

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

February 1, 2006

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

MEMBERS PRESENT

Pete Berzins - Chair
Dave Richins- Vice Chair
Tom Bottomley
Robert Burgheimer
Tim Nielsen
Vince DiBella

MEMBERS ABSENT

OTHERS PRESENT

Kim Steadman
Lesley Davis
Debbie Archuleta
Mia Lozano Helland
John Wesley
April Ward
Krissa Hargis
Gordon Sheffield
Loren Dickinson
D J Stapley
Dave Udall
Shawn Clow
Jacquelray
Michael Roth
Kelee Walton
Jay Jolley
Sean Lake

Matt Hass
Geoff Spaete
Mark Bowker
Tim Perrien
Kurt Frimodle
Francis Marotta
Bill Heller
Alice Skinner
Phillip A
Ed Hansen
Doug Himmelberger
Marc Davis
Suzanne Schweiger-Nitchas
Robin Barbour
S J Djahedi
Tom Warner
Others

1. Work Session:

CASE: Day Care & Retail Center
NWC Sossaman & Guadalupe

REQUEST: Approval of a retail center

DISCUSSION:

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Concerned with how the wrought iron and the chain link come together along the canal
- Outdoor dining should be covered

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- More color
- Tower element roofing should continue around for the patio
- Walls over bridge will be treated like screen walls to incorporate design elements

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Concerned with rear elevation facing Sossaman
- Richness along Sossaman
- Center portion could have another jog

CASE: The Palms at Superstition Springs Lot 1 Retail
6400 block of E Superstition Springs

REQUEST: Approval of a multi-tenant retail building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

- Nice volume shapes and sizes

CASE: The Palms at Superstition Springs Lot 1 Houlihans
6400 block of E Superstition Springs

REQUEST: Approval of a restaurant

DISCUSSION:

Chair Pete Berzins:

- Re-label elevations to show north, south, east, west

Boardmember Dave Richins:

2. Black will be very hot
Scuppers need to be creative

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

Paint the roll up shutter
Could they unify the colors more
The colors don't have to be the same, but these colors clash

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

Concern with how black EIFS will age
Scuppers need to be decorative
Is there a break in plane between the bar and restaurant
Black could be faded out in 6 months
Maybe use alucobond or dark anodized aluminum
Clear anodized aluminum downspouts would go nicely with the other anodized aluminum
Protect the west side from the sun

CASE: KFC/A&W
W of NWC Signal Butte & Baseline

REQUEST: Approval of one building for two fast food restaurants

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Dave Richins:

Looks like two buildings smashed together
Should canopy colors match?
Lights should be the same color

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

Electric service needs to be recessed and screened
KFC tower element seems out of place
The colonel is a sign

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

Agreed the tower element was not cohesive with the building

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

Use the metal element below the windows on the east elevation
Too much happening on such a small building
Should be more cohesive
Agreed the tower doesn't work
Maybe split the faces out more, pop out the entrances

CASE: Chase Bank
NWC Signal Butte & Baseline

REQUEST: NWC Signal Butte & Baseline

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

Concerned with thinness of fascia below the hip

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

Doesn't like the roof material
Modern building; could roof be metal?
Remove the keystone from the roof line
50/50 proportion is poor
Could the overhang be larger?
Thicker fascia should help

CASE: Mekong Plaza
66 S Dobson

REQUEST: Approval of the remodel of a former Target store

DISCUSSION:

Chair Pete Berzins:

Don't be restrained by the Phase I building
Put money on the front, the rear is OK as proposed

Boardmember Dave Richins:

Materials and colors came from the phase I building
Go look at converted K-Mart at 7th Street and Roosevelt
A long stretch of sameness
Small details will make a difference
Make it all Asian

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

More towers at lower levels

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

Collision of two ideas
Let it be Asian
Look at 44 Street
May not be able to match the phase I building
Maybe a moon door?
Tower details should look Asian, not mission
Lights
Pre-cast pieces
Maybe even Zen gardens

CASE: Office DFFM Yukon
3635 E Inverness

REQUEST: Approval a an office building

DISCUSSION:

Chair Pete Berzins:

Bring photos of surrounding buildings

Boardmember Tim Nielsen:

Nice materials

Right side of north elevation (chimney view) flimsy looking

Vince DiBella:

Concern with roof material

Center portion of west elevation is popped out

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

Cornice above roof is not enough change

Colors too passive

Liked the idea of pop-out being all block

CASE: Hampton Mesa
7400 block E Hampton

REQUEST: Approval of an industrial building

DISCUSSION:

Chair Pete Berzins:

Needs more articulation

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

Wants to see the apartments across the street
Dimensional building
Break it up

CASE: M & I Bank
1510 W Southern

REQUEST: Approval of a raze and rebuild of a bank

DISCUSSION:

Chair Pete Berzins:

Very happy with the landscaping at the corner

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

Beige is getting old
Building is nice
More color

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

Color is boring

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

Brighter color

CASE: MARC Center
924 N Country Club

REQUEST: Approval of a new building at the MARC center

DISCUSSION:

This case was not discussed at the request of the applicant

2. Call to Order:

Chair Pete Berzins called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

3. Introduction of Chris Brady, City Manager

Planning Director, John Wesley introduced Chris Brady, the new City Manager, to the Board. Mr. Brady stated he wanted to say hello and meet the Board. If there was anything he could do as City Manager to assist the Board to please let him know. He stated he had come from San Antonio and was very much involved in the development process, and it is a factor in the selection of where you develop. The reputation you have can make a difference in the development community and whether they choose to do business in your community. He has seen reports from Chambers of Commerce that indicate that in a very real sense. He stated everything we do to work with the development community is important, and he always says it is a partnership. They are probably one of the major capital investors in Mesa. That is healthy thing for a community, but obviously well thought out, organized, and planned development is important too. There has to be a partnership to make that work and to make sure that meets the values of the community, so he stands ready to work with the Board. He stated he had met with staff a few times and was impressed with the staff, he thought they do a good job and he looks forward to working with them also.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer then stated the challenge is how to make this a development friendly community. He stated he knew Mesa has a lot of challenges, and this Board tries to be sensitive to that. He stated this Board is made up of working people and they are in the industry and they try to balance quality of life in Mesa with that. There is always improvement that can be made.

4. Approval of the Minutes of the January 4, 2006 Meeting:

On a motion by Dave Richins seconded by Tom Bottomley the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

5. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR05-101 Gin Building
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 206 & 214 N Power
REQUEST: Approval of a 4,023 sq. ft. office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Gene Gin
APPLICANT: Shawn Clow
ARCHITECT: Gerald Deines

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,023 sq. ft. office building

SUMMARY: Shawn Clow represented the case. Mr. Clow stated they were trying to make it look like one unified building.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer liked the wedges but not the way they were placed on the building. He was concerned with the proportions of the wedges. He confirmed there would be split face and standard cmu, but they would both be painted. The wedges looked modern the rest of the building did not. He thought the split face should not be painted. He thought the north side was OK.

Boardmember Vince DiBella thought the southeast elevation canopy piece seemed out of place. Maybe it should be cantilevered. Parts of the building were modern, other parts were not. He did not understand the placement of the wedges. He confirmed the individual glass sections were butt glazed.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought the building looked like a cold, austere box, not an inviting building. He did not think it was neighborhood friendly. He thought the building needed articulation. The wedges looked randomly applied. Too stark.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen agreed the building looked stark and austere. He suggested more volumes of ins and outs. He also suggested patterning of the masonry; maybe row lock. He prefers integral block. It is hard to feel the richness of the block when it is painted or stained. Canopies could provide interest. Need shade and shadow pattern. Maybe use some rowlock and some 8" and some 4" block.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed there would be a wall between the parking and the neighbors.

Chair Pete Berzins preferred the colors on the samples. He thought the pop-outs were not balanced well. He liked the materials. He agreed that even staining the block, you would lose the richness.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated he was OK with the concept for the building, but did not think it was executed well. He stated he felt really badly having to continue the case again; however, the applicant had come back with a whole new design and he thought it needed refinement. He suggested connecting the buildings with a horizontal wedge. He stated if the applicant wanted to use wedges then the building needed to be modern. He stated the colors and materials needed to be more interesting. He thought the wedges should off-set/mirror each other to balance the building. Look at colors, materials, proportioning. Maybe some wedges could be up and some down? Horizontal wedge

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

could be a shade piece. There may be too many wedges.

