

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CITY OF MESA**  
**MINUTES OF THE**  
**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**  
**AUGUST 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

Pete Berzins - Chair  
Dave Richins- Vice Chair  
Randy Carter  
Jillian Hagen  
Vince DiBella  
Robert Burgheimer

MEMBERS ABSENT

Tim Nielsen (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman  
John Wesley  
Debbie Archuleta  
Charlie Scully  
Liz Zeller  
Veronica Gonzales  
Angelica Guevara  
Christine Tucker

Terry Williams  
Gordon Sheffield  
Greg Bowen  
Sean Lake  
Doug Anderson  
Lyn Tan  
Vince Leskosky  
Sherman Cawley  
Dorothy Shupe

Rob Terrel  
Kristjan Sigurdsson  
Britt Sanchez  
Tom Reyes  
Ryan Hyatt  
David Jaeckels  
Stephanie Rowe  
J D Merritt  
Brent Fike  
Paul Klink  
Hocine Imadali  
Mike Reidy  
John Berry  
Mike Naymik  
Lance Richards  
Laura Snow  
Jeff Kost  
Tom Bottomly  
Others

1. Call to Order:

Chair Pete Berzins called the meeting to order at 3:45 p.m.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the July 7, and July 20, 2004 Meetings:

On a motion by      seconded by      the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

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

### 3. Presentation by Terry Williams, Building Safety Director:

Terry Williams, Building Safety Director spoke to the Board regarding "at risk building permits".

He stated the Building Safety Division is prohibited from issuing permits if the project violates the Zoning Ordinance. He stated they are often pressured to speed up the process, so they allow the review processes to overlap.

Mr. Williams stated there was nothing in the Building Code or Zoning Ordinance that prohibits reviewing construction drawings prior to review by the Design Review Board. He stated that before Design Review Board acts to apply conditions it is not a violation of the ordinance because conditions don't exist. If the owner otherwise complies with the Code they have to issue a permit.

Boardmember Randy Carter stated he has a problem with owners who tell they Design Review Board they have construction drawings in for review so they think they don't have to listen to the Board. He wanted to know what would happen if a permit was issued prior to Design Review Board review and then the Board makes changes.

Mr. Williams stated they could revoke or suspend the permit.

Chair Pete Berzins confirmed Building Safety has gone as far as to issue foundation permits.

Boardmember Vince DiBella stated it was his understanding that all divisions needed to approve the construction drawings prior to a permit being issued. How can the zoning plan review group review construction documents if the project does not have approval and there are no conditions?

Boardmember Randy Carter thought Planning and Zoning staff had to sign off before the permit could be issued. He stated he was also concerned that the Board sometimes sees cases with technical issues that don't meet Engineering requirements. He wanted technical review comments earlier in the process.

### 4. Presentation by Gordon Sheffield, on in-fill policy:

Gordon Sheffield explained that citizen volunteers serving on other Boards worked on a policy for in-fill "by-passed" properties. He explained that Mesa is quickly running out of large tracks of land for development and in the future development will be small "in-fill" pieces.

He stated there a number of reasons why some pieces of property have never been built on. Some advantages of building on this pieces of land are: reduction of sprawl, increasing viability of mass transit, utilization of existing infrastructure, variety of housing options, positive return on investment, neighbors upgrading their properties.

He explained that there needs to be incentives for reinvestment in older areas of town, including having different requirements for different "regions" of the City. This would help reduce the time spent in review processes. The applicants would need to apply for variations

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

to the Code whenever they wanted to build in older areas where they can't meet the current Zoning Ordinance requirements.

One of the recommendations was to talk to property owners and neighbors to see what they want for their region.

There are four corridors currently recommended one would be Main Street along the light rail corridor. The second would be West University from Tempe border to Gilbert Road. The third would be West Broadway from Tempe to Gilbert Road. The Fourth would be Country Club Road.

Rob Burgheimer asked how these recommendations were being implemented. Mr. Sheffield stated they are asking the Boards through their minutes to let the City Council know what the Board's want. Boardmember Burgheimer asked about how the recommendation would be implemented. Boardmember Burgheimer stated there was a lot in the final report he was worried someone might get hung up on one small issue and hold up the entire report. Mr. Sheffield stated the costs can be phased in over a five year period. Boardmember Burgheimer felt the City would benefit a great deal over time. He thought the report was well done and saluted the committee's effort.

