

**CITY OF MESA**  
**MINUTES OF THE**  
**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**  
**FEBRUARY 4, 2004**

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  
Pete Berzins - Vice Chair  
Randy Carter  
Vince DiBella  
Tim Nielsen  
Robert Burgheimer

MEMBERS ABSENT

Jillian Hagen

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman	Bud Kimball
Lesley Davis	Sally Stephens
Debbie Archuleta	Keith Walderson
Charlie Scully	Mike Fraccola
Don Cramer	David Cardenas
Scott Root	J.D. Merrit
Sean Lake	Peter Gruen
Dave Cox	Alan Bulman
Mohomad Mohayni	Others
John Reddell	

1. Call to Order:

Chair Carie Allen called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the January 7, 2004 Meeting:

On a motion by Randy Carter seconded by Vince DiBella the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

3. Design Review Cases:

## MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**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 center

**SUMMARY:** Dave Cox of Andrews Design Group represented the case. He stated the neighborhood does not support high rents. He wanted approval at the meeting with stipulations, if necessary.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer felt the building was too tall; he also felt there was a collision of architectural styles. He wanted the applicant to clean up the elevations. For example there were gable elements, mission style elements, and tile roofs. He was concerned about the scale of the 33' tall towers. He felt the design should be simplified.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen agreed there was too much going on and the towers were too tall. He confirmed all the entrances would be shaded, and that the green element on the front of the building would be wood. He felt there was some nice interplay but it needed to be toned down. He was concerned the applicant did not understand what the Board wanted.

Boardmember Vince DiBella liked the stepping, but felt there should be a more interesting element at the step. He felt it needed more continuity. He felt the scale was overwhelming. He did like the 3-dimensional elements.

Boardmember Randy Carter appreciated the efforts but felt the proposal was very busy. He liked the stepped plan, but felt the site was very axial, and the building was too asymmetrical. He felt the rear was too busy and the towers were too large. He felt the center element on the south elevation and the elements at the far right were a concern. He was concerned with the precedent this would set for the two future buildings in front of this building.

Boardmember Pete Berzins liked the building but felt the scale was overwhelming. He liked the color palette.

Gerald Stevens, the owner then spoke and stated he was willing to change the colors. He stated that existing buildings around this site were unattractive. He was upset that the Board felt the first submittal was too plain and this submittal was too busy. He was willing to lower the towers.

Boardmember Randy Carter continued discussion of the case and felt the corner tower should be similar to the others. He wanted to see something behind the tower arches, possibly a chandelier or metal grillwork. He felt the proportions of the towers were off. He was concerned that the proposed colors included warm and cool colors.

## MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated the project needed to be cohesive and unified. There were too many styles. They needed to choose a style.

Boardmember Vince DiBella felt there were too many changes that needed to be made to approve the case with conditions. He wanted to see the project again.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR03-94 be continued

**VOTE:** Failed on a 3 – 3 tie (Randy Carter, Pete Berzins and Carie Allen voting nay)

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer suggested the case be given a conditional approval to move forward and then staff could E-mail the changes to the Board. If they were moving in the right direction staff could approve the final changes, if not it would go back to the Board.

Staff did not feel that suggestion would meet open meeting law.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen felt that the project was nice but needed some simplification. He also felt the scale needed to be brought down.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer that the case be approved with staff conditions; and that the applicant line up the axial point of the building with the driveway, decrease the scale of the towers from 33' to 28', get rid of the stepped parapet in order to have a clean cornice line, and revise the colors.

The motion died for lack of a second.

**MOTION:** It was moved Vince DiBella and seconded by Pete Berzins that DR03-94 be continued to the March 3, 2004 meeting.

**VOTE:** 2 – 4 (Randy Carter, Rob Berzins, Tim Nielsen and Carie Allen voting nay)

**MOTION:** It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Pete Berzins that DR03-94 be continued to a special meeting to be held Monday, February 9, 2004 at 5:00 p.m. in the Planning Division conference room at 55 North Center.

