

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
JUNE 6, 2007

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

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

MEMBERS ABSENT

OTHERS PRESENT

Lesley Davis
Mia Lozano Helland
Debbie Archuleta
Monique Spivey
John Wesley
Christine Tucker
Bill Walsh
Jackie Smylie
Jenifer Weskalmies
Dennis Newconbe
Mike Clements
Robert Pizorno
Dan Brock
Trish Flower
Bill Burke
Paul Pickett

Scott Nye
Jeff Welker
Ward Hollon
Marty Martinez
Jennifer Sandstrom
Reese Anderson
Others

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

1. Work Session:

CASE: Fiesta Lofts
NWC Grove & Westwood

REQUEST: Review of residential towers with retail on the first floor

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- It's cohesive
- The penthouse mechanical locations should be more integrated and articulated
- Landscaping needs a better streetscape

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Concerned with parking flow
- How well will the materials weather?
- Landscaping will be very important at street level as well as to shade so much glass
- Will need some tall trees

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Doesn't like white screen for mechanical units
- Landscaping should use pots at ground level so they don't get trampled. Should also pots along the street side elevations.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Confirmed that Parking regulations are not met
- Why only one pool?
- Concerned using slabs to provide shade can look low budget, must be done well
- Likes the fact that the colors are grouped together
- The massing is better
- Mechanical units need to be better screened
- Pay a lot of attention to how the mechanical units work to make sure they are screened, quiet, and adequate to properly cool all units
- Make sure colors don't turn chalky with time
- Don't use Mexican Fan Palms
- Use the Date palms shown on the elevations

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE: CMC Steel
11202 E Germann

REQUEST: Review of a steel processing plant

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- The colors will help it look like a new steel mill not an abandoned steel mill
- Flatness of roll up doors should have more flare
- Look at the Quonset hut on Center north of University

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Use steel for public spaces and use more for employee areas
- Use forms and spaces to celebrate the steel

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Likes it better than the original submittal
- Take a broad/bold statement at the entry
- Enlarge the scale of the sculpture and the landscaping at the entry

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Galvalume or roof
- Don't have to conceal fasteners if they can solve weather and leakage concerns
- Should be interesting for employees also
- It can look industrial and still not be a big plain building

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The manufacturing building could be interesting like the APS facility in Tempe
- Express the stacks
- Maybe the flue shaft could be a bright color
- Manufacturing doesn't have to be ugly
- Silos can be interesting

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE: Business Center
845 & 851 N Gilbert

REQUEST: Review of an office project

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Front entry windows out of proportion
- Not a painted wainscot
- There is nothing on the rear
- There needs to be more stone
- The carriage fixtures are OK but there needs to be building mounted fixtures to enhance the building
- Buildings are too flat
- Sides of buildings will be visible; need more articulation
- Break the roof line on side elevations
- Use more color
- Score joints
- Muttons or other design features on windows such as pop-outs or trim
- Different color break on pop-out

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Be careful with how the building is clipped at the corner
- Show reveal screed lines

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Trees are not proportionally correct
- Harmonize design thought for palette
- Remove palm trees from palette
- One continuous tree at perimeter
- Berm along frontage
- Suggest desert spoon or similar type of plants

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE: Guadalupe Professional Center
Country Club & Guadalupe

REQUEST: Review of an office building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Stacked column detail seems foreign to the rest of the building
- The very thin arches with stone pilasters are out of scale
- Roof element that ties the buildings is too weak.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Too many different styles
- The metal arches seem too busy
- Eliminate the columns

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Too many styles on one building
- Choose one style, looks like a mix of architecture types all grouped together

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- The parapets look too low, they won't screen roof mounted mechanical units.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Very interesting at first glance, but could be schizophrenic
- The choice of stone doesn't seem to work with the architecture, too massive for the building
- Be very careful with the details
- Look at the medical office project at Shea and Tatum
- Keep the Frank Lloyd Wright elements but eliminate the greek influence
- Look at the window placement, especially at the second floor

