

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
APRIL 2, 2008

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

Tim Nielsen - Chair
Wendy LeSueur – Vice Chair
Tom Bottomley
Robert Burgheimer
Vince DiBella
Craig Boswell
Delight Clark (left at 6:53)

MEMBERS ABSENT

OTHERS PRESENT

Lesley Davis
Mia Lozano Helland
Jeff Conkle
Jennifer Gniffke
Debbie Archuleta
Joe Welliver
Josh Mike
Rob Dmohowski
Joy Spezeski
Jen Babbitt
Nate Babbitt
Grant Blount
Michael Jorgensen
Marc Brimhall
Gary Brinkley
Steven Eiss
Rick Moore
Ian Riggs

M. Radice
Eric Thomson
Curtis Chong
Jessica Gore
Jerry Fannin
Kevin Kerbo
John Harrison
Wilson Efim
Lynn Newhall
Eric Williams
Holly Forden
Robert Emmellenj
Reese Anderson
Others

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

1. Work Session:

CASE: Offices at Parkwood Ranch
NEC Southern & Crismon

REQUEST: Review of nine office buildings totaling 62,375 sq. ft.

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Not enough variety
- Need better quality and individuality
- More change than just color
- Changes in texture, forms, detailing
- Mix it up
- Originality

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- They look very similar to each other, it is hard to tell them apart

Boardmember Delight Clark:

- More variety of colors, too much brown

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Alter the flavor of the buildings
- Overall architecture should change
- Unique architecture

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: North Mesa Auto Center
2431 E McKellips

REQUEST: Review of 13,950 sq. ft. of auto service and retail

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Very awkward site plan
- Parking looks inadequate
- Need to see a design and footprint for the future pad

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- The pad is very small; how can you park it?
- The Board needs to know the pad can be developed
- Buildings are nice in places, but then the change in plan just stops
- If the buildings move within the site plan, 4-sided architecture will be even more important

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Buildings are nice
- Site plan doesn't work

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Could shops back onto McKellips?
- Don't design the site around existing driveways
- Parking should be closer to the buildings
- The future pad is making the site difficult
- Check with Engineering to see if they can use the driveways. They will need M-42 detail.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Mesa Family Medical II
1353 E McKellips

REQUEST: Review of a 9,357 sq. ft. medical office building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Mechanical units would work better on the ground

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Gable and parapet are awkward, could they remove the gable?
- Color board is much better than the color elevation

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: A to Z Auto Sales
727/735 W Broadway

REQUEST: Review of a 450 sq. ft. trailer for auto sales

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Understand their issue
- This is way below the threshold of what the Board expects for Mesa
- This doesn't meet design standards
- It is their solution to the modular that doesn't work
- Look at fenestration
- Look at materials

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Concerned with the design
- Parapets are too thin
- The fake vegas are bad
- The pueblo looking parapet is a concern
- The proportions don't work
- The design can be simple
- It needs presence
- This looks temporary
- A shed roof could look better

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Residential windows don't work, use commercial glazing

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- This building blends into the background

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Bank of Arizona
Dobson & Riverview

REQUEST: Review of a 5,500 sq. ft. bank with drive thru tellers

DISCUSSION:

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Submit detail of ATM with the follow-up submittal

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Tower is interesting
- Likes the proportion of the teller canopy
- Concern with shoulder of gable; could it come up a course or two?
- Could the window area on the south elevation be equal to the fascia?

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Babbitt Motorworks
2020 N Mesa Drive

REQUEST: Review of a 6,996 sq. ft. auto service facility

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Street elevation should be more dynamic
- These materials are good
- Look at Mario Bata book

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Building looks like it would be at back of an industrial area
- COR-TEN steel doesn't work well in Arizona, it streaks
- COR-TEN doesn't fit the sleek, modern ideal of BMW
- Don't confuse simple with sophisticated
- You have to look at the details
- You're on the right track
- Look at Weiss Guy car wash on Country Club
- Concerned with the bay doors facing the neighbors

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Like COR-TEN steel but it looks rustic, BMW seems more refined and upscale
- The windows are the wrong proportion
- The entrance is awkward
- Should be sleeker

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- The richness of a building is in the details
- You can trick the block and steel to be interesting
- Be careful with the proportions and detailing

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Dana Park Village Square Building 9
3510 E Baseline

REQUEST: Review of a 9,500 sq. ft. retail building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Concerned with the double rows of windows on the tower, could they use just one row of windows?