Boardmember Vince DiBella suggested the applicant look at height, proportion, and height differentiation, the number of wedges. Maybe the windows could wrap the corners.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley stated the applicant should not scrap the design. He thought it just needed to be more cohesive, not so disjointed. Maybe canopies could be wedges for a change of light and shadow. Vary the depth of the windows; the size of the windows; maybe a more dramatic change in height? He stated the idea of painting the building all one color was a concern. He thought there should be more color.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen suggested the applicant look at the interplay of volume, shade and shadow.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR05-101 be continued to the March 1, 2006 meeting:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer suggested maybe the applicant could come to the special meeting February 17, 2006 and bring sketches. Even if they were on buff paper, so the Board could look at the direction the applicant was going.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

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

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06 -04 Brown & Recker Self-Storage
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 5932 E Brown
REQUEST: Approval of a 83,513 sq. ft. mini-storage facility
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Brown Recker SS Investments, LLC
APPLICANT: Mark Davis
ARCHITECT: Brian Moore

REQUEST: Approval of a 83,513 sq. ft. mini-storage facility

SUMMARY: Mark Davis and Michael Roth represented the case. The applicant's explained they had designed the gate to look like the monument sign. The building was predominantly block; the tower elements pops out, and has stucco over cmu; the remaining block was to be painted. The tower element was repeated on the east and west elevations. The center scored block would be painted the red color. The roof would be standing seam metal.

Boardmember Dave Richins thought the building had come a long way.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought the new design had some street presence. He liked the scored reveal lines. He suggested they be used on each side of the clock. He suggested brining the smooth stucco all the way down the clock tower to break up the horizontality of the building.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley was not sure the clock added anything to the building. He stated that if they were going to use it, it needed to actually work and not be allowed to stop a few months down the road. He was concerned with the covered metal canopy. He thought it should be a rake, not a hop. He thought the forms were fighting at the coping; he was concerned with the low pitch. He suggested using a shed roof. He thought an additional color in a slight variation would help. He thought the tower was too tall and the walls beside it very blank. He was concerned the striping looked like a racetrack. He suggested varying the height of the striping. He thought the sign on the front elevation was too close to the band and should be up higher.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed the entry gate was made up of 2" square tubular steel frame with 1" pickets 4" on center, and the pickets would be steel painted red. The mesh would be circular punched metal. He suggested they not use the same paint as the block or they might lose the element.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the project had come a long way; however, he was not comfortable with the massing. He liked the gate. He was concerned with the intersection of elements. He did not think the building was harmonious. He was concerned with the relationship of the windows; he thought the clock was a waste of money; he thought the tower element should be lower; and the towers on the side elevations even lower. He did not like the cornice. He questioned why they were proposing eyebrows on the first floor but not the second. He thought there should be actual shade control. He suggested a hip and gable element on the side for shade. He

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

thought the front elevation was close but the side elevations were problematic.

Staffmember Kim Steadman showed the Board a sketch he had done during their discussion. The Board generally liked the revisions in the sketch. (See Exhibit A in the case file).

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR06-04 be approved with the following conditions:

Front office building only (See DR06-004 minutes from the January 4, 2006 meeting for the mini storage units.)

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 complete revised color/material board indicating the revised building materials and colors. This should include information on lights, doors, glass, etc.
 - b. Provide height dimensions to the mid-point of the sloped roof and/or to the peak of that roof on the front office building elevations.
 - c. Provide an additional tree along the Brown Road frontage in accordance with Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - d. Revise the landscape plan to remove foundation plant materials from the stairwell area and include dimensions of the foundation base landscape area on the landscape plan. Foundation base must meet minimum standards.
 - e. Revise the retention basin to provide an irregular shape with berms in compliance with §11-15-3 (D).
 - f. Compliance with all conditions of approval for the self-storage buildings as outlined in the January 4, 2006, Design Review Board meeting minutes for case DR06-004.
 - g. **Work with staff on proportions of the tower and panel sections on the sides.**
 - h. **Work with staff regarding the placement of the cmu and stucco.**
 - i. **Revise the window placement to create more interest and rhythm.**
 - j. **Provide score lines in the stucco.**
 - k. **Disrupt the horizontality of the banding. Details to be approved by staff.**
 - l. **Don't lose the silhouette of the mountains by painting the pickets.**
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
6. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
8. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised black and white elevations, site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: This project is in conformance with the Design Guidelines and, with the revisions outlined in the conditions of approval, will be a nice addition to the streetscape.

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-05 QuikTrip

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 14715 S Power

REQUEST: Approval of a 5,104 sq. ft. convenience store and a 9,879 sq. ft. gas canopy

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6

OWNER: QuikTrip Corporation

APPLICANT: Craig Boswell

ARCHITECT: JMS

REQUEST: Approval of a redesign of a previously approved gas station.