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Out of scale
- Simplify
- Choose one style

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE: Dana Professional Plaza
160 N Power

REQUEST: Review of an office

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Likes the green glass

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Put shadows on the follow-up submittal
- Doesn't like the windows at the entry
- Maybe change the windows and show the thicker steel pieces at the stairway, or use a mullion less piece

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE: Bella Via Village Shops
4427 S Mountain

REQUEST: Review of a retail center

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- The rear is flat

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Not a bad building, but too much of this architecture everywhere
- Elevations are out of sync
- Likes the center portion with the beam
- The massing and proportion are fine, but could they be more creative
- It will look dated
- Improve the rear elevations
- Provide four-sided architecture
- The architect is talented, let him be creative
- Create a place for signage, not just a linear band
- Standing seam metal roof is OK

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- The four towers could be changed
- The tower proportions are too thick

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Interesting plants but need to show contours
- At the corner use an Agave that grows 6' tall
- Use boulders

The applicant suggested using standing seam metal roof; The Board agreed

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE: Emerald Groves Central
2750 N Val Vista

REQUEST: Review of an assisted living facility

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The site plan needs to be integrated to the building
- Show the rose garden/vegetable gardens on the landscape plans
- Each side could be a little different
- Make sure the windows are the proper sizes

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Appreciates the fact they are accommodating the families

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- The citrus will have to be planted in calichi
- Did not agree with the 6' wall behind the citrus

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Could the wall be some solid and some view fencing?
- Can they group the citrus so it is outside the windows?

Other boardmembers agreed the citrus and 6' wall along the streets should not be required for this site. It would be different if this were an office project.

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE: ATSU Student Housing
5850 E Still Cir.

REQUEST: Review of a student housing project

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Likes the blue glass

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Great projects
- Likes the diversity

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE: ATSU YMCA
5850 E Still Cir.

REQUEST: Review of a YMCA facility

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Likes the blue glass

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Great projects
- Likes the diversity

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE: Precision Irrigation
6901 S 89 Pl.

REQUEST: Review of an industrial building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- The canopy needs to be better defined or change the mass of the building to recreate the entry
- Window sizes and placement should be proportional and have more rhythm
- Enhance north elevation

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Would prefer integral block
- Use integral block at public entries

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Could the simple expression of block continue and not use the stripes
- It should be sophisticated and simple
- Maybe one long window instead of a bunch of little ones
- They could recess the bay door panels and create an element

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE: Pecos Business Park
E of Mt. Road north side of Pecos

REQUEST: Review of a business park

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Overhead doors should blend in with the wall

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Look at using different sized windows

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Looks stripy
- Could they use additional color and maybe not all striped
- Some of the building should be solid
- Could the scale be changed with some of the windows
- Maybe fewer windows, but larger
- Could raise the Awnings

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Could they do some berms along Pecos

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Don't let the arch get lost in the new brown color

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE: Pecos Gateway
SWC Pecos & 88 St.

REQUEST: Review of an industrial project

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The tower element is not the right form
- Too many themes
- If they are trying to make it residential then eliminate/redesign the industrial portion
- Tilt buildings look very flat and planer
- Painted finishes look plastic
- Could they cast exposed aggregate
- Rusted steel and corrugated panels
- Create interest with light fixtures and score lines

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- They have articulated the ends and they turn the corners so simplify the rest

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Concerned with building A because it will face Pecos

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Screen wall and landscaping are too flat
- Use berming and break up the walls
- Use boulders
- Change up the colors of the wall to match the building
- Understory plants need organization

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE: NewPort industrial Plaza
3225 S Power

REQUEST: Review of an industrial project

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The solar panels are an element, they can't come off later
- Maybe the service corridor could be nicer
- Very repetitive
- Some of the forms could be exposed
- Could dato the edges of the forms