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Provide photos of center in the follow-up submittal

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Entrada at the San Tan FLMS
SEC 202 & Warner

REQUEST: Review of a 75' tall FLMS

DISCUSSION:

No one was present to represent the case

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Banner Technology Center
1010 N Country Club

REQUEST: Review of a 65,718 sq. ft. data processing building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- The 12' wall will look very industrial along 10th

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Use 1/8" scale
- This building is sophisticated
- Need larger scale with follow-up submittal
- How the panels are attached will be important, they could be the art of the building
- Need details of how panels are attached
- Could the "IT" aspect be addressed in the building
- Provide a detail of the wall with the building behind it

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- 12' wall could be made to look like an extension of the building
- Maybe raked joints
- Concrete block should be ground face, plain block won't work

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Likes how the landscaping is organized
- May need to simplify palette
- Could they do something with height, building up to the building

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Waveyard
8th and Dobson

REQUEST: Review of preliminary plans

DISCUSSION:

There was no one present the discuss the project

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Banner Baywood Emergency Room Expansion
6644 E Baywood

REQUEST: Review expansion of the emergency facilities

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Likes the ramp

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Likes the glass element on the tower
- Likes the way it ties into the hospital
- Is the split face block too much of a contrast to the rest of the building?

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Very glad to see Emergency entrance is at the front of the hospital
- Circulation is a concern, could they do a round-a-bout?

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

2. Call to Order:

Chair Tim Nielsen called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the March 5, and March 13, 2008 Meetings:

On a motion by Tom Bottomley seconded by Craig Boswell the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

4. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR08-14 Spotless Carwash
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2844 East McKellips Road
REQUEST: Approval of a self-serve car wash
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Arizona Dream Builders & Designers
APPLICANT: John Reddell
ARCHITECT: John Reddell
STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of a self-serve car wash

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

MOTION: It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR08-14 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 requirements of Development Incentive Permit BA08-001.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
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 green.* (*The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.*)
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-15 Bank of Arizona

LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC of Signal Butte Road & Southern Ave
REQUEST: Approval of a bank with drive-thru operations
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Debartolo Holdings
APPLICANT: Jones Lang Lasalle
ARCHITECT: Gensler – Chuck Albright
STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of a bank with drive-thru operations

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

MOTION: It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR08-15 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, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
4. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket *and painted green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
5. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-16 Cracker Barrel
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC Signal Butte & Hampton Avenue
REQUEST: Approval of a 12,192 sq. ft. restaurant
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: DeBartolo
APPLICANT: Cracker Barrel Old Country Store, Inc.
ARCHITECT: Colleen Atwood
STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of a 12,192 sq. ft. restaurant

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

MOTION: It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR08-16 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, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
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 green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-17 Brakes Plus

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1106 S Signal Butte
REQUEST: Approval of a 4,800 sq. ft. brake facility
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Weingarten/Investments
APPLICANT: Kimley-Horn and Associates
ARCHITECT: Arcodev Architects – Norman Herman
STAFF PLANNER: Jeff Conkle

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,800 sq. ft. brake facility

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

MOTION: It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR08 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, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
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 green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-18 Health South Rehab Hospital
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC 56th Street & Baseline Road
REQUEST: Approval of a 48,309 sq. ft. hospital building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: VHS Acquisition Subsidiary
APPLICANT: John D. Kuhn
ARCHITECT: Curtis Chong
STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of a 48,309 sq. ft. hospital building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR08 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, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
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 green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-19 Warehouse Addition

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 5524 E Baseline Rd
REQUEST: Approval of a 9,059 sq. ft. warehouse
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Lynn Urry
APPLICANT: Greg Hitchens
ARCHITECT: Greg Hitchens
STAFF PLANNER: Jeff Conkle