Boardmember Dave Richins wanted to know how many in-fill property owners in Mesa were surveyed as part of this process. Mr. Sheffield stated that the committee had worked with developers, architects, and a man who does in-fill projects in Phoenix. Boardmember Richins wanted a report that shows a list of in-fill properties with their size and current zoning. He questioned why Table 1 does not show single family homes. He thought the City was doing everything from the top down and should be allowing the neighborhoods to control the process. Mr. Sheffield stated the intent was for the City to facilitate the process, provide places for the meetings and to assist the neighbors, but the intent was for the neighbors to control the process.

### 5. Design Review Cases:

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

**CASE #: DR04-45**                      **Walgreen's**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**            NEC Alma School & Guadalupe  
**REQUEST:**                            Approval of Walgreen's drugstore  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**            District 3  
**OWNER:**                              Hugh Bancroft III & Joy Bancroft  
**APPLICANT:**                      Kristjan Sigurdsson  
**ARCHITECT:**                        Kristjan Sigurdsson, K & I Architects

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 14,820 sq. ft. drug store

**SUMMARY:** Staffmember Charlie Scully explained that the applicant had revised the building elevations since the packets were distributed to the Board. The trendstone and slate bands had been eliminated. The color of the metal banding had changed. The only slate being proposed now was small accent squares.

Mr. Sigurdsson confirmed that the massing and stepping on the elevations was still the same as originally proposed.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed the colors on the material board had not changed, they were simply eliminating the blue.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR04-45 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 revised exterior elevations with the following modifications:
  - a. Provide a letter of agreement from the property owner of the parcel to the north to ensure the new landscaping shown in the reconfigured islands north of the subject property will be installed and maintained as per the approved plan.
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 documentation of recorded boundary line adjustment and lot combination for the reassembled parcels with building permit application.
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.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**VOTE:** Passed 6 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The revised proposal is reasonably well-designed.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR04-46**                      **Greenfield Court**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**              NWC Greenfield and Southern  
**REQUEST:**                              Approval of four new retail buildings as part of the Greenfield Court development  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**                District 6  
**OWNER:**                                Lexon Developer Services  
**APPLICANT:**                         Mark A. Bowker, K & I Architects  
**ARCHITECT:**                         Kristjan Sigurdsson, K & I Architects

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 30,944 sq. ft. shopping center

**SUMMARY:** This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually. During the staff presentation Mr. Sigurdsson confirmed that the rear of the parapets will be finished when they are visible.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR04-46 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:
  - a. Provide a Letter of Approval for this project from the Greenfield Court Architectural Review Board.
  - b. Revise the monument signs to address the dimensional requirements for height and area, as per Chapter 19 of the Zoning Ordinance.
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. Submit two (2) half-size color elevations, one (1) full-size and one (1) 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 is reasonably well-designed.

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

**CASE #: DR04-47**                      **Arizona Federal Credit Union**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**            NEC Southern and 72<sup>nd</sup> St.  
**REQUEST:**                            Approval of Arizona Federal Credit Union  
**OWNER:**                                Superstition Springs Investments  
**APPLICANT:**                        David Jaeckels, BCI (Building Committee, Inc)  
**ARCHITECT:**                         Richard Woods, Woods-Associates, Inc

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 5,264 sq. ft. credit union

**SUMMARY:** This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer liked the daringness of the building. He confirmed the metal roof section panel system would be alucobond with a white membrane roof. Boardmember Burgheimer was concerned the back side of the roof would be visible. He was also concerned with the heavy cornice top flashing on the wall. He confirmed the roof mounted equipment would be screened with alucobond.

Boardmember Vince DiBella liked the rich materials. He was concerned with the banding piece, at the top of the wall; he thought it seemed heavy.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen confirmed the alucobond would be silver.

Boardmember Randy Carter was concerned about contextualism and thought the project was very different from the surrounding area. He confirmed there had been neighborhood meetings through the Planning and Zoning process. He suggested using galvalume on the back side of the roof. The only concerns raised by neighbors had been regarding landscaping and those concerns had been addressed. He confirmed the air conditioning proposed for this building would be large enough to handle the future expansion.

Boardmember Dave Richins was concerned about the amount of parking provided and questioned why so much had been provided.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by that DR04-47 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:
  - a. Future expansion of the building in the area indicated to the west of the proposed building is required to be approved by the Design Review Board.
  - b. The roof to be sheathed with galvalume or standing seam metal.
  - c. Revise the cornice piece at the top of the wall by adding a trim piece, a fin piece, or a step.
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

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

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 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 Board determined that this was well designed. For the reasons stated on the record.

