsen
Vince DiBella

MEMBERS ABSENT

Wendy LeSueur

OTHERS PRESENT

Kim Steadman
Lesley Davis
Debbie Archuleta
Mia Lozano Helland
John Wesley
Jim Nash
Jennifer Gniffke
Krissa Lucas
Ryan Matthews
Rich McAllister
Wahid Alam
Jeff McVay
Jeff Looker
Robin Colburn
Don McCubbn
Carisa Mowry
Loraine Stany
Benjamin Brooke
Elicia Nastica
Wm. Mark Brashears
Towanda Carrigan
Zamir Hazan
Trenton Jones
Bruce Loel
Brant Layton
Dan Filuk
Gregg Sherwood
Bill Wells
Marv Turney

Les Partch
Dorothy Shupe
Susan Stewart
Nathaniel Layton
Tony Cooper
Michael Jorgensen
Tim Pleger
Charly Carpenter
Bob Hunt
Randy Carter
Andrea Furman
Mike Williams
Blair Leach
Andrew Russell
Ivan Hilton
Jim McDowell
Gesad Martorano
Francine Szueways
Dan Atmer
Doug Himmelberger
Dave Udall
Bill Hunse
Marvin Tate
Don Cramer
Others

1. Work Session:

CASE: East Valley Sports
NWC Power & Boise

REQUEST: Approval of sporting goods store

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- More pronounced entry feature
- The sign area seems foreign to rest of building/maybe make it thicker at roof edge

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Liked the row lock
- More protection/shade for the entry
- More dominant entry
- Would prefer real brick it will last longer and wear better

CASE: Stapley Plaza
349 N Stapley

REQUEST: Approval of a strip commercial center

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Berzins:

- Preferred the same glass all the way through the tower
- Concerned with the depth of the parapets
- Show the parapets on all elevations
- No spandrel glass

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Wanted cantilevered awnings on the west side
- Wanted relief between the building and the glass
- Concerned with the variety of elements on the east not being cohesive; they seem to collide; the columns on the arch elements seem to disappear
- Need some variety on the west elevation

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- The silver polish color seems foreign to the rest of the palette

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Thought the fascia at the top seemed heavy

CASE: Logan's Roadhouse
202 & Dobson

REQUEST: Approval of a sit down restaurant

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Was concerned about having enough area for outdoor waiting area
- Liked the materials
- Was concerned that the dumpster and grease pit be screened

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Liked the shape of the columns; was concerned they be thick enough
- Wanted the steel members at the top to be thicker and weightier
- Agreed with staff that the building should be shifted to get a sidewalk along the building next to the parking area
- Would like to see metal trusses between the pilasters
- Suggested a recessed panel on the rear elevation

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Thought it was a good transition between the Bass Pro and the other architecture of the center

Boardmember Pete Berzins:

- Wanted to see the screen wall

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Suggested using exposed scuppers to reinforce the warehouse theme
- Suggested using warehouse looking lights on the building

CASE: The Commons at Superstition Springs
7400 block of Southern

REQUEST: Approval of three retail warehouse buildings

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Suggested they change the two entry parts on one building to make them a little different

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Maybe switch the colors on one building
- Thought any art/sculpture should not be hidden between the buildings
- It's a nice looking project
- Could they do a seating element as art

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Understood why they are defining the sign area, but was concerned that if there were only one tenant the sign area would be out of character
- Maybe the sign bands could be the same color as building

Boardmember Pete Berzins:

- Thought they should do something special like an art; in the front

CASE: Bunker Care Center
3529 E University

REQUEST: Approval of a care center accessory to an existing mortuary

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Concerned that the building complement the existing building

CASE: Carrigan's World
300 block North Alma School

REQUEST: Approval of a day care center expansion

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Concerned with the percentage of lot coverage for this project
- The building is too tall for a residential area
- Out of scale to the surrounding area
- Neighbors are concerned there is too much building for the site and the building is shoved to the rear too near the residences
- Doesn't mind the building; just not at this site
- Neighbors want an 8' wall
- If they keep the parapet roof it needs to be broken up

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Questioned whether they had enough outdoor play area to meet requirements
- Did not think the building looked kid friendly
- Looks like an automotive use
- The curved element seems out of scale
- Are they preserving the trees?
- Show the screen wall on the follow up submittal
- Building has a very heavy feel
- Could they reduce the parapet and create a penthouse element to screen the mechanical units
- Why not create a well in the center of the building instead of the curved element?