REQUEST: Approval of a 9,059 sq. ft. warehouse

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

MOTION: It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR08-19 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, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
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 green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-20 Wachovia Bank
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2009 North Stapley Drive
REQUEST: Approval of a 3,988 sq. ft. bank building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Red Development – Sean Wood
APPLICANT: Callison LLC
ARCHITECT: Martin Hill, Callison LLC
STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of a 3,988 sq. ft. bank building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR08-20 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. Future installation of additional ATMs will require Administrative Approval.
3. Provide vehicular cross access with the parcel west of this site.
4. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
6. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
7. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket *and painted green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
8. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
9. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-21 Lowe's

LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Country Club & Kiowa
REQUEST: Approval of a 137,933 sq. ft. home improvement store with a 31,179 sq. ft. garden center
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: Vanderbilt Farms LLC
APPLICANT: Pew & Lake
ARCHITECT: BRR Architecture
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of a 137,933 sq. ft. home improvement store with a 31,179 sq. ft. garden center.

SUMMARY: Reese Anderson represented the case. Mr. Anderson stated they were in agreement with the conditions of approval except for 1b regarding screening of mechanical equipment. He stated the roof was sloped, so the mechanical equipment at the east end of the building protrude higher than the proposed parapet. He stated that in order to fully screen the units the west parapet would have to be 34'.

Comments from neighbors: Gary Palangian stated he thought Lowe's was trying to design a building that worked. Mr. Palangian thought the building was backward. He wanted the loading away from the homes and the garden center next to the homes. He stated the south and west sides of the building were very big, he wanted windows on the sides and doors on the bottom for rear yard views. He stated the site line from the rear yards was hard to envision. He wanted landscaping to soften the building.

Laurie Buckles wondered if the store could be oriented so it sits along the north, facing south, so deliveries would be along Kiowa. She did not want trucks passing behind homes.

Robert Emmelkamp stated the developer has not tried to work with the neighbors. The current design plan only has two entry/exit points. He thought the Council should vote first. Then if they lose at Council they would be willing to work with the applicant.

Boardmember Craig Boswell confirmed that changing condition 1b would take a variance, which the Design Review Board can not grant. He thought increasing the parapet height would be an error.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated the answer to condition 1b was to penthouse the units. He confirmed they were proposing to use 5 to 10 ton units, which he stated were very small for a building this large. He stated they should be using large commercial units.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur confirmed the neighbors don't want the building at all, so she thought the walls should be as low as possible.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought that if you want a building to disappear, adding elements to the rear and side elevations seemed to be the wrong solution. Regarding flipping the building he thought they would be solving one problem and causing another. The truck loading dock would be along the street which is not allowed by Code. There is a

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

substantial distance from the building to the residential. He personally would want the building to disappear as much as possible. He thought the trees and the light colors helped do that. Moving the garden center would move the loading closer to more neighbors.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated flipping the building would move the impact from one neighborhood to another neighborhood. He stated garden centers are often the least maintained areas of home improvement stores. He stated he thought the landscape buffer could have been a very nice park like area, but apparently the neighbors had rejected that.

Chair Tim Nielsen stated to Wendy LeSueur's credit, she recommended a forest of trees and no shrubs, to screen the building from the neighbors, and also address the neighbors security concerns. He wanted the buffer area graded so it retains water to help water the trees.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley confirmed with Boardmember LeSueur that Willow Acacia could be a dense screen.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur suggested providing 50% more trees than they were showing on the landscape plan. She stated how the trees are watered would be very important. She wanted the number of emitters doubled, with some of the emitters 4' to 5' from the root ball. She also wanted the applicant to use 2 gallon emitters.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley stated they should layer the trees in a triangle.

Anthony Farmer of Lowe's stated the design of the mechanical units and grouping them together would require larger/taller units. He stated they have never grouped them before. He stated they were only willing to raise the parapet.