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Heavy blue in the middle
- Wants the tan to look like it can hold it up

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Wants the trees to remain at the building to provide shade
- Saguaros could be used in groupings along Power Road

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE: Mt. Vista FLMS
SWC Southern & Signal Butte

REQUEST: Review of a Freeway Landmark Monument Sign

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Thought FLMS should be to designate a place not be really tall monument signs
- The Mt. Vista portion should be larger than the Target portion
- Needs to have the same design character as the buildings
- Needs additional materials, coffering

Boardmember Dave Richins:

- Doesn't like the double legs, use one solid base

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- There is no battering on the building
- Needs to be a better material than stucco
- Cornice needs to match cornices on buildings

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Needs more design
- Wants massing to ensure it won't warp like the one at Superstition Gateway

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

2. Call to Order:

Vice-Chair Dave Richins called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the May 2, 2007 Meeting:

On a motion by Vince DiBella seconded by Tom Bottomley the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

4. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 54 Walgreens

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1130 W Southern
REQUEST: Approval of a 14,550 sq. ft. drug store
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: Kimco North Trust I
APPLICANT: Richard Starr, Evergreen Devco
ARCHITECT: Sheldon Shaw
STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of a 14,550 sq. ft. drug store

SUMMARY: This case removed from the consent agenda.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley was concerned that this application was perpetuating the design of the center. He thought pads should be more exciting. He did not think the applicants had addressed the Boards concerns regarding the shape of the arches, the areas that looked like boarded up bay doors, the flatness of the building, the color.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer agreed with Boardmember Bottomley's concerns; however, he did not think they could force the applicant to building a project that was different from the existing center. He agreed the building was very flat and could use more color.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-54 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:
Provide a 30' x 30' entry plaza area, or gain approval of a SCIP.
 - a. Provide 2' foundation base along exterior building adjacent to drive-thru lane, or gain approval of a SCIP.
 - b. Maintain the maximum 8 contiguous parking spaces between parking lot landscape islands, or gain approval of a SCIP.
 - c. Provide 8' wide landscape medians between double-row parking, or gain approval of a SCIP.
 - d. Provide a 12' wide landscape island/pedestrian pathway combination, or gain approval of a SCIP.
 - e. Provide the required 2 trees, 6 shrubs per 25' linear feet adjacent to an arterial street, or gain approval of a SCIP.
 - f. Approval of an Administrative Site Plan Modification.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

(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.
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 – 1 (Boardmember Bottomley voting nay)

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 63 Arco AM/PM

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2751 E. University Dr.
REQUEST: Approval of a 2,900 sq. ft. c-store; a 968 sq. ft. car wash; and a 5,412 sq. ft. gas canopy
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: BP West Coast Products
APPLICANT: Manuel Aguirre
ARCHITECT: Manuel Aguirre
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of a 2,900 sq. ft. c-store; a 968 sq. ft. car wash; and a 5,412 sq. ft. gas canopy.

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought the building was a throwback to c-stores from 20 years ago. There was minimal color; they did not show the planter the Board asked for at the work session; the applicants had added control joints on the rear of the building, but not on the sides. He thought that the car wash needed to have masonry at the base. He also thought the gas canopy needed to be broken up. He did not think the Board was being consistent in how this applicant was being treated as compared to other gas stations that had been reviewed in the last few years. He stated that if the applicants wanted the gas canopy to “disappear” they should not have placed the blue stripe all the way around it. He thought the entry sign band looked tacked on.

Boardmember Dave Richins thought the revised plans had come a long way from the original submittal. He did agree there should be more color on the car wash.