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Suggested sloping the roofs to help with the scale

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Liked the circulation – drop off area

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Liked the bike path for the children in the yard
- Could the entry area be reduced if the signage were moved?
- Liked the glass blocks at children's level
- Concerned with how the parapet dies into the curved element

CASE: Banner Desert Landscape Plan
1400 S Dobson

REQUEST: Approval of the overall landscape plan

DISCUSSION:

The applicant's brought a revised landscape plan that addressed staff's concerns

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Appreciated the changes
- Thought the new design complemented the architecture

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Liked their solutions

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Stated the revisions had addressed his concerns with the original submittal
- He was concerned with the corner lot and wanted them to landscape adjacent to it; the applicant confirmed that the site was off-limits during the environment clean-up
- He appreciated that they were showing what would happen with the future widening of Southern

CASE: Commercial Center
NWC McKellips & Stapley

REQUEST: Approval of a retail center

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Appreciated that the TCF Bank had taken comments from their previous site and incorporated them into this design
- Had concerns with the retail building
- Retail building seemed too horizontal
- Retail building lacks richness of form
- Concerned with how the towers died into the roof
- The sign band and all the tile need additional stepping or a change in material
- Maybe more stone
- Retail should be a little more festive; maybe an accent color

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Was concerned with the colors of the retail building; too monochromatic

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Concerned with the drive thru facing the residential to the north – headlights facing homes

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Suggested reveal screeds

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Was concerned with the dark color with the light band
- Did not want the band to look like a stripe
- Concern with the placement of colors
- Look at the center element

CASE: Purrfect Auto
265 S Power

REQUEST: Approval of an auto repair facility with related retail

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Was concerned with the lack of pedestrian connections

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Very concerned with the amount of parking

CASE: Earnhardt's Nissan
7300 block of East Hampton

REQUEST: Approval of a new vehicle storage lot

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Thought the steel arch element was weak; could it have a little more visual weight

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Liked the balance of color and how it was applied; but agreed it was very pink

CASE: Greenbrier II
7205 E Baseline

REQUEST: Approval of an office retail building

DISCUSSION:

The Board liked the project.

CASE: Quick N Clean car wash
S of SEC Power & University

REQUEST: Approval of canopies for a car wash facility reviewed at a previous work session

DISCUSSION: The applicant stated the canopy would be a neutral color not the blue in the photo

Boardmember Tom Bottomley

- Warned the applicant the Sanitation Division does not like to turn while backing
- Show what the end of the tunnels will look like when the car wash is closed

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Suggested cladding part of the columns with the block material
- Dumpster location is the biggest concern

Boardmember Pete Berzins:

- Suggested the trash be moved to the end of the hammer head

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Show the roll up doors on the follow-up submittal; what color will it be; what will it look like closed

CASE: Riverview Auto Mall
Loop 202 and west side of Dobson

REQUEST: Approval of an auto mall with three new car dealerships and a body shop

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Wanted this project to be somewhat compatible with the Riverview project across the street. Could they use some of the same materials?
- There seems to be a lot of white and gray
- Review the other architecture at Riverview
- There seems to be a lot of banding and striping; should be broken up with pilasters, colored accents, copings, etc.
- He didn't want them to mimic the other side of the street

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Wanted the detention pond to be a soccer field and located at the south end
- Was OK with this site being its own "zone" like the Bass Pro zone and the entertainment zone; but he thought this was too bland and boring
- There is a higher expectation at Riverview and this will have to come up a notch or two
- The buildings are too flat and plain

Boardmember Pete Berzins:

- There have been other car dealerships recently that have had more architectural interest
- Likes seeing the four buildings together so they Board can make sure they work well together

Boardmember

2. Call to Order:

Chair Pete Berzins called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the September 6, 2006 Meeting:

On a motion by Dave Richins seconded by Tim Nielsen the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

4. Review and provide comments on the Falcon Field Sub-Area Plan's Architectural Character Policies (Design Direction document).