SUMMARY: Craig Boswell and Dave Cisiewski represented the case. Mr. Cisiewski stated QuikTrip would like to have a special meeting with the Board to discuss design of future buildings, rather than an ad hoc approach. He stated they were hoping to get approval of several elements from the Board.

Boardmember Dave Richins asked if there intention was to come up with a prototype they could then building over and over again?

Boardmember Tom Bottomley stated he was OK with several different variations; however, they need to take sites on a case-by-case basis. They can't have one design. They need to have variety.

Chair Pete Berzins stated they can't just come up with elements the Board likes and then use them for everything.

Mr. Cisiewski stated they were thinking of designs for the next 3 to 5 buildings. He understood that if they went into a center they would have to conform to the architecture of the center.

Boardmember Vince DiBella stated they have already gotten a lot of input from the Board. He hoped to see some proposed elevations at the special meeting.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated if they were going to meet he thought it would take a couple of hours. He stated QuikTrip does a quality project, the concern has been about sameness and the need for change. He thought that if they were going to meet anyway they should hear case DR06-05.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen stated he doesn't mind them master planning a few stores, but they need to make some changes.

Boardmember Dave Richins stated he would like to see a map that plots where their stores are. He stated they expect to see a high design quality, and a variation on the theme.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen stated they would still have to be site sensitive.

Planning Director, John Wesley stated that, because the agenda stated the case was being continued to the March 1, 2006 meeting it could not be heard prior to that date.

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that discussion of future QuikTrip designs be held February 17, 2006 at 12:00 noon in the Planning Division Conference Room.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR06-05 be continued to the March 1, 2006 meeting

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The applicant requested a continuance to the March 1, 2006 Design Review Board meeting and for further discussion and direction at a February 17, 2006 Special Meeting.

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-07 ACS Building

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 550 E University Dr

REQUEST: Approval of a 2,873 sq. ft. office

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1

OWNER: Steve Bleck

APPLICANT: Boyd Thacker

ARCHITECT: Boyd Thacker

REQUEST: Approval of a 2,873 sq. ft. office

SUMMARY: Boyd Thacker represented the case. Mr. Thacker stated the area is transitioning. They don't want to perpetuate the surrounding residential architecture.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley stated overall, they blend into a residential area. He thought the wainscot adjacent to the entry should be lower to create a height difference between the two elements.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed the top of the windows were 8' in height, and a little higher at the entry. He also confirmed the roof slope was 6 12. Would have liked to see more windows.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer agreed there were some very bad examples along University; however, there are some cute houses to the north. He would have liked this to be a real jewel that could set a trend for future redevelopment in the area. He thought the north entry should be defined by using additional color or using the stone. He would like to see the light fixture on the south.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed the rear portion of the lot would remain vacant.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen agreed that introducing another color would enhance the building.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR06-07 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Provide a revised color/material board indicating the trim color and manufacturer details for the windows and stone caps as well as details on the glass and window mullion colors.
 - b. Provide revised color and black and white elevations that include call-outs for color/material locations on the building as well as the locations of the light fixtures.
 - c. Revise the windows to include a mullion patten with a more residential character.
 - d. Provide a revised site plan and landscape plan that indicates the location of the ground mounted mechanical equipment on the west side of the building approved as part of the DIP (ZA06-004).

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

e. Provide an additional color on the building. 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 Development Incentive Permit (DIP) (ZA06-004).
5. Compliance with all conditions of approval for case Z05-105.
6. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
8. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0 (Chair Pete Berzins left prior to this case)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The proposed project is reasonably well designed and will be an enhancement to the neighborhood.

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-08 Mt. Vista Medical Office Building I

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1301 S Crismon

REQUEST: Approval of an 85,000 sq. ft. medical office building

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6

OWNER: William Molloy

APPLICANT: Suzanne Schweiger - Nitchals

ARCHITECT: Devenney Group

REQUEST: Approval of a 85,000 sq. ft. medical office building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Dave Richins that DR06-08 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. **Approval of the Site Plan by the City Council is required per condition 2, Ordinance 4363 (reference Z05-017). This Design Review Approval is contingent upon that approval.**
2. Any future signage must be approved by Design Review and must be in conformance with the Comprehensive Sign Plan for the Mountain Vista Medical Campus (reference Z05-017).
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
6. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
8. Provide two half-size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The proposed medical office building is very nicely designed and will be an attractive and compatible addition to the hospital campus.