Boardmember Vince DiBella agreed the canopy should improve, but thought it could be offset by a better building. He agreed the car wash needed to improve as well.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer agreed with Boardmember Bottomley’s concerns. He thought that the Board had seen so many projects at the last few work sessions, this project had fallen through the cracks and not been scrutinized the way it should have been. He agreed this project did not have the same design quality as recently approved gas stations. He thought the canopy was spindly. He thought that if the racing stripe was allowed on the canopy it should not be allowed on the buildings. He did not think the sign panel related well to the building.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR07-63 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:

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- a. Bollards are to be painted a primary building color. Details can be worked out through the Plan Review Process.
 - b. Provide revised elevations that include the details of the materials/colors for the gas canopy including the LED lighting. Also include the LED lighting color for the carwash building. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.
 - c. Revise the columns on the gas canopy to provide a building material such as stucco or masonry extending up to the canopy.
 - d. Screening of SES should include walls on either side of the units painted "BP Dark Pearl" to match the building. The proposed Live Oak in the landscape island adjacent will provide additional screening.
 - e. Provide plant material (shrubs/groundcover) in the proposed future cross-access location along the south property line.
 - f. Provide additional landscaping along the public street frontages and some form of irrigated landscape plant material at the pump islands on at least one side or between the islands. Also provide a raised planter for the plant material adjacent to the entry of the C-store. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.
 - g. Reveals are to be used on the building vs. score joints.
 - h. Use decorative lights, not wall-paks in visible locations. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review Staff.
 - i. **Provide cmu at the bottom of the car wash.**
 - j. **Work with staff to remove the blue stripe on the buildings and provide an additional color somewhere else.**
 - k. **Work with staff to provide an additional step on the front of the building, over the entrance, so there are two steps.**
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 requirements of the Board of Adjustment for the Development Incentive Permit. (BA07-012)
 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.
 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 JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-64 Sandstone Industrial
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 465 S Robson
REQUEST: Approval of a 32,400 sq. ft. industrial building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: ZBM Southwest
APPLICANT: Massen Commercial
ARCHITECT: Jennifer Sandstrom
STAFF PLANNER: Kim Steadman

REQUEST: Approval of three industrial buildings totaling 32,400 sq. ft.

SUMMARY: Boardmember Dave Richins stated his main concern with this project was the site plan. He stated the CEPTED review had confirmed the Board's concerns regarding the lack of visibility into the southwest corner of the project. He did not think the dead end parking should be allowed. Staffmember Lesley Davis stated the staff report agreed with the Board's concerns regarding the safety of people walking to the southwest portion of the site.

The applicant stated he had only received the staff report the Friday prior to the meeting. Boardmember Richins stated the Board had made their concerns very clear at the work session May 2, 2007. The applicant stated pulling the building away from the wall would not change the neighborhood. The building would still be secluded.

Boardmember Richins stated his issue was that the entrances faced the narrow walkway and the wall. Her was also concerned that the parking was at the very north end of the site, so people would have to walk all the way to the south end of the building. He thought we need to craft sustainable projects in the City and he did not think this project was sustainable. He thought there was too much on the site. He stated that if there were fewer users for the buildings it might be different but as designed this project was unsafe.

Staffmember Lesley Davis stated that in the pre-submittal report dead-end parking was listed as a concern.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley agreed that the unit at the south end was not safe. He agreed this was not a good, safe, sustainable project. He thought the basic design was fundamentally flawed. He did not think that moving a couple of doors or parking spaces would solve the problem.

The applicant then gave the Board an 8-1/2" X 11" non-dimensioned sketch with two 14,800 sq. ft. rectangular buildings with some parking in front of the buildings and parallel parking all the way around the perimeter of the site.

Boardmember Bottomley stated he was also opposed to the design of the building. The applicant again stated no one told him there were problems. Boardmember Bottomley stated he had been told at the work session that the Board had concerns with the building. He had been given directions regarding the elevations.

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer asked what the paper was the applicant had given the Board. The applicant stated it was a revised site plan he had drawn up after receiving the staff report. He thought the revised plan provided better circulation.

Boardmember Vince DiBella thought that if a DIP was required that should be going through at the same time if not before Design Review.