Staffmember Wahid Alam explained the plan was for a 6 or 7 square mile area around Falcon Field, not just for the airport itself. He stated there had been neighborhood meetings. The purpose of this document was to show people who develop in this sub area, examples of varied architecture. The purpose of the document was to inspire individual designers and architects to create their own statements. They are not trying to say anyone has to build what is in the document.

Boardmember Dave Richins stated he was inspired by the examples of creative industrial architecture. He confirmed the purpose of the document was to inspire people as they come through.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed Falcon Field proper is owned by the City of Mesa. He was concerned that a developer could not afford this type of architecture when they lease the land. He liked the idea that they can identify the area and have entry features but it has to come from the heart, and the heart is the airport. Scottsdale Airpark has some nice buildings, but not as nice as some of these photos. He did not want a blanket height restriction.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley confirmed this document had not gone to associations yet. This Board was the first group to review the document. Mr. Alam stated they had met with area residents regarding overall land use. Their concern was more with the area near the canal. Their concern for the airport was length of runways future plans of the airport, whether the airport wants to extend the runways, heights, etc. Boardmember Bottomley stated he had an appreciation for the airport themes in the document; however, he thought the scale of the area needed to be considered. He thought it needs to create a neighborhood feel. Scale and material usage needs to be considered carefully. He likes industrial high tech right around the airport. He thought that as it radiates out it needs to be gradually transitioned to the fact there are residential neighborhoods. Be sensitive to scale and color as it gets closer to residences. One thing he thought was the Mesa Arts Center had a nice feel on the inside, but the outside is a little stark. He thought it could transition better and be more user friendly. He thought the materials closer to residences should be warmer friendlier materials and colors.

Boardmember Vince DiBella was generally in favor of the document. He confirmed the intent of the document was to define the character not necessarily strict design guidelines or an ordinance item, just to define the character and quality of types we are looking for.

Staffmember Kim Steadman stated Boardmember Burgheimer had contacted him knowing he would not be present for this discussion. Boardmember Burgheimer said the same things. He thought the document should remove the world class architecture that might be startling to some people, because there were plenty of good examples of industrial architecture, a lot of it from this valley, that would help people to understand we want a certain level without scaring them by showing them the Sydney Opera House.

Boardmember Richins stated he never wanted to discourage anyone from bringing monumental architecture to Mesa. He wouldn't be sad to see a photo of something built at Falcon Field in someone else's examples in the future.

Boardmember DiBella stated he did not think the photos were meant to be taken literally. He thought they were intended to define materials or shapes to liven-up what the possibilities are. The underlying zoning would define what the uses would be.

Former Boardmember Randy Carter spoke regarding this item. Agreed with previous comments. He stated that as an architect living and practicing in Mesa he stated he would take the document more literally than was offered by Staffmember Alam. He did not think the world architecture should be in the document. He thought there should be more local photos. Photos of Scottsdale, Kierland areas were good. He thought the Falcon Field area was taking some of the most beautiful areas shown on the map and turning them into some very avant-garde architecture. He thought the City and citizens should be careful of how others perceive what we are requesting for that area. All of the world architecture shown does not have a place in that area next to the desert uplands area. He thought the City needed to look very carefully at what we want to represent for the character of the Falcon Field area. He thought some of the architecture represented belongs at Williams Gateway where there will be larger aircraft and a large manufacturing backbone. Falcon Field is a much more residential feel not only in use of land and the number of residences there. He wanted to know why only 300' notification instead of 1000'. He thought doing manufacturing in the area of 202 at Greenfield and Higley was a travesty. He stated his office had spoken to future clients who were interested in hotels and offices. He wanted the general plan amended. He thought the document should talk more about shade and how to integrate art and how the architecture will blend in with existing neighborhoods.

Staffmember Wahid Alam then stated the document was 35 pages and there were 4 photos on the front page of the document that were not local.