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-09 Samuelson McKone Development

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2821, 2845 N. Omaha & 4305 E. Oasis

REQUEST: Approval of a two industrial buildings totaling 67,397 S.F.

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5

OWNER: Dover Associates

APPLICANT: Dickinson Architects

ARCHITECT: Loren Dickinson

REQUEST: Approval of two industrial buildings totaling 6,397 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 Dave Richins that DR06-09 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. Indicate material and finish of pier accents painted DE6069 'Homestead' on elevations of both buildings.
 - b. Coordinate ROW and landscape/parking setback dimensions on sheets A1-0, L1.1 & C-1 so that all are in agreement and meet the required setbacks.
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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-10 Wireless Toyz

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 344 S. Power Rd.

REQUEST: Approval of a 6,720 retail building

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5

OWNER: Wireless Toyz

APPLICANT: Mark Bowker

ARCHITECT: Kristjan Sigurdsson

REQUEST: Approval of a 6,720 sq. ft. retail building

SUMMARY: The applicant requested the case be continued to the March 1, 2006 meeting.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Dave Richins that DR06-10 be continued to the March 1, 2006 meeting as requested by the applicant.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

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

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-11 **Talon Airport Plaza**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Power & Ray roads
REQUEST: Approval of a 28,300 s. f. building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Power and Ray Holdings L.L.C.
APPLICANT: Robert W. Kubicek
ARCHITECT: Robert Kubicek Architects and Associates, Inc.

REQUEST: Approval of 28,300 sq. ft. of retail 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 Dave Richins that DR06-11 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. Not Used
 - b. Provide Color/Material information for roofing material of the arched roof between 'B' & 'D'.
 - c. Revise Foundation Base to meet code, as noted above.
 - d. Comply with the Ordinance requirement for Site Plan Review.
 - e. Provide a cross-access drive and pedestrian path to the parcel to the south.
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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project, as conditioned, meets the design intent of the Zoning Ordinance.

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-12 Hickey Jeep

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 6743 E Main

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,538 sq. ft. showroom

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5

OWNER: F. Scott Hickey

APPLICANT: Bill Heller, EPC Construction

ARCHITECT: John Erion

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,538 sq. ft. showroom

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

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Dave Richins that DR06-12 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 before submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Provide name and manufacturer for the paint to be used on accent metal.
 - b. Revise site plan and landscape plan to comply with BA05-51 stipulations and provide a 5' wide (max.) pedestrian path through the parking to the sidewalk.
 - c. Revise the landscape plan to comply with all requirements of Chapter 15 of the City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance except as modified by BA05-51.
 - d. Staff to review and approve a revision to the parapet walls, as necessary to provide full screening of rooftop mechanical units.
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, bldg. downspouts & 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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project, as conditioned, meets the design intent of the Zoning Ordinance.

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR06-13 Riverview Comprehensive Sign Plan

LOCATION/ADDRESS: Dobson Road & Loop 202

REQUEST: Approval of the Comprehensive Sign Plan for Mesa Riverview

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1

OWNER: Bixby Arizona

APPLICANT: Kelee Walton, Young Electric Sign Company

REQUEST: Approval of a comprehensive sign plan for Mesa Riverview

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

MOTION: It was moved by Dave Richins and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR06-13 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the design as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown in the Mesa Riverview Comprehensive Sign Plan submitted as an exhibit for DR06-013.
2. Compliance with all Conditions of Approval of cases Z04-082; Z04-085; Z04-087; Z04-088; Z05-101; DR05-103; DR05-104; DR05-105: and DR05-106.
3. Approval of a Comprehensive Sign Plan from the Board of Adjustment.
4. The Auto Park Brand Monument Signs and Single Tenant Monument Signs identified as signs 'F' and 'P' in the Comprehensive Sign Plan are to receive Design Review approval on a case-by-case basis with the accompanying building for those lots/pad sites.
5. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0 – 1 Boardmember Vince DiBella abstained.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The design of the proposed signage is compatible with the previously approved Freeway Landmark Signs and the Mesa Riverview theme.

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Other Business:

Repaint of Super K-Mart building DR01-15

Staffmember Lesley Davis explained the applicants were proposing a color change that staff was not comfortable approving. Since the Staff was concerned that the placement of the colors accentuated the painted volumes rather than making it seem like the building has movement. Staff was not opposed to adding color, it was how it was applied, with very bold colors rather than the richness of color in this area. This is an elegant building. It is monochromatic but it definitely has its merits. Therefore staff referred the discussion to the Board.