Staffmember Lesley Davis stated any revised site plan would have to be reviewed by Planning and Engineering staff, as well as a revised landscape plan. The applicant wanted clear direction regarding the architecture. Boardmember Richins didn't think the Board should be tying up the other applicants discussing a case that may not be going forward.

Boardmember Burgheimer thought the Board should address the architecture. He stated he did not like the mission style on an industrial building. He thought the buildings should be simplified. He thought they should introduce another color, and a banding or pop-out treatment.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur was still concerned with the placement and size of the windows.

The Architect, Jennifer Sandstrom, asked the Board what they consider to be residential windows. Boardmember Bottomley stated the proportions of the windows and the way they are grouped with the sill height look residential. He suggested the windows be separated, or change the proportions. He thought the building was very flat. The mission element and the industrial use were at odds with each other.

Boardmember Dave Richins suggested the applicants go to the area around Falcon Field or to Broadway 101 and look at other industrial areas and look at those buildings.

The applicant stated he had gone to Greenfield north of McKellips and the buildings were boxes. One was masonry and most were tilt.

Boardmember Bottomley stated the Board is trying to raise the standard for development in the City, not just approve what has been approved in the past. He stated the applicant needed to look at the details on buildings, and use materials in creative ways. Look at light and shadow, look at proportions so the building is not so flat.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Wendy LeSueur that DR07-64 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. **Work with staff to redesign the site plan based on the sketch presented the Board at this meeting.**
 - b. **Simplify the building parapet line. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
 - c. **Introduce an additional band or block of color. To be approved by Design Review staff.**

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- d. **Introduce a score joint. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
- e. **Revise the landscape plan. To be 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 of the Zoning Case (Z07-020).
- 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.
- 7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
- 8. Provide two half-size color elevations to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

Boardmember Vince DiBella thought the applicant had been given the Board's concerns at the May 2nd work session and had addressed none of them in the follow-up submittal. Boardmember Burgheimer thought the project was not that difficult and the architect should be able to address the conditions. It was agreed that if staff did not think the applicant was addressing the conditions they could bring the revisions back to the Board. Staffmember Lesley Davis stated it was difficult to determine whether the revised site plan could work because it was not dimensioned. She stated a dimensioned site plan would have to be routed through the appropriate City divisions.

VOTE: Passed 4 – 2 (Boardmembers Bottomley and Nielsen voting nay)

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-65 GarageTown USA
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 3309 S Power
REQUEST: Approval of a 162,018 sq. ft. condo storage
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Friendship Construction Ent.
APPLICANT: Welker Development Resources
ARCHITECT: Lindquist Architects
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of a 162,018 sq. ft. condo storage project

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-65 be approved with the following conditions:

9. 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.
10. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
11. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
12. Compliance with all requirement of the Zoning Case (Z07-020).
13. 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.
14. 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.
15. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
16. Provide two half-size color elevations to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-66 Odyssey Medical
LOCATION/ADDRESS: N of NWC Crismon & Baseline
REQUEST: Approval of a 112,125 sq. ft. office project
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Sydney Crismon Developments
APPLICANT: Bob Hunt
ARCHITECT: Thomas Kenrick
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of a 112.125 sq. ft. office project

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-66 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 submitted.
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.
6. Provide two half-size color elevations to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-67 Goodyear Tire
LOCATION/ADDRESS: N of NWC Crismon & Baseline
REQUEST: Approval of a 7,551 sq. ft. tire store
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Goodyear Tire
APPLICANT: Russell Stout & Assoc.
ARCHITECT: Russell Stout
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of a 7,551 sq. ft. tire store

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-67 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 the glass color. Details can be worked out through the Plan Review process on the Construction Plan set.
 - b. Provide a detail, including color specifications of the proposed trellises for the building. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.
 - c. Provide a revised landscape plan that provides the plant material in the right-of-way. This can be done in gray-scale if being installed by others.
 - d. Identify the SES location on the site plan, floor plan etc. This equipment should be fully recessed and painted to match the building unless otherwise 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 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 JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-68 Red Mountain Promenade
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 6663, 6715, 6747 E McDowell
REQUEST: Approval of three retail buildings totaling 20,145 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Superstition Promenade
APPLICANT: Mike Larson
ARCHITECT: Irwin Pasternack
STAFF PLANNER: Monique Spivey

REQUEST: Approval of three retail buildings totaling 20,145 sq. ft.