5. Provide comment regarding an amendment to the City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance, deleting the requirement in Subsection 11-18-3 (A)1, that applications for building permits must be accompanied by drawings demonstrating the application is in conformance with Title 11.

Planning Director John Wesley, explained the proposed change to the Zoning Ordinance and Title 4 of the City Code to allow construction documents to be submitted to Building Safety prior to projects completing the public review process. The Ordinance currently prohibits that from happening. This is an effort to try to better serve customers and speed the review along. The Council Report in the Board's packet, explains how we would do that and amend the ordinances to allow projects to be submitted with the approval of the development services manager and with the condition that applicants would sign an "at risk" statement acknowledging that they understand that as they continue through the public review processes there may be changes required to their request and they would be obligated to take those changes and incorporate them into their drawings and redo them and go back through the review process. There are a few concerns that have been raised regarding this process. One would be that while staff is working with the applicant and trying to negotiate what staff feels would be improvements to a project, if the applicant has already gone through the expense to create and submit construction documents they might be reluctant to take those suggestions because of the cost to make those changes. Also as projects get to this Board or the Planning and Zoning Board and City Council, and you are requesting changes they might again raise that issue and say "but I have already spent thousands of dollars on construction drawings and they are already under review so we don't want to make that change". The response would be, "but you signed the 'at risk' statement". Another concern is with the public. If the public gets to a Council meeting and they are asking for a change and the Council is considering the change and the applicant says but I have already done my construction documents and staff has already reviewed them, it could look pretty bad, that the City has been facilitating approval of the project already, without public discussion. The other problem would be that it could end up costing extra staff time to review something that gets changed and has to be reviewed again. He stated this Board does not have to vote on this issue, staff is simply asking for comments that can be taken to Council. This proposal has been reviewed by the Downtown Development Committee who recommended approval and to the Planning and Zoning Board who recommended staff slow down on this and include it as part of the overall Zoning Code update and get this Board's insights on it before it goes to Council. Staff was planning to take this to Council in November.

Boardmember Dave Richins stated he agreed the City could get into a perception problem with the public. Even if the applicants signed the "at risk" documents the applicant would think the City treated them unfairly and made them revise all kinds of things and the City would be pressured to not make changes. He thought it was interesting how the Planning and Zoning Board handled it. He agreed it might be better to address this in the comprehensive changes to the Zoning Ordinance that are happening now. Instead of doing something from an ad-hoc approach now, maybe we should slow down and wait and make sure this is incorporated into the comprehensive changes. He was in favor of moving projects quicker and there are some simple projects that could be moved quicker, but some of the larger more complicated projects could have difficulty doing that. He was hoping the comprehensive changes could address that.

Boardmember Vince DiBella was not particularly in favor of this. Several times the Board has had applicants who come to the meeting and state that they completed their construction documents and are ready to submit them the next day so they are unwilling to accommodate any changes that might be considered. From an architect's point of view we are doing that already with some projects. In Mesa with the submittal deadlines and cut-off dates and the expedited review process he wasn't sure how this would really help. He thought there already were mechanisms in place to expedite it. On smaller projects that

require Planning and Zoning and Design Review, running them concurrently helps, as opposed to larger, more complicated projects that require more time.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen facetiously suggested the next step would be to allow “at risk” footings. He stated if we are going to fast track construction documents we might as well fast track footings too. He thought the whole key was how you sell the “at risk” document. They must understand it really is at risk. Usually the Design Review Board is the last one to see a project. Public input is rare even though neighbors are notified. A lot of times the Board knows the documents are at risk. He thought it had to be hammered home that the submittal is really at risk. The land use issues and public comment should be put to bed before you make that investment, if you are a smart developer.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought there were two competing factions; one a developer who is trying to get in the ground quicker because construction costs are going up. In many ways, although we probably could streamline the process a little bit, part of his feeling was in support of the way it happens now with the separate processes. The reason is that you can sometimes get ahead of yourself so much that you find yourself raising the child before the child is born. You are making decisions and finalizing things in the owners mind before certain approvals are given and before the design has a chance to develop. He likes the multi-step process of pacing the project, not stretching simple projects out simply because that is the time frame that is given. But when he thinks that going from a pre-submittal meeting, with very sketchy information, to construction documents right away is a huge leap. At that point there is a lot of cost involved in making any changes, then the owners is even more frustrated. He thought that when you bring up a design gradually you ultimately get a better solution. That was one of the reasons he liked the work session review a month or two prior to seeing the project at the regular agenda. He thought that if projects are rushed too much you get things that are just built rather than being planned. He stated that he once had a client who wanted to rush a residential project so much he did not understand why it had to be designed. He had the construction company ready and the funding for the materials. He wanted to just start building walls and he would decide where to put doors and windows as it was being constructed.