**VOTE:** Passed 6 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** To allow the applicant time to address the Board's concerns.

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

## MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2004 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 1,457 sq. ft. truck sales

**SUMMARY:** Bud Kimball, Mike Fraccola, Sally Stephens, and Keith Waldersen represented the case. Mr. Fraccola thanked the Board for all of their work and the special meetings the attended to accommodate this case.

Boardmember Pete Berzins liked the changes.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed the handicap parking space had been moved to the northeast corner of the site, and the ADA walkway had been revised. He liked the new elevations.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed that the applicants had not been able to meet with a landscape architect, so they would be presenting landscape plans at a future meeting. He confirmed they were not presenting the "super graphics" that had been talked about at the January 30<sup>th</sup> special meeting. The applicants also did not have a sign submittal. It was suggested the signage and landscaping be brought back to the Design Review Board at the same time.

Boardmember Pete Berzins confirmed that the proposed signs would be like the ones that were seen at the January 23<sup>rd</sup> special meeting.

Boardmember Vince DiBella felt the proposal had come a long way. He confirmed the grill element would be round tubes. He also confirmed the aluminum diamond plate, where shown, would replace the panels in the bay doors. In answer to a question regarding the placement of the diamond plate Chair Carie Allen explained that at the January 30<sup>th</sup> meeting the diamond plate was placed in the shape of a "J" on the one bay door and a "T" on the other. Boardmember DiBella confirmed the burgundy panel would be a painted panel.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen liked the enhancements.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed there would be 5 columns at each corner.

Chair Carie Allen did not like the red tube grills. She felt the building was too busy. She stated she would vote for the project because she felt the applicant had done a lot to address the Board's suggestions.

## MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR03-95 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. **Provide directional signage at the Main Street drive access point-indicating exit only.**
5. **Provide a safe pedestrian walkway and accessible route from the parking area to the vehicle display area.**
6. **Provide 12" to 18" high decorative screen walls around the vehicle display area. Design of wall to be compatible with the building and approved by Design Review Staff.**
7. **Light standards and light standard colors to be approved by Design Review staff.**
8. **Provide landscaping plan to be reviewed and approved by the Design Review Board at a future meeting.**
9. **If the applicant chooses to use graphics on the windows, those graphics are to be reviewed and approved by the Design Review Board at a future meeting.**
10. 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.
11. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
12. Provide two half size color elevations, and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of revised site plan, one full size and one 8 1/2 X 11 landscaping plan 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 development as proposed with conditions complies with the Design Guidelines and meets the expectations of the Design Review Board.

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

## MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR04-05**                      **Power & Brown Retail Building**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**              SWC Power & Brown  
**REQUEST:**                              Approval of an 11,224 sq. ft. retail building  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**                District 5  
**OWNER:**                                Glenwood Development  
**APPLICANT:**                         David Cardenas  
**ARCHITECT:**                         David Cardenas

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 11,224 sq. ft. retail building

**SUMMARY:** David Cardenas represented the case. He stated he was willing to change the roof slope of the tower elements to that they match.

Boardmember Randy Carter wanted to see the central tower raised and he wanted the roofs to be the same pitch.

Boardmember Burgheimer agreed with Boardmember Carter.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR04-05 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:
  - Provide 6 additional trees in the foundation base, within 30' of building.
  - Provide additional landscaping, ground covers, shrubs and/or accent plants in the foundation base so that landscaping along each building side equals the following percentages of exterior wall length - east equals 50%, north equals 25%, south equals 10% and west equals 10%.
  - Revise the two end features so their roofs are the same pitch at the center element.
  - Raise the center tower raised 2' to 3' to be the same as the other towers.
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. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
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 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 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**VOTE:** Passed 6 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The development as proposed with conditions is well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: 2 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR04-06**                      **Ellsworth Crossing**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**              2721 South Ellsworth  
**REQUEST:**                              Approval of a 8,400 sq. ft. retail center  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**                District 6  
**OWNER:**                                Glenwood Development Company LLC  
**APPLICANT:**                         David Cardenas  
**ARCHITECT:**                         David Cardenas

