

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 6, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
FEBRUARY 6, 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

MEMBERS ABSENT

OTHERS PRESENT

Lesley Davis
John Wesley
Mia Lozano Helland
Jeff Conkle
Debbie Archuleta
Joe Welliver
Richard Dyer
Jerry Carl
Paul Walker
Kevin Kerbo
Jerry Fannin
Wilson Ejim
Bob Winton
James Alexander
Bob Nuttall
Randy Helfman
Janet Golio
Nick Tsontakis
John McAtee
Cliff Coffaco
Others

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 6, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

1. Work Session

CASE: Montecito Apartments
307 S Hawes

REQUEST: Review of a 214 unit apartment complex

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Concerned with the 15' landscape area, what will this space feel like? Concerned about the quality of this space.
- Only 15' wide with 3-story units around it; how much light will it get?
- 15' building separation is not very much
- The rendering is helpful but agrees they need more details
- Maybe change the arch details
- Still needs more variety
- Urban concept doesn't work if no one uses the landscape area
- Concerned with how it will be executed

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- The windows should be off-set so you aren't looking directly into opposite unit
- Need to see details of parking canopies
- Parking canopies should be detailed so they fit with the buildings
- Just using paint for details is not enough, use another material to create accents; like a metal band or cast stone
- Look at maintenance of the landscape palette
- Can use berms to create interest

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- Concerned with security of the 15' landscape area
- Concern with canopies of trees having enough room
- Concerned the area will be very dark at ground level
- Likes the variety of having 2 and 3 story units

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Follow-up submittal needs to be all at the same scale
- Rendering should have shadow lines
- Show how much movement there is in building planes and accents

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 6, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- Check the distance separation for buildings
- Plans need more details
- Show screed lines; lights; window details; etc. on follow-up submittal
- There are a lot of large blank masses that look plain
- Need variation of color and stucco finish
- Show details of the balconies
- Where are the wrought iron details on the other buildings?
- The three tiered windows are not consistent with the Mediterranean theme of the rest of the project
- Concerned with A/C units in mechanical wells; need to see a roof plan
- It looks like a castle, needs more relief
- It should be broken up and staggered
- You need to pull the edge and break it up
- The monolithic approach needs more details to enrich it
- The buildings should move in and out
- Too many units for the site

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Concerned with everything being so book matched
- Too predictable and too static when it is a mirror
- Patios should not be directly across from each other
- The 15' landscape area is a glorified alley
- This is not high end
- Very monumental, too vertical
- They are accentuating the height
- It needs a base

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Patios are screened
- Concerned there may be building safety issues with exiting through 15' landscape area if there is only one access in and out
- They need a good Code analysis because of the density
- Consider an additional color
- Appreciates the movement that is there

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 6, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Sun Valley Center
7464 E Main

REQUEST: Review of a retail building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Interesting building
- Could they do something to tie in more with the center
- This may be too different
- Show where the signs are proposed to be placed on the follow up submittal

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Likes the building, can see where they have tried to tie into the center

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Likes the building
- Can they tie the landscaping to the angles of the buildings
- Reinforce the lines and planes of the buildings

Wendy LeSueur:

- Simplify the plant palette
- Palette doesn't need to be tied to the center
- Tie it to the building
- Myoporum does not do well in our climate
- Only use one lantana color
- There are too many colors and they are fighting each other

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 6, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Cracker Barrel
Signal Butte & Southern

REQUEST: Review of a 10,354 sq. ft. sit down restaurant

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- It looks like just another Cracker Barrel
- Need to tie it into the center
- It shouldn't be that difficult to copy some of the colors and forms of the center

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Likes Cracker Barrel restaurants, but the building is not very attractive
- Could achieve a lot more than a road house/shack
- Most of the front porch area doesn't get used, could they break it up?
- The T1-11 look is not good
- This building needs to tie in to be more compatible with the center
- At Riverview they were similar to the Bass Pro, this center is very different from Riverview
- The detailing of the canopy could be improved to be better refined and detailed to fit Arizona climate
- The residential grade downspouts don't work
- Make it more Arizona
- Maybe Arizona territorial would work

The applicant's stated the vernacular is a roadhouse or an 1880's country store. They also stated the entire front elevation is a trademark.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Transition the restaurant from the center
- Could they integrate the sign element with something behind it that would match the center?
- Could use the cornice element
- It just needs to relate not match

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 6, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- The Board is asking for some sympathies to the center
- They don't need to redesign the prototype, just use elements from the center

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Can they use something other than the hardipanel?