Mr. Wesley stated he appreciated the comments. He stated that it would not be automatic for every project that makes the request. It would be ones that looked like they were heading down the right path. He agreed that it would affect this Board more than any other.

Randy Carter then spoke and stated he did not think this was a good idea for many reasons. He wanted that in the record as practitioners and citizens not just as Boardmembers and architects. The first problem he saw was that it emasculates the power of the Design Review Board to be the voice of the citizens in helping these projects be better aesthetically. He thought that would be the first thing to go. The second thing is he has a project that has been delayed and the owner is losing money in construction costs, but he did not believe it was the staff in Planning and Zoning and Design Review that was the problem. Mesa has the easiest and most simple system in the Valley; including Pinal County, Tucson, Yuma, Flagstaff; this is the easiest. There are actual cut-off dates, dates when things are done, the staff is very good about getting their comments out on time, etc. He remembers sitting on this Board for 6 years, and there were several projects that came through and tried to say the Board could not make changes. There were projects that had gone to the Mayor because they thought the Design Review Board was holding them back, because the Board wanted some design changes in the site

planning, architectural interest, and tried to revise how the buildings looked and how the entrances were projected to the citizens. He wanted it in the record that he did not think it was a good idea to officialize this. There have been larger projects that have gotten special dispensation from the Mayor to put the projects in early, while they are going through the public hearing processes. He did not think it should be officialized in the zoning document that this is available to everyone, because he thought we would end up with a mess. Secondly he thought the Board of Adjustment should be included in the discussion, because they have to deal with DIP's and SCIP's and if projects were already in for review in Building Safety there was undue pressure to approve the request. The Board of Adjustment had a project a few months for a site plan modification that wanted a variance. There was not enough evidence to support the variance but the architect and owner had gotten dispensation to submit drawings and there was great force put forth in that meeting to grant that because the preliminary plat was in Subdivision Technical Review. So he did not think it was a good idea. He hoped these comments would get to the Mayor and City Manager and all those who are getting pressure from the developers. He thought Mesa had a very good system and if everyone would simply follow the rules and meet the dates it was possible to be in for permits in 3-1/2 months. He stated it was not the Boards or Planning and Zoning that were causing the problems. If there were delays, it was usually from the Civil permit review. At least in his office.

Staffmember Kim Steadman confirmed there was no need for an official vote from this Board.

6. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-68 Power Ranch Mini-storage
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 8200 E Germann
REQUEST: Approval of a 186,687 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Gregg Sherwood, Germann Road LLC
APPLICANT: Gregg Sherwood
ARCHITECT: Don Cramer

REQUEST: Approval of a 186,687 sq. ft. mini-storage facility

SUMMARY: Don Cramer and Greg Sherwood represented the case.

Mr. Cramer stated they had reduced the height on the north, east and west elevations, to 12'-4".

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed there would not be any landscaping to soften the wall along the east, north, and west property lines. The office was to be constructed of 2 X 6 frame with stucco. Mr. Cramer stated wood frame construction allowed for better insulation for caretakers quarters. Boardmember Nielsen thought the office should be masonry to tie in with the rest of the project. He also thought a masonry building would wear better. He thought the exterior walls of the storage buildings needed architectural interest. He suggested using some split face masonry to provide a slight pop-out and shadow lines. Or use scored block to create a geometry for interest.