**REQUEST:**    Approval of an 8,400 sq. ft. retail center

**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 DR04-06 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:
  - Additional trees and shrubs along Ellsworth Road are required in conformance with section 11-15-3(A) of the City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance.
  - The Administrative Approval letter dated December 18, 2003 addressed to Sean Lake from Dorothy Chimel approving a minor modification of the site plan to allow for the proposed retail building.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
5. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
6. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of revised site plans, and landscaping plans 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 development as proposed with conditions is well designed.

## MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side A)

**CASE #: DR04-07**                      **Sonic Drive-in**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**            4450 East Brown  
**REQUEST:**                        Approval of a 7,561 sq. ft. drive-in restaurant  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**            District 5  
**OWNER:**                         MVP Equities Ltd. Partnership  
**APPLICANT:**                    Stephanie Rowe  
**ARCHITECT:**                    Stephanie Rowe

**REQUEST:**     Approval of a 7,561 sq. ft. drive-in restaurant

**SUMMARY:**     J. D. Merrit, Peter Gruen, and Sean Lake represented the case.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was concerned with the design of the canopy. He asked staff to clarify why this canopy does not have to meet the landscape requirement for a landscape island every 8 parking spaces. Staffmember Laura Hyneman responded that this user is considered unique because these canopies and parking spaces are used for dining. Boardmember Burgheimer wanted the canopy to be a stronger element. He was pleased that staff had worked with the applicant regarding the glare that usually occurs from the lighting of these canopies. He would like the columns to be thicker, but understood they are used for the menu. He suggested using a full cantilever.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen appreciated that the Sonic design was tied in to the center. He would also like the columns to be more of a design element but understands their constraints. He supported the design because it represented the Sonic experience.

Boardmember Vince DiBella felt the columns would disappear if the canopy were wider and had more horizontality. He would like to see the canopy designed as a heavier, horizontal element.

Boardmember Randy Carter suggested that if they went to a full cantilever the canopy would provide better shade for customers in the back seat of the car. He suggested the canopy be wider and have a larger profile. He suggested adding a cornice treatment to the canopy. He also suggested the columns could be a brighter color, like red so they are more noticeable.

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested the columns could be thicker at the top of the column. In answer to a question from Boardmember Burgheimer, Mr. Merrit confirmed the width of the canopy was 14' and the gutter or fascia is 14" or 15". He stated the red LED lighting would be used on the canopy.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated no lighting was shown on the canopy elevations. It was shown as a painted band.

Mr. Merrit stated they would use LED lighting, not neon. It would be ½" in width.

Boardmember Burgheimer was not concerned with the use of LED lighting. He suggested using the trellis detail on the columns.

Boardmember Pete Berzins had no concern with the canopy. He was concerned with the

## MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

landscaping at the second car pullout. He was concerned that the landscaping could scratch cars. He felt the pullout area needed to be pulled even farther back. Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that the pullout area had been designed to meet Sonic standards. Boardmember Berzins and Carter would prefer the landscaping be replaced with stamped concrete.

Boardmember Carter was concerned with the driveway location and the amount of traffic that will be generated by this use. He felt that with traffic driving over the elevated canal, cars exiting this site would not be visible to drivers on Brown Road until they got to the driveway.

Chair Carie Allen felt the columns were functional and fit their 50's drive-in, carhop, theme.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Pete Berzins that DR04-07 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:
  - Add a cornice to the back of raised "Sonic" parapet above the restaurant building.
  - Provide a revised color board that matches colored elevations.
  - \*Provide stamped concrete in place of the landscape strip at the drive aisle.
  - The applicant be allowed to use red LED lighting on the canopy.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
5. 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.

Discussion: There was discussion regarding the canopy size. The height of the canopy as proposed was 15". This motion did not include increasing the size of the canopy.

