

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
DECEMBER 3, 2003

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Lower Level of the Council Chambers 57 East First Street, at 3:45 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Carie Allen - Chair
Vince DiBella
Randy Carter
Jillian Hagen
Rob Burgheimer (arrived at 5:30)
Pete Berzins

MEMBERS ABSENT

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman	Dave Cox
Lesley Davis	Gloria Walker
Charlie Scully	Hal Friborg
Debbie Archuleta	Byron Stephens
John Wesley	Emily Stowe
Amy Schackelford	John Mahoney
Angelica Guevara	Dan Brock
Cindy Lisonbee	

1. Call to Order:

Chair Carie Allen called the meeting to order at 3:37 p.m.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the November 5, 2003 Meeting:

On a motion by Randy Carter seconded by Pete Berzins the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

3. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-88 **Office for Saager Properties**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 3607 East McKellips
REQUEST: Approval of a 9,528 sq. ft. building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: SLPR Inc.
APPLICANT: Eric Faas
ARCHITECT: Brock, Craig & Thacker

REQUEST: Approval of a 9,528 sq. ft. office building

SUMMARY: This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually. The Board wanted to commend the applicant for their attractive project and their work with the neighborhood.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Randy Carter that DR03-88 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
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. **Eliminate turf in any parking lot landscape areas; specifically at the northwest corner of the building and south of the trash enclosure. Replace with decomposed granite and shrubs to more closely match the other proposed parking lot landscape islands. Details to be approved by Design Review staff.**
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 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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is well-designed and should be an attractive addition to the area.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-89 **Superstition Springs Mazda**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 6343 East Test Drive
REQUEST: Approval of a 5.3 acre new car dealership
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Bob Thomas
APPLICANT: John Mahoney
ARCHITECT: John Mahoney

REQUEST: Approval of a 5.3 acre new car dealership

SUMMARY: John Mahoney represented the case.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed the colors would be as shown on the color board not as depicted on the color elevations. He was concerned with the vibrant green and orange colors. He confirmed the entry doors would be blue, the window mullions would be orange, and the green would be used on the metal canopies and the wall section to the right of the display glass. He felt the green in particular was too vibrant. He likes the use of color but felt this was too much. He was pleased with the architecture of the building.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen was concerned that the signs make the building look industrial rather than contemporary. She felt they detracted from the architecture of the building.

Boardmember Pete Berzins was concerned with the lighting on the green elements.

Boardmember Vince DiBella felt the siding material seemed appropriate to the scale of the building.

Chair Carie Allen confirmed that the metal elements would be factory finish not painted. She felt the green elements were like neon signs. She confirmed this would be the first Mazda dealership in Arizona with these colors.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR03-89 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
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. **New trees to be planted on the golf course property according to the timeline described in the Development Agreement dated June 6, 2001.**
5. **Exterior lighting design to comply with all requirements of zoning case Z01-12.**
6. **Provide a landscape plan with botanical names for each plant to ensure that the proposed species conform to the Plant List approved with the zoning case Z01-12 or are similar in character.**

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

7. **Compliance with all requirements of the Comprehensive Sign Plan (BA02-29).**
8. **Sign package for signage attached to the building to be approved by the Design Review.**
9. 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.
10. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
11. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of 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 – 1 (Carie Allen voting nay) Chair Allen felt there was too much of the green. She did not feel the green color enhanced the architecture, but felt it was more like signage.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is well designed for the use and in this specific area, surrounded by auto dealerships and a golf course, the colors are warranted.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side A and B)

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-92 **Wells Fargo**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 4505 East Mckellips
REQUEST: Approval of a 4,525 sq. ft. bank
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Wells Fargo Corporate Properties Group
APPLICANT: Byron Stephens
ARCHITECT: Harold F. Friborg, Leo A. Daly

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,525 sq. ft. bank

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Randy Carter that DR03-92 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
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 Comprehensive Sign Plan (BA00-012).**
5. **Verify that decomposed granite color matches color used in shopping center planters.**
6. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
8. Provide two half-size color elevations. If changes are required by the Design Review Board provide one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of 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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is reasonably well designed and should complement the surrounding shopping center.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side A)

CASE #: DR03-94 **Retail Center**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC University & Meridian
REQUEST: Approval of commercial center
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Charles Keith
APPLICANT: Gloria Walker, Andrews Design Group
ARCHITECT: Don Andrews