Boardmember Vince DiBella agreed the office should be block. He also thought the office should be pulled out from the wall. He wanted to see variation in the wall panels.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley agreed with previous comments. He was concerned with the design of the office for a caretaker quarters. Mr. Cramer stated there would not be a caretaker. Boardmember Bottomley suggested using awnings above the window of the office and above the entry door to provide color and shade. He wanted architectural interest on the exterior walls of the storage buildings.

MOTION: It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-68 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. **Enhance the west, north and east, walls as discussed.**
 - b. **Revise the office building to be masonry and add colored canopy (or**

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 6, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

canopies) to office.

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 4 – 0

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-89 Deseret Family Medicine

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1425 S Greenfield

REQUEST: Approval of a 13,550sf medical office building adjacent to an existing medical office building

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6

OWNER: Dr Robert Allen

APPLICANT: Tim Nielsen

ARCHITECT: Tim Nielsen

REQUEST: Approval of a 13,550 sq. ft. medical office building adjacent to an existing medical office building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR06-89 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. Increase the dimensions of the parking lot landscape diamonds to 5'x5' to meet Code.
 - b. Correctly identify all trees, and replace the pines with a more appropriate tree. Staff to review and approve.
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. 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. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
6. Provide two half-sized color elevations, one full-sized and one 8½"x11" set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to Design Review Staff before submitting for building permits.

VOTE: Passed 4 – 0 – 1 Tim Nielsen abstained

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-90 Lot 7 Mesquite Canyon Plaza

LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Ellsworth & Guadalupe
REQUEST: Approval of an 11,085 sq. ft. retail shops building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Triple 'S' Land & Investments
APPLICANT: Fred Woods
ARCHITECT: Fred Woods

REQUEST: Approval of an 11,085 sq. ft. retail shops building

SUMMARY: Fred Woods and Tom Starr represented the case. Mr. Woods stated they had revised the elevations after receiving the staff report. He stated they had enhanced the gable element, and added architectural interest to the building.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed the red block shown on the elevations was actually split faced in cocoa brown to match the center. He confirmed the cantilever would come out 6' to 7'. He thought the placement of the block seemed haphazard. He thought the pop-outs helped the building.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed they had increased the height of the glass at the center entries to 10'. Glass elsewhere was at 8'. He still thought there needed to be more glass for retail users. He appreciated the disruption. He thought the building was top heavy above the glass. The split face didn't seem to have a theme or rhythm. He suggested there should be more of it. He suggested the split face go up higher at the entry. Maybe patterned screeds would help. He was concerned with the thinness of the steel awning. He thought there had been some improvements; however, the center portion still needed to be more dominant.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought the design was unsettling. The center portion fell short; there was not enough glass for retail; the element at the bottom didn't work; the vertical elements have no rhyme or reason; the gable was too thin. He also thought the actual color chips looked very green as opposed to the rendering. The back elevation actually steps but the front doesn't. He suggested using pilasters on the front.

Boardmember Dave Richins agreed with the comments. He was concerned that the masonry didn't line up with anything.

MOTION: It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-90 be continued to the November 1, 2006 meeting

VOTE: Passed 4 – 0

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-91 Stonehenge

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1230 E Baseline
REQUEST: Approval of a 5,337 sq. ft. retail/restaurant use
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: BCO Mesa
APPLICANT: Wesley Babcock
ARCHITECT: Timothy Pleger

REQUEST: Approval of a 5,337 sq. ft. retail/restaurant use

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR06-91 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 decorative pavement where pedestrian paths cross asphalt areas; no painted stripes.
 - b. Staff to review and approve design for monument sign.
 - c. Provide dimensioned drawings of the screening wall.
 - d. Return the cornice around the rear corner of the mid-level parapets, thickening the end of the wall to 2' thick. Occurs in two locations. Staff to review and approve.
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 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-92 **HTG West Phase I & II**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 4309 E Florian
REQUEST: Approval of a 6,687 sq. ft. office building in two phases
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: PG Properties
APPLICANT: Vaishali Carpenter
ARCHITECT: Jim Grover

REQUEST: Approval of a 6,687 sq. ft. office building in two phases

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR06-92 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. Specify the storefront and glass materials for this project on the elevations.
 - b. Identify the location of the trash barrels on the site plan and landscape plan.
Provide screening for the barrels and be sure there is a path for them to be wheeled out to the street.
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 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-93 Superstition Springs Commerce Center

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 7235 E Hampton Ave

REQUEST: Approval of 3 office/warehouse buildings totaling 40,877 sq. ft.