SUMMARY: Irwin Pasternack and Dick Presto represented the case. Mr. Pasternack explained that they had two restaurant uses for the eastern building and two restaurants interested in the western building along McDowell. He also explained that the patios faced McDowell. He was designing the buildings so that they could also be used as retail spaces.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought there were a lot of colors on the shopping center, and they appear stronger in the field than they do on the color board. He thought the buildings in the forefront could be a different variation from the center, like the M & I Bank. He thought the colors should be subtler.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley liked the geometry of the plan. He liked the patios and the juxtaposition of the entry buildings. He agreed the colors should be limited. He stated that if they do sign restaurants and have to eliminate windows they need to be careful how that is done. He suggested using trellises to create interest.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur did not think they needed to copy the center, just take some of the colors and forms.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed there could be minor revisions to storefronts to provide flexibility for restaurant users through the Administrative Design Review process. He agreed the colors should be muted and subtle.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer did not want the applicant to use the bright yellow, the bright purple, or the pink color that are on the shopping center.

Mr. Pasternack stated the pink color was not what he wanted and would be revised. He also stated the yellow was supposed to be a creamier shade. He was willing the change those colors.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-68 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

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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. The applicant shall work with staff on the color palettes for each building (Pads 1, 2, and 5). The colors scheme shall be selected from the color board exhibited at the Design Review Board meeting of June 6, 2007.
 - b. The applicant shall re-design the restaurant buildings (Pads 1 and 2) in a manner that reduces the appearance of a retail storefront setting.
 - c. Provide additional stone veneer on the East Elevation of Pad 5.
 - d. The project must be developed consistent with the conditions of approval listed for Administrative Site Plan Modification approved May 1, 2007.
 - e. All landscaping must be consistent with the Desert Uplands Development Standards native plant palette.
 - f. Trash enclosures shall be painted and designed to match existing trash enclosures within the site.
 - g. All proposed signage must be consistent with the approved Comprehensive Sign Plan for Red Mountain Promenade (ZA07-35).
 - h. Revise the brighter yellow color on the entire center.**
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.
 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 JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 69 Mammoth Equities Mesa

LOCATION/ADDRESS: S of SEC Power & McDowell
REQUEST: Approval of 15,542 sq. ft. of retail and 32,080 sq. ft. of office
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Mammoth Equities
APPLICANT: Joseph Holasek
ARCHITECT: Gary Nogle
STAFF PLANNER: Kim Steadman

REQUEST: Approval of a 15,542 sq. ft. of retail and 32,080 sq. ft. of office

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-69 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 pedestrian connection to residential development as approved by Council through Zoning Case.
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 JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 70 Goodwill Power Center
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 14207 S Power
REQUEST: Approval of a 40,993 sq. ft. second hand store
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Piedmont Development of AZ
APPLICANT: Steven Nevala
ARCHITECT: Sherman Cawley
STAFF PLANNER: Monique Spivey

REQUEST: Approval of a second hand store and a retail building totaling 40,993 sq. ft.