REQUEST: Approval of a 14,400 sq. ft. retail building

SUMMARY: Dave Cox and Gloria Walker represented the case. Mr. Cox stated that they would like direction in what desert uplands design criteria means. He also explained that the sides of the cutout on the entry feature would be stucco.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt that this project was a very plain strip center that could be built anywhere in Arizona, and it did not relate to the desert uplands. He felt the project needed richness in the architecture. He felt the project had no architectural interest; it was just a square box with no interest. He suggested the building be asymmetrical, and the building heights could be varied. He did not feel the cutout in the entry feature added to the building. The rear elevation was extremely plain. This is a concern because it backs up to single-family homes. He wanted more detailing on the rear, maybe accent elements or, more color. He wanted to see unique design and interesting shapes.

Boardmember Pete Berzins agreed with Boardmember Carter's comments. He did not feel this project was a "distinctive southwest desert design theme". He liked the tile, but felt it was the only thing on the building that had a southwest feel. He felt there should be more tile used on the building. He felt the slump block should be brown or another southwestern color. He did not like the center portion of the building. He didn't feel the building had features that would make it an interesting building.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen agreed with the previous comments. She felt the Board was not objecting to the building materials but to the plainness of the building. She felt the color palette was too monochromatic, the front was very flat and repetitive, and the signs were all the same. She felt the rear was so flat that adding color would not be enough.

Boardmember Vince DiBella was very concerned with what will happen to the south end of the project in the future. He was concerned that site plan was bad. He felt this project looked like any other project on any corner anywhere.

Mr. Cox agreed the rear elevation needed to be revised. He stated that they are on the very edge of the City and there is a very limited budget. He agreed that you can see that in what is proposed.

Boardmember Berzins stated that he didn't feel what the Board was asking for would cost much more to construct, it simply needed to be better designed. Boardmember Hagen stated

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

the Board does not have a problem with the proposed building materials, simply the way they were being proposed.

Boardmember Carter felt the building needed unique design and interesting shapes. He suggested the center portion be more dramatic, perhaps a larger cornice, larger columns. The applicant might consider making the columns under the center portion even larger than the others, or maybe use arches for the entry area. For the rear of the building he suggested using tiles and reveals, something attractive for the neighbors to look at. He wanted the architects to spend more time on the nuances of proportion and size.

MOTION: It was moved by Jillian Hagen and seconded by Pete Berzins that DR03-94 be continued to the January 7, 2003 meeting:

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: To allow the applicant time to redesign the building.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-95 **Just Trucks**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1959 East Main
REQUEST: Approval of a .39 acre used car lot
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: Sally Stephen
APPLICANT: Michael Fraccola
ARCHITECT: Kimball Design Group

REQUEST: Approval of a .39 acre used car lot

SUMMARY: There was no-one present to represent this case. Staffmember Laura Hyneman spoke to the applicant by phone, he stated he could not get to the meeting but was willing to do whatever the Board wanted. He also stated he was in agreement with the staff report and the conditions of approval. She stated that the applicant wants to cut back the old canopy and wanted the Board to allow him to get a permit to cut back the canopy and then give direction on what changes need to be made to the rest of the application. She felt the greatest problem with this project was the design of the landscaping. She also stated that the applicant had stated on the phone that he would hire a landscape architect.

Boardmember Vince DiBella questioned the reason for cutting back the canopy.

The Board felt the case needed to be continued due to the fact there was no one present to represent the case and answer their questions.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt that what the applicant was proposing was not going to work. He was very concerned with how customers, especially a handicapped customer, could get from the parking to the front of the building safely. He has serious concerns with how the site plan functions. He didn't think the planter made any sense.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen was concerned that the project narrative stated they were enhancing the building, but she did not feel they were.

Boardmember Carter stated all they were doing was changing the color and adding some stone.

Boardmember Hagen felt the canopy needed to be removed entirely because it did not relate to the pedestrian quality of the building.

Boardmember Carter confirmed that the bays would be used for displaying trucks. He suggested the bay doors changed to glass so they look like a showroom.

Boardmember Pete Berzins confirmed the case had been heard by the Board of Adjustment in September, but they had continued the case in order to get input from the Design Review Board.