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6

OWNER: Superstition Springs Hospitality Group

APPLICANT: Les Partch

ARCHITECT: Les Partch

REQUEST: Approval of three office/warehouse buildings totaling 40,877 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 Tom Bottomley that DR06-93 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.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-94 Wings Valet

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 5655 S Sossaman
REQUEST: Approval of four hanger buildings totaling 123,642 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Williams Gateway Airport Authority
APPLICANT: Carter Burgess
ARCHITECT: Dan Richardson

REQUEST: Approval of four hanger buildings totaling 123,642 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 Tom Bottomley that DR06-94 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 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-95 Market Builders

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 5135 E Ingram
REQUEST: Approval of a 23,744 sq. ft. office/warehouse building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: LGE Corporation
APPLICANT: Christopher Norstrom
ARCHITECT: Paul Devers

REQUEST: Approval of a 23,744 sq. ft. office/warehouse 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 Tom Bottomley that DR06-95 be approved with the following conditions:

8. 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 pedestrian connection from the building to the parking area on the west side of the building. The surface needs to be decorative.
9. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
10. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
11. 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.
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. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
14. 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 – 0

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-96 Phoenix Children's Hospital Clinic & Medical Office Building
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC Southern & Higley
REQUEST: Approval of two medical buildings totaling 50,362 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Ensemble Real Estate Services
APPLICANT: Mo Stein
ARCHITECT: Mo Stein

REQUEST: Approval of a two medical buildings totaling 50,362 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 Tom Bottomley that DR06-96 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 the Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Provide one tree and three shrubs for each of the two landscape islands located on the front elevation of the ambulatory building at each end of the parking row adjacent to the building.
 - b. Provide an employee area, with seating, for the ambulatory clinic building.
 - c. Provide a detail of the EIFS reveals for each building and locate on building elevations. The detail should provide a substantial shadow line. Staff to review.
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. 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. 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: Passed 5 – 0

-

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-97 EI Taco Tote Neon
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1050 S Country Club
REQUEST: Approval of neon on an existing building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: Ricardo Mora
APPLICANT: Robert Polcar Architects
ARCHITECT: Robert Polcar

REQUEST: Approval of a neon on an existing 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 Tom Bottomley that DR06-97 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 and exterior elevations.
2. Compliance with the conditions of approval described in ADR06-31 and ZA06-37.
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.)

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-98 Gateway Business Center

LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC Atwood & Waltham/South of Pecos & West of Ellsworth

REQUEST: Approval of four office/warehouse buildings totaling 75,114 sq. ft.

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6

OWNER: Brent Payne

APPLICANT: Andrew Schuh, Cawley Architects

ARCHITECT: Paul Devers, Cawley Architects

REQUEST: Approval of four office/warehouse buildings totaling 75,114 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 Tom Bottomley that DR06-98 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. Design Review approval is required for the proposed monument signs.
 - b. Provide trash enclosure and gate elevations, as well as, material/color information. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.
 - c. Provide a detail for the screen walls. Extend the screen walls along Waltham Ave. (west of Building 1 and around the corner) and Atwood (south of Building 4) to fully screen the parking areas and drive aisles from the public streets, in accordance with §11-15-4(B)10 of the Zoning Ordinance. Details to be approved by Design Review staff.
 - d. Provide a detail of the enclosed rear yards. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.
 - e. Compliance with all landscaping requirements, as outlined in §11-15-3 of the Zoning Ordinance.
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. Compliance with all conditions of approval for zoning case, Z06-065.
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.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-99 Signal Butte Self Storage

LOCATION/ADDRESS: NEC Signal Butte & Guadalupe

REQUEST: Approval of a 66,000 sq. ft. mini-storage facility with office/caretaker

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6

OWNER: Sunbelt Property Management

APPLICANT: Tony Cooper Sr.