**VOTE:** Passed 3 – 3 (Boardmember Burgheimer, Carter, and DiBella voting nay)

Discussion continued regarding the size of the canopy and how the canopy might be increased in size. Chair Carie Allen was concerned the canopy might look top heavy.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR04-07 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:

## MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- Add a cornice to the back of raised “Sonic” parapet above the restaurant building.
  - Provide a revised color board that matches colored elevations.
  - \*Provide stamped concrete in place of the landscape strip.
  - The applicant be allowed to use red LED lighting on the canopy.
  - Revise canopy fascia detail #2 to provide an additional 6” channel to top portion of canopy, to be the tan, not to be additional lighting.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
  3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
  4. All backflow preventers 2” or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6’ radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2” shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
  5. 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:** 5 – 1 (Boardmember Nielsen voting nay) Boardmember Nielsen felt the fascia would be too thick.

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The development as proposed with conditions is compatible with the existing shopping center.

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

**\* After review of this stipulation by staff, it was determined that the Design Review Board lacked the authority to delete this raised landscape median Ordinance requirement.**

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #:** DR04-08                      **S.L.A.M. Development**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 2530 East Southern  
**REQUEST:** Approval of a 6,764 sq. ft. medical building  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 2  
**OWNER:** SLAM Development  
**APPLICANT:** Fifer Design Studio  
**ARCHITECT:** Marty Fifer

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 6,764 sq. ft. medical building

**SUMMARY:** At the request of the applicant this case was continued to the March 3, 2004 meeting.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR04-08 be continued.

**VOTE:** Passed 6 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** To allow the applicant to present the case to the Planning and Zoning Board.

Recorded on Tape No.: (side A)

## MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR04-09**                      **Office Building**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**              5404 East Southern  
**REQUEST:**                              Approval of a 9,225 sq. ft. office building  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**                District 6  
**OWNER:**                                Allan Bulman  
**APPLICANT:**                         Donald Cramer  
**ARCHITECT:**                         Donald Cramer

**REQUEST:**    Approval of a 9,225 sq. ft. office building

**SUMMARY:**    Don Cramer and Alan Bulman represented the case. Mr. Cramer stated the lot was difficult to develop, so they brought the building out to the street frontage and put the parking in the rear. He also stated that with all of the residential uses in the area they designed the building to be residential in character. Regarding the concern regarding the parapet design in the corner he felt the parapet, as shown, was the only way for the roof to work.

Boardmember Pete Berzins liked 90% of the building. He felt the parapet stands out and wanted a different solution or at least make the parapet less visible. He liked the windows.

Mr. Cramer stated this building would be similar to the buildings to the east, which he designed. He stated he was open to suggestions for the roof problem.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt there were attractive solutions; he suggested the framing plan be revised to raise the fascia to hide the ridge. To accomplish this the wall would need to be moved out 2' to 3'. He felt the buildings to the east were unremarkable and felt this building had the potential to be much nicer. He liked the bottom portion of the building, but he had concerns with the building from the fascia up. He felt the building was "prairie style" which meant the fascia should be cut back at a more severe angle to give it more definition. He suggested a 3" to 4" offset in the fascia. He felt a complementary color would be helpful, maybe on the fascia. He liked the wainscot and the windows. He felt the parapet broke up the horizontality of the building. He wanted the entries to be more defined. Mr. Cramer stated the building was designed as a shell and the entrance doors might not be where he was showing them. Boardmember Carter confirmed that the doors could become windows but the other windows would not move. He confirmed that Mr. Cramer did not intend to have secondary exit doors. Mr. Cramer stated the Board could stipulate that exit doors not be allowed. Staffmember Laura Hyneman felt it would be better for the Board to have a condition regarding what they would want the doors to look like if they were used, rather than prohibiting them.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer felt that the buildings to the east had no sense of entry. He was concerned with the identification of tenant entrances. He felt that a dormer or something could be used to define the entry.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt the building was so horizontal it needed some definition. He was concerned that doorways and windows could move around in the working drawings.

## MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated that on the buildings to the east there were standardized windows with approximately 10' in between which allows the interior walls to move.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt the fascia design needed to be more in character with the rest of the building. He felt the parapet helped break up the building.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed the wainscot was split-face with a split-faced band above. He was concerned with the abrupt stop between the split face and the stucco. He suggested using a rowlock course to differentiate between the two. He was concerned about venting requirements for the roof. He felt that dormers could provide a 3-dimensional quality to the building, and also shed water at the entries. He was concerned with the fascia design. The parapet pieces that align with the eave line could become a vertical element that comes all the way down to the ground. They could be replicated in other areas of the building.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen agreed with previous comments. He liked the disruption of the long horizontal line with the parapet. He would like to see the applicant take that disruption and put it on other parts of the building or jog the fascia and elevate some portions of the roof. The other thing he wanted to see was an element to show where the entrances were, maybe not the actual doors but something that could be seen from the parking lot. He liked the courtyard but suggested a trellis or fountain. He wanted a point of arrival for the site. He liked the ins and outs of the building.

Boardmember Vince DiBella stated that the shadow line on the rendering was confusing. He confirmed the fascia is at the eave line and the windows are at the same plane as the fascia.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer agreed with previous comments. He felt the building was "prairie style". He felt this building could be nicer than the adjacent buildings. He wanted to see a complementary color used so that the building was not so monochromatic. He felt the fascia should be raked in. He wanted to see a strong shadow line on the fascia. He liked the parapet wall because it breaks up the elevation. He suggested the spring line could vary. However, that was only a suggestion for dealing with the problem of the parapet. He felt the roof was too plain and horizontal. He also suggested varying the fascia line. He stated he was trying to give the applicant several options for this problem. He wanted the wainscot to come out or change the coursing so that the stucco has a nice terminal line. He wanted a change in plane at the stucco line. Mr. Cramer suggested using a 12" cap block instead of a 4" cap block. Boardmember Burgheimer was concerned with how the fire riser and S.E.S. would be handled, because he was not pleased with where they were located on the existing buildings to the east.

Boardmember Randy Carter did not like the suggestion to use 12" block. He suggested using bulb nose block, or use an 8" and then transition to a 10".

Boardmember Vince DiBella suggested an 8" X 8".

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed the building would be block, he suggested pulling it out about  $\frac{3}{4}$ " using an 8" block and then transitioning to a bulb nose or rowlock block. The windows and walls would be set in  $\frac{1}{2}$ " from that.

Chair Carie Allen liked the project and felt the building would look much better than the

## MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

elevations due to the steps in the building. However, she was concerned that the building looked striped.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR04-09 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:
  - Solve the technical problem with the parapet wall by adding more parapet elements; adjusting the ridgelines; or adjusting the fascia line.
  - Change the fascia by sweeping it back and stepping the fascia.
  - Change the wall plane at the wainscot line by adjusting the horizontal dimension; creating a break with a cap; or by pulling out the sill.
  - Provide an additional complementary color and a stronger variation between the two beiges presented.
  - Use the complementary color on the fascia.
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 or units are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
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. SES Panels are to be located within a building niche or screened with walls and landscaping and painted the same color as the building.
8. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of revised 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 (Pete Berzins voting nay) Boardmember Berzins felt the conditions were too ambiguous for staff to enforce.

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The development as proposed with conditions is

Recorded on Tape No.: 2 (side B) and 3 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR04-10**                      **Buggy Bath Office**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**              1945 West University  
**REQUEST:**                              Approval of a 2,352 sq. ft. office building with 400 sq. ft. garage  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**                District 3  
**OWNER:**                                Desert Mountain Associates  
**APPLICANT:**                         Robert Ivory  
**ARCHITECT:**                         Arvid Johnson

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 2,352 sq. ft. office building with 400 sq. ft. garage

**SUMMARY:** This case was continued to the March 3, 2004 meeting. Moe Mahayni, an adjacent property owner stated he was concerned that this project has proper access to the office and that there would be enough parking.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR04-10 be continued to the March 3, 2004 meeting.