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 6, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

2. Call to Order:

Chair Tim Nielsen called the meeting to order at 5:22 p.m.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the January 2, 2008 Meeting:

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

4. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 6, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-140 Piper Plastics
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 4818 & 4762 E Indigo
REQUEST: Approval of two manufacturing buildings
Building 'A' 45,071 sq. ft.
Building 'B' 11,060 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Randall Wajtysiak
APPLICANT: Nick Tsontakis
ARCHITECT: Nick Tsontakis
STAFF PLANNER: Kim Steadman

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Craig Boswell that DR07-140 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 cut sheets for an architectural style wall-mounted fixture for areas of the building that are clearly visible from the public street.
 - b. Identify the symbol for palm trees in the plant legend.
 - c. Parapets must fully screen all rooftop mechanical units per §11-15-4 of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - d. Fully recess the SES into the building.
 - e. Revise the landscape plan to meet minimum Zoning Ordinance requirements and to provide a more cohesive plant palette with less random locations.
 - f. Identify on the elevations that reveal joints have been provided on the building to break up the stucco surfaces rather than screeds.
 - g. Provide screening of all parking areas and drive aisles in accordance with §11-15-4 of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - h. Provide a change in stucco texture for the horizontal band and wainscot for both buildings.
 - i. The design of the riprap in the retention areas must be natural in appearance with no visible grout and utilize a stone that has a natural appearance in the landscaping. The retention design must conform with §11-15-3(D).
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

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 6, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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.
7. Provide documentation of approval from the Mesa Commerce Center Owner's Association.
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 for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 6, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-07 **Alexan Gateway Commons**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 3143 S. Power Rd.
REQUEST: Approval of a 240 unit apartment complex
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Saia Family LP
APPLICANT: TCR Southwest Properties
ARCHITECT: Gary Todd
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of a 240 unit apartment complex

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Craig Boswell that DR08-07 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 site plan and landscape plan with the revisions to the number of trash enclosures required per Solid Waste Department requirements outlined in the Development Impact Summary.
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.
7. Provide two half-size color elevations, 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 7 – 0

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 6, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-08 Gateway Commons Commercial

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 4143 S. Power Rd.
REQUEST: Approval of a 47,528 sq. ft. office retail project
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Saia Family LP
APPLICANT: Saia Enterprises
ARCHITECT: Palmer Architects
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of a 47,528 sq. ft. office retail project

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Craig Boswell that DR08-08 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 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. Revise the landscape plan to comply with §11-15-3(C) of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - b. The Service Entrance Section needs to be recessed and painted to match the building. Indicate locations on the site plan and landscape plan.
 - c. Provide a revised black and white elevation for the office building that identifies possible sign locations. Details to be approved by Design Review staff.
 - d. Revise the elevations for the PAD building to extend the stone up the columns on the corner tower as shown on the elevations presented to the Design Review Board at the January 2, 2008 'Work Session'.
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.
7. 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 for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 6, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-09 McKellips Office

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2554 E. McKellips Road
REQUEST: Approval of a 1,877 sq. ft. office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Spencer Arnett
APPLICANT: Indigo Fox Designs
ARCHITECT: Sunghoun Kim
STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of a 1,877 sq. ft. office building

SUMMARY: Chair Tim Nielsen abstained and turned the meeting over to Vice-Chair Wendy LeSueur.

James Alexander, Chairman of the Homeowners Association for Conquistador Mobile Home Park spoke. Mr. Alexander stated the Association was concerned with the 2-story building. He asked that the windows on the north elevation be moved to east or west. He also stated there is a 30' easement along the east property line that needs to be noted to prevent future problems.

Brenda Penner represented the case. Staffmember Mia Lozano-Helland explained that staff did not think the Board's concerns had been met.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer wondered why they did not have an elevator? He thought the mezzanine was a box. He suggested they mirror the pitched form of the other roof area rather than using a parapet. Could they use a ground mounted A/C unit and clean up the roof, then they could lower the roof. The colors are not harmonious. Use a different color of green. Look at putting glazing above the green roof area on the "right elevation". Simplify the elements, the building is too small to support them. He suggested they get rid of the parapet and go to a sloped roof. He suggested rather than using two small canopies over the two windows they use one large canopy over both windows. Framing this building in wood would make more sense.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed there was a DIP to relieve setbacks. He confirmed the client wants the mezzanine for file space so they can have 5 offices on the first floor. He stated the proportions of the building area problem with the mezzanine. It is too vertical.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley agreed with the suggestion to have glass above the green roof element on the "right elevation". He thought the building was too stripy. He suggested they move the windows on the north elevation so they are too high to see out of rather than removing them completely or use clerestory for light. He stated the cornice needs to be consistent; the bands detract from the building; and they need to reinforce the entry. He suggested moving the entrance to the east elevation so it is closer to the parking. Just make sure the south elevation is still interesting. He agreed the colors were fighting each other, especially the green. He thought the entry needed more than a "tacked on" canopy.