ARCHITECT: T² Architecture Group

REQUEST: Approval of a 66,00 sq. ft. mini-storage facility with office/caretaker quarters

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR06-99 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 site plan and landscape plan that includes the required 25' landscape setback along the south property line per the approved site plan (Z04-068). Additional landscaping is required on the west side of Building E as well as in the transmission easement in accordance with the previously shown approved plan (Z04-068) and allowable plant material per the Western Area Power Administration (W.A.P.A.)
 - b. Provide Foundation Base Landscape for Building A per §11-15-3 of the City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance.
 - c. Provide a revised color selection for the orange standing seam roof for Building 'A', that more closely resembles the rendering. The choice needs to be more in harmony with the earth tones proposed for the rest of the project.
 - d. Compliance with §11-15-4 of the Zoning Ordinance for the screening of the mechanical units is required. These units can be relocated to the ground and screened in accordance with ordinance requirements.
 - e. Provide a residential style light fixture for Building A.
 - f. Reduce the depth of the fascia on the higher roof portions for Building A to be proportional to what is shown on the lower roof fascias. The north and east elevations are correct. The west and south need to be revised to match.
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.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-100 Fry's Marketplace Expansion
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 4440 E Main
REQUEST: Approval of 18,032 sq. ft. of shops
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Fry's
APPLICANT: Greenstreet Properties
ARCHITECT: CSHQA

REQUEST: Approval of 18,032 sq. ft. of shops where the garden center was

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda by Boardmember Tom Bottomley.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley was concerned with the center portion of the front elevation. He thought there still needed to be something to create more interest. He also thought the south elevation should bump up slightly.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR06-100 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 revised elevations that call-out the color placement on the building.
 - b. **Work with staff to enhance the center portion of the front elevation.**
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 Zoning Administrator or Board of Adjustment for the required Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit (SCIP).
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. Also provide 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 4 – 0

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-101 Tate Office Building

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 905 N Country Club
REQUEST: Approval of a 1,026 sq. ft. office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: Marvin & Judy Tate
APPLICANT: Marvin Tate
ARCHITECT: None

REQUEST: Approval of a 1,026 sq. ft. office building

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda by Vice Chair Dave Richins. Mr. Richins was concerned with the lack of material submitted.

Staffmember Kim Steadman explained the evolution of this case, and explained that the Board's main concerns at the work session had been with the site plan, which had been revised as they directed.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley stated the new building would be at the back of the site and he thought the enhanced landscaping would help the overall site.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR06-101 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 5' x 36' planter along the south property line.
 - b. Provide landscaping to meet code, except as modified by BA05-39.
 - c. Request approval to use barrels. Route the request through Barry Davis (480) 644-4779.
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

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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 4 - 0

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

7. Appeals of Administrative Design Review:

Bed Bath & Beyond:
202 & Dobson

Blair Leach and Doug Himmelberger represented the case and explained the changes since the original submittal approved by the Design Review Board. He explained that there had been a submittal for administrative approval that staff had approved; however, Bed Bath and Beyond did not want that revision and had submitted another design.

Boardmember Dave Richins questioned whether they really needed the two center columns. He preferred the version staff had approved.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley liked the one staff approved. He thought it had more visual interest. He thought the other version seemed out of proportion.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen was OK with either one.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed the one staff approved was their prototype. The applicants confirmed the issue was signage.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Vince DiBella that Bed Bath & Beyond be approved as submitted:

VOTE: Passed 3 – 1 (Boardmember Bottomley voting nay)

Famous Footwear
202 & Dobson

The applicant proposed replacing an area of cmu with patterned EIFS.

Boardmember Dave Richins didn't mind the change. He thought it breaks up the elevation. He thought it needed to be a different color so it wouldn't look like a mistake.

Boardmember Vince DiBella thought it needed the pattern.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Tom Bottomley that the administrative submittal for Famous Footwear be approved subject to the following conditions:

Provide EIFS with a pattern, in a color slightly darker than the masonry.

VOTE: Passed 4 - 0

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

8. Other Business:

9. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 7:40

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da