Boardmember Vince DiBella found it difficult to believe that the existing building had enough value to make it worth investing in the improvements the Board was going to want to see. He

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

felt it would be much more practical to demolish the existing building so that they could design the site plan and place the building to maximize the area available for displaying vehicles, with the proper landscaping and the proper ingress and egress. He felt that the building was sited so poorly for what they want to use the site for that it causes too many problems, such as safe access for customers.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen agreed, she did not feel the site was suited for what they want to do with it. She felt it would be difficult enough to simply enter and exit the site, much less trying to place vehicles for display. She didn't feel they could fit more than 5 or 6 cars. The canopy was over scaled and looked like a gas station canopy. She didn't like the garage bays. She felt the building should be more pedestrian in scale. She did not like anything about the landscape plan and she was very concerned the fountain would become a dried up pile of mud. She was not in favor of the fountain. She was concerned with the placement of boulders in the landscape setback. She felt that in a 5' landscape setback they would need to have a screen wall or trellis with plants but that would block the visibility of their inventory.

Boardmember Pete Berzins stated they were trying to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. It's a gas station. It looks like a gas station. He agreed they should demolish the building. He couldn't think of anything that could be done to that building to make him approve the application.

Boardmember Randy Carter agreed that the best situation would be for the applicant to tear down the existing building; the glass they would have to add, remediation on the in ground lifts. But if they were unwilling to tear down the building he wanted the bay doors to be glass, the wainscot to continue around the entire perimeter of the building, the metal canopy needed to either be removed entirely or faced with EFIS, with cornices or pop-outs, if they were stuck with the canopy it needed to be thicker to match the building. He also suggested cornices at the soffit of the building to soften the building. The columns need to be widened to at least 2' and wrapped in stone on them, or at least a stone wainscot to match the building.

Chair Carie Allen agreed with the previous comments. She was concerned with telling the applicant that he had to tear down the building. She wondered if the building could be remodeled.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen stated she didn't think the most important issue was the building, it was the site plan. She didn't think the site worked for the use intended with the building located where it was.

Chair Allen agreed that the site would work better and the applicant could display more vehicles and be more efficient with a new building, but she felt it would cost more money.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Pete Berzins that DR03-95 be continued to the January 7, 2003 meeting.

VOTE: Passed 5 - 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: To allow the applicant time to redesign the project.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side B) and Tape 2 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-87 **San Angelin Apartments**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 3800 block of South Power
REQUEST: Approval of a 348 unit apartment project
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Ruiz Engineering
APPLICANT: Pew & Lake
ARCHITECT: Ruiz Engineering

REQUEST: Approval of a 348 unit apartment project

SUMMARY: This case was withdrawn from the agenda.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR03-87 be withdrawn:

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The zoning case was denied by City Council.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Other business:

Review of changes for the commercial building at 4660 East Main, DR03-85:

The applicant's asked the Board if they were going in the right direction, before they make a formal submittal for the January 2004 meeting.

Jerry Torr and Joe Doty were present to represent the case. The applicants stated the building had been separated into two buildings; moved to the east property line so there would be only one parking field. The different functions within the building were color coordinated, the offices were one color, the bays were another color, and the retail in the front was another color. The building size had been reduced from 37,000 sq. ft. to 29,000 sq. ft.; the parking had been reduced from 98 spaces to 80. The building had been reduced in height; the offices were proposed at 15' high, the retail at 17' and the bays were 23' in height.

Chair Carie Allen confirmed there would be a 25' separation between the two buildings and that the area between the buildings would be landscaped and has tables for an employee break area. There would also be tables in front of the various uses for break areas. The applicants stated they had met with the fire and sanitation departments to get approval of the revised site design.

Boardmember Vince DiBella did not feel separating the building had helped. He suggested placing the buildings so they are not aligned. He felt this would allow them to do something interesting at the corners, which would then be visible.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen liked their efforts to vary the heights and enhance the entrances. She felt the east elevation was too plain, she felt it needed more interest. She felt the front was too flat, she suggested using angles.