Chair Tim Nielsen stated they had not proposed any other solutions. He stated there are other solutions to condition 1b. He wanted the applicant to work with the neighbors and to come up with a solution.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR08-21 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Finish the backside of all parapets that project above 28' or above the lowest building wall height with a cornice and paint colors to match the front side of the wall.
 - b. Screening of roof-mounted mechanical units is required in accordance with §11-15-4(B) of the Zoning Ordinance. This requires that the height of the screening element shall equal or exceed the height of the structures tallest piece of installed equipment. Individual "hats" or screens are not permitted.
Work with staff to screen the mechanical units. The height of the parapet wall can be increased 1' to 2' not 5' to 8'. Increase is not to

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

occur all the way around.

- c. Revise the landscape plan to meet the minimum standards per §11-15-3(A) of the Zoning Ordinance. The minimum number of trees and shrubs is required on the Lowe's development piece and cannot be counted if located on the adjacent buffer piece. The landscape buffer adjacent to the residential must be landscaped separately per the plan submitted.
 - d. Foundation base landscape has not been provided. Revise the landscape plan to provide the required Foundation Base Landscaping per §11-15-3(C) of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - e. Revise the landscape plan in accordance with §11-15-5(B). The plan indicates that the "Landscape Island Bonus" option is being utilized, however it has not been used correctly. A significant number of additional planters are required. The intent is to double the number of trees in the parking lot. A palm tree is not an acceptable tree for a landscape island unless it is in addition to a required shade tree.
 - f. Replace "Texas Ranger" as a shrub for the parking lot area with another type of shrub that can grow successfully in a confined space.
 - g. Provide street frontage landscaping with tree substitution in accordance with §11-15-3 of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - h. Identify bike rack locations on the site plan.
 - i. Revise the elevations of the monument signs to be more compatible with the building design and for compliance with §11-14-3(E) of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - j. Provide elevations of all site walls and gates. The design must be compatible with the buildings. Identify colors and materials.
 - k. Compliance with §11-15-5(A) for minimum dimensions for pedestrian connections. Pedestrian paths need to be a decorative surface wherever they cross drive aisles.
 - l. Indicate location of outdoor cart storage. This area needs to be screened by a solid wall that ties in with the building design. Also, include a detail of the cart corals for the parking lot.
 - m. **In the buffer area on the west and south side of Lowe's; increase the number of trees by 50%; increase the number of emitters for the trees to six using 2 gallon per hour emitters; go out 4' to 5' with some of the emitters; and grade the buffer so the trees can receive rain water.**
 - n. **Hold a neighborhood meeting to discuss proposed solutions for the screening of the mechanical units, and provide minutes of the meeting to staff. Neighborhood approval of the screening method is not required.**
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
 3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
 4. Compliance with all requirements of case Z08-05.
 5. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
 6. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket *and painted green.* (*The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.*)

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
8. Provide two half-size color elevations, revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting a building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 1 (Boardmember Craig Boswell voting nay)

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-22 Montecito Apartments
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 307 South Hawes Road
REQUEST: Approval of a 215 unit apartment development
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: SLAM Development
APPLICANT: Wilson Ejim
ARCHITECT: Roy Noggle
STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of a 215 unit apartment development

SUMMARY: Reese Anderson and Wilson Ejim represented the case. Mr. Ejim brought revised plans to the meeting; however, staff had not had any time to review the plans. Mr. Ejim stated the windows are not a round arch. The owner wants one color with a trim color. The blank wall now has windows. The parking canopy would have a metal tile roof.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated it was very hard to read the elevations presented. The large shadow lines covered up a lot of the details.

Boardmember Vince DiBella agreed the plans were hard to read. He thought the buildings needed more articulation, and architectural interest. There needed to be more than one material from base to roof. He stated the parking canopies should be of a lighter color so they would not be hot and would not clash with the landscaping.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur confirmed the square windows would have the cast concrete and the tall windows would have a pop-out. She thought there needed to be more detail.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley stated the project looked stacked. There was no variety, too little variation. The vertical windows emphasized the verticality. The buildings looked extruded. It was big, and tall. It needed some interest. He appreciated the changes that had been made but there needed to be more.

Chair Tim Nielsen was concerned that there are still windows looking across into windows. He agreed it was extruded. So many windows stacked on top of each other. He stated there were things that could be done to make it more interesting. Why couldn't the stone section come up? Why not use color to break up the verticality?