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 6, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Boardmember Craig Boswell agreed the building was too tall.

Vice-Chair Wendy LeSueur thought the building still looked like a box. She thought the landscape areas needed additional trees to screen the neighbors. She suggested using Sissoo for a denser screen.

MOTION: It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR08-09 be continued to the March 5 2008 meeting:

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0 – 1 Chair Tim Nielsen abstained (Boardmember Rob Burgheimer left prior to the vote)

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 6, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-10 Mesa 40

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 3900 block of south Power Road
REQUEST: Approval of six (6) buildings to be used for offices and warehouses.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Wentworth Property Co, LLC
APPLICANT: Robert Winton
ARCHITECT: Robert Winton
STAFF PLANNER: Jeff Conkle

REQUEST: Approval of six office warehouse buildings totaling 236,704 sq. ft.

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda due to a conflict by Boardmember Rob Burgheimer.

MOTION: It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR08-10 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. Revise elevation drawings to indicate architectural light fixtures will be bronze.
 - b. Revise landscape plans to indicate the required number of trees and shrubs.
 - c. Revise site plan to indicate wing wall screening at service entrance sections.
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.
7. Certificates of Occupancy and/or Completion for individual buildings shall not be granted until Zoning Ordinance required parking and landscaping are constructed for those buildings.
8. All limits of construction shall have temporary landscaping, extruded curbs, and screen walls where parking and loading/service areas are visible from Rights of Way and public areas.
9. Dedicate the right-of-way required under the Mesa City Code at the time of application for a building permit, at the time of recordation of the subdivision plat, or at the time of the City's request for dedication whichever comes first.

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 6, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

10. All street frontage landscaping for the entire subdivision will be installed during Phase I.
11. 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 – 1 Boardmember Rob Burgheimer abstained

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 6, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-11 Choice Bank
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1756 S Crismon
REQUEST: Approval of a 5,224 sq. ft. bank
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Crismon CB One LLC
APPLICANT: Bob Hunt
ARCHITECT: Thomas Kenrick
STAFF PLANNER: Joe Welliver

REQUEST: Approval of a 5,224 sq. ft. bank

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Craig Boswell that DR08-11 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.
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 FEBRUARY 6, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Appeals of Administrative Design Review:

ADR07-93 West Broadway Commons & West Broadway Plaza
1716 W Broadway

Staffmember Lesley Davis explained the request. Lee Johnson, Bob Nuttall, and Randy Helfman represented the case. Mr. Johnson stated the applicants did not realize the change from integral block to painted block would be an issue because they were still using the same manufacturer. Mr. Johnson also stated the building has already been “tagged” so having the painted block is easier to remove and paint over the “tagging”. Mr. Johnson also stated they were proposing to install a 6’ wall around three sides of the adjacent properties open storage area which is currently fenced with chain link.

Chair Tim Nielsen confirmed there is landscaping adjacent to the proposed 6’ wall, and that the wall would be painted to match the applicant’s building. He suggested they use a hidden pilaster design rather than a typical “dually” so it will better match their building.

Boardmember Craig Boswell believed they applicant had made an honest mistake. He asked if they could improve the landscape along Broadway where the Plaza West Broadway project is.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley stated he understood the buildings are built and they are already being tagged. He was concerned that the punched metal in the photo appeared to be different colors.

Bordmember Delight Clark questioned why the applicants had not asked staff if they could make the material changes. She was concerned with the red shown in the photos, it did not appear to match the approved color board.

Chair Tim Nielsen then explained why the Board prefers integral block. He stated it was possible to have to block “dipped” in a coating that prevents “tagging” paint from absorbing into the masonry. He explained one of the Board’s concerns was when buildings are constructed and then painted, so the block, the mortar, everything is all the same color with no variation. He wanted the architect to work with staff on the design of the 6’ wall to get it to match the building. He suggested using a cap, or changing the mortar color.

MOTION: It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Craig Boswell that ADR07-93 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Have the architect work with staff on the design of the wall to make it compatible with the building.

VOTE: 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 6, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Other Business:

It was decided to continue the Falcon Field Design Guideline discussion to the march 5, 2008 meeting so all the boardmembers could be present.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da