Boardmember Pete Berzins liked the fact that they had moved the building to one side instead of being in the middle with two rows of parking. He did not feel they needed to split the building in two. He felt they were going in the right direction; however, he did not like the colors. He suggested using a block wainscot. He was concerned with the design of the east elevation.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt that going to two buildings was a good thing. He didn't know that there was much more they could do with the site plan without losing significant square footage. He was concerned with the elevations. He suggested the awning shapes could be revised. He agreed a wainscot would help the east elevation. He suggested adding additional windows to the offices. He suggested using suspended metal canopies instead of the crenulated forms they were proposing. Mr. Doty stated that the offices were recessed 5' so they could extend the canopy out to the edge of the other building. Boardmember Carter felt the building could look very nice by adding a wainscot around the building and introducing windows and a cantilevered canopy. He wanted the canopy to be fairly thick and introduce an additional color. He suggested using 2' X 2' windows with the cantilevered canopy. He suggested beefing up the cornice. He suggested score lines and a diamond tile to break up massing. He suggested a color stripe on the rear, also glass along the north wall of the office. He did not feel the glass shown on the elevations needed to go to the ground; he would prefer

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

a wainscot below the glass. He wanted the building to be less industrial and more human in scale. He wanted the changes on both buildings, so the project would be unified.

Mr. Doty stated their biggest problems are the site design. He felt changing the cornice, changing the colors and adding windows and canopies would be easy for them.

Boardmember Berzins suggested adding a roof or shade structure between the buildings.

Chair Carie Allen agreed they had probably done as much with the site plan as they could, she appreciated their efforts in changing the roof lines and stepping the building in and out. She liked the idea of having the flat awnings to mirror the flat roof.

The next item for discussion was revisions to the Eckerd's at Stapley and McKellips:

Staffmember Charlie Scully explained that at the November meeting Eckerd's had proposed changing the roof material, the trim and the block. The only thing they were asking for at this meeting was permission to change the block used for the main field material, which was proposed to match the church to the south. Mr. Scully stated that jumbo brick, which had been approved, is not available in the size proposed. What they were proposing was to use a standard cmu block with a paint application to make it look variegated. Representatives of the contractor were present to speak to the Board.

Bruce Wenger stated that they were unable to purchase the proposed block with the kerosene finish process from Phoenix Brick. He stated that Phoenix Brick had been cited by the Environmental Protection Agency for using that process. He stated Phoenix Brick was unable to recreate the look with another process. He stated they then went to Interstate Brick who had provided the material for the church, however they could not make a variegated product in the structural units the applicant wants.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen asked what exactly they were proposing, and if they had a sample of what they were proposing.

Mr. Wenger stated they had photos of what they wanted to do. He stated that they were proposing to have a specialty painter paint the block to look variegated. He stated they had built a mock-up on site 6'-4" wide and 4' tall.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was concerned that the Board had reviewed the project with various building materials and now that it is time to construct the building the applicants are asking to change the material to something else. They had proposed brick, which was substantially more money than a painted block. He felt this was like bait and switch. He confirmed they had done curb and gutter and they were ready to pour footings. He did not believe they could not get masonry. He felt it was an issue of time and money. He felt the applicants had backed themselves into a corner and they wanted the Board to support them. He stated there is brick available in California or even from other manufactures in Arizona.

Boardmember Vince DiBella stated they had mentioned the Interstate Brick product wasn't available in the structural component they needed. He asked if they could alter the structure to use a veneer.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Mr. Wenger did not know if there was a veneer available.

Boardmember Burgheimer agreed that it is harder to get light colored block.

Mr. Wenger stated that other manufacturers had solid colors but not variegated.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that his concern was the Board had approved a brick building and now it was painted block, which is totally different and would not be the same character.

Mr. Wenger stated they did have the 8 X 4 X 16. He stated that there is a \$30,000 reduction in the cost of the materials to go with gray cmu; however, he stated that the cost for the painting job they were proposing would be \$180,000.

Boardmember Hagen asked what would happen when the building was "tagged".

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed that each individual block would be painted. He suggested a veneer would be cheaper.

Mr. Wenger stated that they felt they could get the paint cost down to about \$3.00 a square foot where a veneer would cost about \$6.00 a square foot, and the architect was adamant that they not use a veneer.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman confirmed that the applicant had been told the paint job would last 15 years.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated he would rather see the building go to an integral block with an integral colored grout, rather than see it painted. He was disappointed that it would not be brick, but he did not know that the Board would not have approved an integral block building if that was what had been presented originally. He would rather see integral block with a color mortar. He felt that when buildings are painted they lose the mortar lines and become a uniform mass.

Mr. Wenger stated they were going to rake the joints and tape the joints before painting.

Boardmember Hagen was concerned that the painted block would come across as looking fake.

Mr. Wenger stated they could use a white block and a red block, he asked if they could mix those blocks to get the variegated look?