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-70 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 minimum 2' foundation base on the entire length of the south elevation noted on the site plan as the "Queuing area" of the Goodwill Building.
 - b. Provide a minimum 5' foundation base along the entire length of the east elevation, and part of the south elevation noted as "beyond", located behind the trash compactor and truck well of the main Goodwill building. Foundation base landscaping is required, excluding rolling door and access door areas.
 - c. The "Goodwill" sign shall be centered on the main building facade. In addition, the "Goodwill" sign shall be placed below the stucco reveal line in a manner consistent with the color rendition exhibited to the Design Review Board on June 6, 2007.
 - d. Recordation of cross-access easements along the property lines with the parcel located adjacent to the southwest. Notate this on plans.
 - e. Recordation of 24' wide future cross-access with adjacent parcel to the south and east as noted on the site plan.
 - f. Recordation of a 25' easement for ingress and egress along the property line with the parcels to the east.
 - g. The site must be developed consistent with all conditions of approval for (Z07-50).
 - h. Remove Transformer located within the east landscape setback area, unless required by a Public Agency.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

(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 JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 71 SanTan Crossing Office Condos

LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC Guadalupe & Loop 202
REQUEST: Approval of 7 office buildings totaling 69,484 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Crown Builders
APPLICANT: Jeff Will
ARCHITECT: Jeff Will
STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of 7 office buildings totaling 69,484 sq. ft.

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-71 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 JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 72 SanTan Crossing at LeSueur Estates

LOCATION/ADDRESS: W of NWC Guadalupe & Loop 202

REQUEST: Approval of an 18,404 sq. ft. retail center

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District

OWNER: Denro (AZ) Inc.

APPLICANT: Edward Roblee

ARCHITECT: Kurt Reed

STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of a 18,404 sq. ft. retail center

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-72 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 JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 73 Mesa Country Club Shops

LOCATION/ADDRESS: N of Baseline E side of Country Club
REQUEST: Approval of a 17,942 sq. ft. shops building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: Amsource Mesa
APPLICANT: Pew & Lake
ARCHITECT: Boice-Reidle-Rhea
STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of a 17,942 sq. ft. shops buildings

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-73 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. Design Review Board approval required for development of future Pad C.
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.
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 JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-74 Retail Buildings & Panda Express

LOCATION/ADDRESS: NEC Baseline & Country Club
REQUEST: Approval of a 7,424 sq. ft. shops building and a 2,448 sq. ft. Panda Express
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: CFT Development
APPLICANT: Ward Hollon
ARCHITECT: Ward Hollon
STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of a 7424 sq. ft. shops building and a 2,448 sq. ft. Panda Express

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-74 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. Orient the pedestrian connection between the retail and restaurant buildings to one side and create landscape median that is $\pm 4'$ and incorporate landscape materials.
 - b. Continue the perimeter landscape strip the entire length of the west side of the parcel from south to north and include appropriate landscape plant materials.
 - c. Approval of a Site Plan Modification by the Planning & Zoning Board.
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.
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 JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 75 Retail Center

LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC Southern & Stapley
REQUEST: Approval of a 210,000 sq. ft. shopping center
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: CTW Retail Partners
APPLICANT: Kellie Hill
ARCHITECT: RKA
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of a 210,000 sq. ft. shopping center

SUMMARY: Raymond Floyd, Kevin Kerpan, and Kellie Hill represented the case. Staff member Lesley Davis explained that staff was concerned with the rear elevations, the transition shops, and the fact that the black line elevations did not show some of the details shown on the color elevations. She also explained that some of the elements shown on the color elevations cannot be built; such as the benches shown in front of the service doors, and the pots along the rear elevations.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer liked the feel of the hand-sketched renderings. He thought the project was festive looking. He stated the project needed the faux paint and the hand painted details. He wanted the applicants to be careful with the details on this project. It needs to be stucco, not EIFS. The shops building looked like EIFS on the color elevations that building needs to be stucco also. He thought Major A needed more color. He wanted them to return the temple element. Maybe some more stone, and bright blue tile instead of paint. He suggested they look at using trellises and vines. Maybe more raised planter details.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur thought there should be a small gathering place and maybe live music. Mr. Floyd stated they were proposing an area near the street corner. Boardmember LeSueur liked the liveliness and color of the landscape palette, but wanted the materials massed with broad sweeps of color.