Boardmember Tom Bottomley stated the elevations needed variety. Horizontal plane needs to be broken up, so there is a balance. Maybe stone and a base color. There needs to be differences at pedestrian level. The Board needs to see the detailing with the next submittal.

1. **MOTION:** It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR08-22 be continued to the May 7, 2008 meeting

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

The Board gave the applicant the following suggestions:

Break up the verticality

Additional color

New material

Movement of the base

Not so static

Distinguish the entries

Carport design is poor, the post will be placed where the car door opens

Cantilever projections.

Show the Board where the score lines will go

Show the Board where the light fixtures will go

Convey the details graphically

Render the drawings correctly, remove the shadows. They can color only a portion of the building to save time.

Define the base of the building and the entry points

Show placement of exterior building mounted light fixtures

Detail the balconies on the new elevations

VOTE: Passed 5 – 1 (Boardmember Rob Burgheimer voting nay)

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-23 Red Mountain Business Park
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 4608 East Virginia Street
REQUEST: Approval of 8 industrial buildings totaling 268,792 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Dorcey Abshier
APPLICANT: Henry Chan
ARCHITECT: Brock Grayson
ENGINEER: Brian Smith
STAFF PLANNER: Joy Spezeski

REQUEST: Approval of 8 industrial buildings totaling 268,792 sq. ft.

SUMMARY: Henry Chan represented the case. Mr. Chan stated they had moved colors around, they had not sand blasted or added texture. He stated the client agrees with the conditions. To address condition 1d., they were proposing to use a combination of screening and berming.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley stated the architecture did not have enough interest. Too much of a box, too stark, too industrial. He thought it looked dated already. The darker elements don't vary in scale. Paint is the only thing breaking the line. The corner panel is in front of form liner. There should be more reveal joints.

Chair Tim Nielsen confirmed the form liner is painted. Why is the separation always at the same height on every building? The entrances should be more volumetric. More texture and variation. Too much sun at entrance, it will be very hot. Maybe use a canopy.

Boardmember Vince Di Bella confirmed they had added reveal lines and 2" deep panels on the street elevation.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer noted that the north elevation will be visible from the freeway. Some things won't read as a box, it looks strange split up the way it is. Provide off-sets or change some of the heights.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur agreed they should off set the parapets more and thought they could add more interest at the entries. She liked the striated look on the elevation drawings.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR08-23 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 color schedule for each building providing specific detail on how the color schemes will be used for each element. Additionally, include a site plan that indicates which color scheme will be used on which buildings.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

- b. Design Review Staff to review and approve manufacturer and paint color for Service Doors/Bays
- c. Landscape islands shall contain at least one (1) tree and three (3) shrubs. In locations where a landscape diamond was approved instead of a landscape island as part of Z08-015, each landscape diamond and half diamond shall contain at least one (1) tree. Trees in landscape diamonds shall not be counted towards foundation base landscaping
- d. Parking areas adjacent to the public rights-of-ways shall be screened in accordance with §11-15-4 of the Zoning Ordinance. Design Review Staff to review and approve the screen wall and/or berm locations and elevations of the screen wall.
- e. Design Review Staff to review and approve elevations of fenced wall areas. Submitted elevations must show the fenced wall, the gates and the building. The height, building material, and paint manufacture and color must be included in the submittal
- f. Minimum 10% of required trees in foundation base of Building G shall be at least 36" box size
- g. **Work with staff to revise the elevations. Changes should include the following:**
 - **Provide textured concrete and an additional volume at the main entry to the buildings.**
 - **Provide shade canopies to articulate entries in key locations.**
 - **Provide additional textured concrete on key elevations that are more visible, such as along Virginia or along the Freeway.**
 - **Create more verticality to vary parapet heights.**
2. Compliance with Conditions of Approval of zoning case Z08-015
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
6. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket *and painted green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
8. Provide two revised half-size color elevations, revised site plans, landscaping plans and black line elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 1 (Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought the case should be continued, he thought the conditions were too general).

The remainder of the Board thought the architect had the ability to make the changes and that staff member Lesley Davis understood what the Board wanted and could work with the applicant to meet the conditions.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da