Boardmember Randy Carter asked if they had investigated Superlite superstone or founders stone.

Boardmember Burgheimer agreed that would be a good choice. He confirmed it comes in 4" X 16".

Boardmember Carter also suggested founders finish, because it comes in browns, grays, whites, etc.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Mr. Wenger stated that the cost of this building is much higher than other Eckerd's because of the 4" X 16" block. He claimed that there is only one mason out of 10 who can lay 4" X 16" block.

Boardmembers Carter and Burgheimer disagreed and stated that the 4" X 16" can be layed twice as quickly because it is easier to work with and handle.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen stated she felt the real issue was whether the Board would approve the painted finish.

Chair Carie Allen felt that if the Board was not going to approve the painted block and they needed to give other options.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that the Board had given them several options: founders finish, veneer brick, or ladrillo foundry in a different color. There are also other places that they can purchase the products from, such as Tucson and California.

MOTION: It was moved by Jillian Hagen and seconded by Vince DiBella that the use of painted block be denied.

VOTE: Passed 4 – 1 (Boardmember Pete Berzins voting nay)

The Board agreed that the material did not have to be variegated.

Mr. Wenger stated if they could go to a light color solid block that would be great, he asked if they could have a week to find out what is available and then meet with staff to present some options.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that he was concerned they would not be able to get structural brick in the blond/white color. Other Boardmembers stated that a beige color would be acceptable.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman suggested that the applicant bring in samples and leave them with staff and then the Board members could come in and look at the samples.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman then stated that as an extension of the Board's meeting with the City Council she was proposing multi-family guidelines. She stated these guidelines would include everything from large-scale apartment projects the Board is used to reviewing to duplexes and fourplexes; they would also include townhouses and condominiums. She felt it was important to have guidelines that could be given to developers very early in the process so that they would know what the City was looking for in multi-family housing projects.

Chair Carie Allen confirmed that until now the Board has only reviewed projects that are 12 or more units to the acre.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

What Staffmember Laura Hyneman was suggesting was having some members of the technical sub-committee that meets regarding the revised Design Guidelines and some members of the Design Review Board get together and write multi-family guidelines. She stated staff had already put together an outline, and was researching what other communities were doing. She stated that some of the things she felt needed to be addressed were site planning issues and building design, streetscape compatibility, safety issues, the way residential products look from the street. She was asking the Board to volunteer to participate. She explained that there was nothing in the Codes to specifically address multi-family project. There are residential design guidelines that address single family residential and then the Design Guidelines that address office, commercial, and industrial.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated that where he came from the street was the back of the building and people played in the front area. He would like to see what Seattle and communities in Florida and other areas have been doing. He would like to encourage diversity and creativity. He was concerned that communities now are designed around fire, sanitation, and engineering requirements.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen thought it sounded like staff was proposing a workbook with ideas and concepts that we are looking for and maybe what we don't want as opposed to actual guidelines. She stated that DC ranch is very good at compiling documents that explain what they are looking for. She felt that it would be a good idea to develop workbooks for specialty areas such as the Desert Uplands. Ideas rather than guidelines.

Boardmember Burgheimer felt that the problem with guidelines is that they don't have any teeth. He felt they should be incentive based, otherwise the developers would not do what the guidelines say.

Boardmember Hagen wanted to ensure the guidelines would not restrict the applicants who were being creative.

Chair Carie Allen stated that she has been told that developers and zoning attorneys don't understand incentive bonuses. They understand zoning and the number of units allowed per acre period.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt that it was important for the project to be reviewed by a citizen board.

Boardmember Vince DiBella stated that someone could take the current design guidelines and meet exactly what they stated and the project could still be very bad. He was concerned with who would be determining whether they had met the guidelines.

Boardmember Burgheimer felt that the obvious solution was for all multi-family to be reviewed by the Design Review Board.

Staffmember Hyneman felt that it would be easier to get project through the Board if the developers had guidelines to review before they made their first submittal through staff.

Boardmember Burgheimer was concerned the homebuilders group was going to be very

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

concerned with any guidelines.

Staffmember Hyneman felt that the answer was to include them early in the process.

Chair Carie Allen stated that what the developers want is a level playing field. They will do what is required as long as everyone else is held to the same standard. She agreed that there might be some resistance because they are concerned with how long the process takes. But what they want more than anything is fairness.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da