Boardmember Dave Richins thought they should apply the old work detailing of the buildings to the screen walls.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley liked the pedestrian connections throughout most of the project, but was concerned with the narrow pedestrian area in front of Major A. He was also concerned with the 90° angle at the east corner of Major A. He thought the ranch market was fun but wanted to ensure that it would be durable. He thought Major A was a box with a temple entrance.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer suggested a water feature and a round about near the buildings.

There was discussion regarding how to add more interest to the Major A elevations.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR07-75

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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 details on the glass, storefront and light fixture colors/material specification. Details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.
 - b. Provide revised black and white elevations that incorporate additional design provided on the colored rendering. This shall include, but is not limited to the colors/specifications on the decorative accent painting, scrollwork, medallions, pots, bells, etc. Also, provide color elevations for all sides of the buildings.
 - c. Finish the backsides of all parapets that extend above the primary roofline to match the front.
 - d. Include the type of palm tree proposed on the landscape palette.
 - e. **Shops C, D, and Ranch Market to be built as presented with flexibility on details such as pots and benches to be worked out with Design Review Staff.**
 - f. **Revise Shops A to look like the Ranch Market and other shops buildings.**
 - g. **Work with staff on major A to add planters at corners; increase the scale of the heads; provide pop-outs, to be more temple like.**
 - h. **Finish backside of parapets. Entry tower to be four sided for Major A.**
 - i. **Rework the pedestrian sidewalks across the front of Major A.**
 - j. **Create a crescendo at the center of project.**
 - k. **Site wall needs to include details from the shops buildings and Ranch Market.**
 - l. **Remove trees from the narrow area behind Shops B.**
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.
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 – 2 (Boardmembers Bottomley and Nielsen voting nay)

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 76 Las Casitas Assisted Living

LOCATION/ADDRESS: NEC Hawes Road & Desert Lane
REQUEST: Approval of a 32,221 sq. ft. assisted living facility
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Michael Killean
APPLICANT: Boyd Thacker
ARCHITECT: Boyd Thacker
STAFF PLANNER: Kim Steadman

REQUEST: Approval of a 32,221 sq. ft. assisted living facility

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-76 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 one additional color for fascia or wall**
 - b. **Provide gable formed covered patios with concrete slabs for each living unit.**
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 JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07- 77 Retail J at Riverview

LOCATION/ADDRESS: Dobson & 8th
REQUEST: Approval of a 69,747 sq. ft. 24 hour fitness center
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: DeRito Kimco
APPLICANT: Saemisch DiBella
ARCHITECT: Vince DiBella
STAFF PLANNER: Monique Spivey

REQUEST: Approval of a 69,747 sq. ft. 24 hour fitness center

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tm Nielsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-77 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 minimum of 6' to 8' in height of screening for trash enclosures serving Retail Pad J & M.
 - b. Each tree or shrub symbol shall be clearly referenced next to the tree specimen name and corresponding scientific plant name on the landscape material schedule.
 - c. All signage proposed must be consistent with the approved Comprehensive Sign Program for Riverview.
 - d. The project must be developed in compliance with conditions of approval listed for (Z07-55).
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.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide (2) two half size color elevations, (1) one full size, and (1) 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 – 1 (Boardmember DiBella abstained)

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-78 Cheesecake Factory

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 6555 E. Southern Ave.

REQUEST: Approval of a 10,136 s.f. restaurant with 1,611 s.f. of outdoor dining

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6

OWNER: Macerich

APPLICANT: Dewayne Mitchell, The Cheesecake Factory

ARCHITECT: Architects Design Consortium

STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of a 10,136 sq. ft. restaurant with 1,611 sq. ft. of outdoor dining

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-78 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 6 – 0

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Other Business:

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da