Jay Jolley with K & I Architects and Tom Warren represented the owners.

Mr. Jolley stated he thought the building was very mute without much color. He stated staff wanted to see desert shades, which to him meant browns. He didn't think that was where the building wanted to go. He presented revised colors that had been toned down.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed they were addressing the K-Mart portion of the building which would be 145,000' sq. ft. of the 150,000' sq. ft. building. The remaining shop space would be separate. The proposed garden area of the K-Mart building was proposed for a restaurant. The restaurant would have separate identification that would be compatible with what was decided for American Home Furnishings. He thought the bolder colors read more industrial; however the building sits off the street and it is very monochromatic. He thought it was a very well done building. He confirmed the base color of the building would remain the same. Mr. Warren stated that the portion of the building facing Baseline would change and they would work with staff to choose a color that would be compatible and work with the shops space. Boardmember DiBella was OK with the proposed changes.

Staffmember Kim Steadman stated staff's concern was that the original building used devices to camouflauge the boxiness of the building and the way they were choosing elements attached to the building and painting them bright colors made it clear that they were attached to a big box. Staff was hoping to change the way the colors were used to integrate the elements back into the building.

Staffmember Lesley Davis stated that the surrounding area had rich colors as opposed to the bright colors proposed for this building. This project is near Pierpont and the Wal-Mart center that use richness of colors.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought that a little color might be a smart idea for marketing reasons. He would like to see changes to the building. He thought yellow was a very difficult color to use on buildings. He thought the yellow was too commercial looking. He preferred the muted colors.

Boardmember Dave Richins agreed the muted colors were nicer. He thought the big box would disappear behind the newer colors.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen stated there was a richness to this building, even though it was a little austere. He understood staff's concerns. Particularly the two major elements, the

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

two-story opened arched canopy elements that disrupt the box. He appreciated the attempt to bring some life to the building. He agreed that yellow is a very difficult color. He preferred the muted colors, and thought there was more depth and richness to those colors. He agreed with staff that the shade and shadow of these elements helped disrupt the box. He thought there needed to be more study of the colors and the placement of the colors so they were not just painted architectural appendages. That they were actually developing a richness to the building, not just quickly putting color on the appendages. He thought they should work with staff on the placement of the colors on how the disruption of the architectural forms helped the big box and how can the enhancement of the colors do that.

How do the architectural forms relate with their colors?

Chair Dave Richins confirmed there had not been a lot of negotiation with the applicants. Staffmember Lesley Davis stated she had never seen the revised colors. She was concerned with how these colors would turn the corner into the restaurant portion the applicants talked about at the meeting.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley confirmed the restaurant portion would be painting their entire space, which faces toward Baseline. Then the shops space, facing Baseline would be painted. Mr. Bottomley confirmed the tenants for the shops space did not have predetermined colors they wanted to use on the shops portion of the project. He was concerned with the use of yellow background to the red sign. He understood staff's concern with the painted elements popping out with the stage back drop of the big box. His main concern was with the yellow. He understood they were trying to draw attention to the sign area, but he did not think the yellow was the right choice. He did not think the yellow was compatible with the red.

It was moved by Rob Burgheimer, seconded by Vince DiBella that the Board approve the muted colors presented at the meeting.

VOTE: 5 – 0

Wal-Mart Fueling Stations

Sean Lake and Tim Perry represented the Wal-Mart fueling stations.

Boardmember Vince DiBella questioned why they need a separate pole for the security cameras. He preferred they be mounted in the ceiling.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer questioned why they can't do something besides bollards to protect the pump islands. Maybe an island piece, a pre-cast concrete planter box at each end of the pump islands. He understood they needed to protect the individual dispensers. He wanted to see some variation in the columns, he suggested the block come out or in, or use a score line, or introduce a reveal edge. He confirmed the bollards would be painted the main body color.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley did not like the security poles. He thought the third column detracted from the other columns. He confirmed the medallion elements were boxed out,

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 1, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

he suggested they use a screed.

Mt. Vista Medical Building II

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed the hospital was permitted at 3-stories, the Mt. Vista Medical Building I was approved at 4-stories and this building was proposed at 5-stories.

The applicants stated the building architecture matches the hospital with some variations to give them their own identity.

The Board thought the building elevations were very nice and complemented the hospital and the other office building. The Board thought this would be the most attractive hospital campus in the Valley.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da