**VOTE:** Passed 6 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** To allow the applicant time to address staff concerns.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side A)

## MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

### Other Business:

Staffmember Laura Hyneman explained that CVS Pharmacies were proposing covered parking for two of their facilities; one at the southwest corner of Southern and Greenfield and the other at the southwest corner of University and Val Vista. She then passed out submittals for the Southern and Greenfield project.

S.G. Ellison explained that CVS is based out of Rhode Island. When they were in the valley during the previous summer they were very hot, so they decided that covered parking would be a nice amenity for their customers.

Mr. Ellison stated the reason for placing the covered parking where they were proposing it was that most people park close to the building and they felt these rows drew the most intense sun. He stated that Roger Manning had designed the canopy structures to fit the design of the building and not encumber the architecture of the building. He explained that on the Val Vista site the canopy would be tethered in one spot.

Boardmember Randy Carter was concerned that the canopies would be tethered to the building in 3 or 4 locations, the remainder would be about 8' from the wall. He was concerned that water would runoff the canopies and splash onto the building and the building would be streaked and dirty.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed the ends would be open. He confirmed the lighting would be the same as in the parking lot with less foot candles integrated into the under side of the canopy. Mr. Ellison stated they would not be fluorescent tube lighting.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed the corrugation would match the building color.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer suggested standing seam, because they would have to crimp corrugated metal in order to get it to go in the direction shown on the elevations.

Boardmember Randy Carter was concerned that after all of the work CVS had done with the design of these buildings, now they were going to "hide them" behind canopies. He thought the canopy should be pulled back away from the entrance of the building.

Chair Carie Allen questioned if the new parking canopy detracts from the entrance to the building.

The Board appreciated the idea of having covered parking, however they were concerned with the canopies being directly in front of the building.

Boardmember Burgheimer was concerned with asking them to break the canopy at the landscape islands. He suggested removing the tree only from the landscape island and using one continuous canopy. He felt the purpose of the tree was to provide shade and the canopy would do that.

Boardmember Pete Berzins questioned whether the landscape island would remain. It was suggested they use a ground cover that can grow in shade.

## MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Randy Carter felt the canopies were very attractive but he did not feel they added to the architecture of the building.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen was concerned that this would be setting a precedent for buildings that have already been constructed.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer felt that canopies were expensive and not everyone would be willing to use them. He did feel that in the future it would be better to design the canopies at the same time as the building so that they could be integrated into the architecture.

Chair Carie Allen asked how they should be integrated: shapes, materials, or in more substantial ways.

Boardmember Carter stated they could match the EFIS, they could make it match the building. He felt that the canopies needed to be away from the entrance. He felt that people who wanted shade would walk a few feet further.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen was concerned that it was a site accessory. He was concerned that future proposals would tie into the building better. He suggested using cable awnings.

Boardmember Burgheimer warned the applicants that Building Safety would probably want at least one handicap space to be covered.

Mr. Ellison stated that there would be cable spans on the Val Vista store. On that store there would be only one tether.

Boardmember Berzins confirmed the cover would be sloped for water drainage.

Boardmember Carter felt the curve on the Greenfield store seemed to match the store, where this parking cover, for the Val Vista store did not seem to match as well.

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested using a full-cantilever canopy. He felt it would be easier for customers to get in and out of their vehicles.

Boardmember DiBella was concerned that the parking structures were obstructing the view of the buildings.

Chair Carie Allen felt the parking covers were unobtrusive small structures. She liked innovative ideas. She felt that the Board would be able to see any future projects on a case-by-case basis.

Boardmember Burgheimer felt that they were trying to do something positive that would add value to their project. They were not proposing a standard parking structure.

Boardmember Carter stated that his objection was to having the canopy continue past the front entrance.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen was concerned with the 12' height. He understood that they were trying to match architectural features on the building; however, the lower the structure the more shade you provide and a normal shade structure would be 8'.

## MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested having the canopy at 10'.

Mr. Ellison stated they were willing to cut back the canopy; however, he felt that it might not be worth the cost to only cover 6 spaces.

Boardmember Burgheimer felt that most customers would probably be in and out within a few minutes and therefore he understood why they wanted the spaces closest to the building to be covered because they are the ones used the most.

Boardmember Nielsen then suggested that when it is 114° outside customers might be willing to walk a few feet to have covered parking.

Chair Carie Allen was concerned that moving the canopy further out would block the building even more.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that if the canopy were moved out to the street it could be lowered, which would provide more shade. He also felt that by bringing it down your eye would look beyond it to the building.

S.G. Ellison stated that they would probably try one project with the canopy up against the building and another project where the canopy was at the street, just to see which works better.

Boardmember Randy Carter stated that on the building at Southern and Greenfield the cornice was not continued around the building as shown on the approved plans.

Mr. Ellison stated he would be willing to accept a motion that would allow them to either move the canopy to the street or at the building with the canopy pulled back away from the entrance.

It was moved by Rob Burgheimer seconded by Pete Berzins that the canopies be approved with the following conditions:

1. That the canopies as presented be located at the street.
2. That the canopies be lowered to 10'.
3. That the canopies be one continuous canopy with the landscape island to remain without the tree.

Vote: Failed 3 – 3

After reviewing the perspective of the canopies some Boardmembers still felt that the canopies should be pulled back away from the entrances. It was determined that the columns as shown on the perspectives were not practical because they would make it difficult to open the doors of larger vehicles. Mr. Ellison asked for the option to either pull the canopies away from the entrance or provide the canopies at the street.

Boardmember DiBella confirmed that the applicant was looking at providing the covered parking at other sites that have already been approved. For future sites they would probably design the sites with covered parking from the on-set so that they could be integrated into the

## MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

design.

It was moved by Pete Berzins seconded by Tim Nielsen that the covered parking canopies be approved for CVS at Southern and Greenfield and CVS at University and Val Vista with the following conditions:

1. Provide the canopies at the building as presented with the exception that the canopies be pulled back from the entrance.
2. As shown on the colored rendering provide the canopy at the street.
3. The height to be lowered to 10'.

During discussion the Boardmembers talked about whether the landscape island should remain with the tree and have the canopy broken at the landscape island, or should there be one full canopy with the landscape island to remain without the tree. Mr. Ellison stated they were willing to leave the landscape island and break the canopy in order to get an approval.

Vote: 3 – 3 (Tim Nielsen, Vince DiBella and Carie Allen voting nay)

Boardmember DiBella stated he was concerned that in the future applicants would expect to automatically get approval to retrofit parking canopies for their projects. He stated he could vote for approval of these two individual sites as long as any other sites are viewed for their individual merit. Staffmember Laura Hyneman confirmed that the Boardmembers were concerned that future sites would be approved administratively. Staffmember Hyneman stated that as long as she was Design Review Planner she would bring these cases to the Board for review, until they had reviewed enough cases that staff was comfortable that they knew what the Board was looking for.

It was moved by Pete Berzins seconded by Vince DiBella that that the covered parking canopies be approved for CVS at Southern and Greenfield and CVS at University and Val Vista with the following conditions:

1. Provide the canopies at the building as presented with the exception that the canopies be pulled back from the entrance.
2. As shown on the colored rendering provide the canopy away from the building in locations of their choice.
3. The height to be lowered to 10'.

Vote: 4 – 2 (Boardmembers Tim Nielsen and Carie Allen voting nay)

### Staples storefronts:

Staffmember Laura Hyneman explained to the Board that Staples had installed red storefronts at the store in Falcon Gateway. The approved storefronts for the center were green. The Board felt that the red was a departure from the remainder of the center and they did not feel they would have approved red had the applicant presented it when the project came through the Design Review process. The Board wanted the storefronts changed to match the

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

remainder of the center.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta  
Planning Assistant

da