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

**CASE #: DR04-15**                      **Home Place Plaza Color**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**                2735 & 2729 East Main  
**REQUEST:**                             Remodel of an existing retail center and approval of an additional new building  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**                District 2  
**OWNER:**                                Red Mountain Retail Group  
**APPLICANT:**                         Steve Helffrich  
**ARCHITECT:**                         Steve Helffrich

**REQUEST:** Approval of color palette

**SUMMARY:** Steve Helffrich represented the case.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen was concerned that although the original bright yellow was changed, the second color had also been changed and it was brighter.

Boardmember Vince DiBella was still concerned with the yellow color.

Boardmember Randy Carter thought yellow was the wrong color for the building and the surrounding neighborhood. He wanted a new color scheme with more contrast.

Boardmember Dave Richins was glad the project was not beige.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed the trellis would be steel and glue lam beams. He also confirmed the "rusted" steel would be acid dipped. He believed the owner should be able to decide color. He thought there would be enough brown in the "rusty" metal and painted block to balance the project.

Chair Pete Berzins confirmed the applicant had been directed at the previous meeting to either revise the first yellow color or revise the entire palette.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Dave Richins that the colors for DR04-15 be approved:

**VOTE:** Passed 4 – 2 (Boardmembers Jillian Hagen and Randy Carter voting nay)

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The Board should not legislate color as long as the color is well done.

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

**CASE #: DR04-35**                      **Baseline Office Center**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**              NWC Baseline and East Valley Auto Dr.  
**REQUEST:**                              Develop 64,070 sq. ft., two-story office building  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**                District 6  
**OWNER:**                                Michael Reidy  
**APPLICANT:**                         Michael Reidy  
**ARCHITECT:**                          Sherman Cawley

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 64,070 sq. ft. two story office building

**SUMMARY:** Mike Reidy represented the case. He stated they had revised the building elevations by breaking up the 300' elevation. They had changed the center two bays of the east elevation and center bay of the south elevation by adding new vertical elements. The glass inset would be from the floor to ceiling. He stated the treatment would be continued along Baseline. The glass panel at the end of the second floor glazing would be brought down. The lower sill would be continued all outside faces of the building.

Boardmember Dave Richins liked the changes.

Boardmember Randy Carter thought the changes were a nice compromise.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer would have liked the recesses to be deeper, but felt the applicant had addressed their initial concerns.

Boardmember Vince DiBella agreed the changes offered a good compromise.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen liked the changes in glass. She still thought the building was flat. She thought the landscaping was too symmetrical. She thought the palms should be used to strengthen the verticality along the south side. She was concerned the landscaping as presented would hide the changes that were being made to the building. She thought the palms should identify the changes and go in and out. She suggested triangulating the palms with groups of three then two for more effect.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR04-35 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 revised exterior elevations with the following modifications to be approved by Design Review staff prior to submitting for construction permits:
  - a. Provide three (3) additional trees along the Baseline frontage to ensure at least twenty-eight (28) total trees, including the five (5) palm trees allowed as substitution for the street landscaping.
  - b. Work with Design Review staff to revise the landscape plan to identify the changes to the building rather than hiding them.
  - c. Provide typical elevations with color and material information for site walls, retaining walls, and screen walls.
  - d. Provide elevations of parking canopies with color and material information.

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

- e. Show locations of building signage and ensure that any attached signs are designed with integral raceways.
- f. Provide light fixture cut sheets.
- g. Punctuate the building corners with palm trees arranged in a grove massing.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Fire Cods, 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 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 Board determined the revised building elevations were a nice compromise. For the reasons stated on the record.

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

**CASE #: DR04-42**                      **Caseldine**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**            623 N. Gilbert Road  
**REQUEST:**                        Approval of a 1,800 sq. ft. dental office  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**            District 2  
**OWNER:**                         Robert Caseldine  
**APPLICANT:**                  Phillip Reina  
**ARCHITECT:**                     James Klein

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 1,800 sq. ft. dental office

**SUMMARY:** Philip Reina showed the Board revised elevations he felt addressed the concerns in the staff report. He stated the project is a very small scale office.

Boardmember Dave Richins liked the way the arches on the original drawings broke the roof line. He thought the other office projects along Gilbert were less residential in character. He was concerned this building would not be identifiable as an office project. He wanted to see stronger elements. He was concerned with the closeness of the mechanical room and air compressor to the adjacent neighbors. He wanted enough sound proofing to prevent the noise of the air compressor disturbing the neighbors.

Boardmember Randy Carter wondered why they proposed both the gable roof with EIFS fascia and arches. He suggested raising the height of the building and providing 9' ceiling heights. He thought the entrance feature should be raised to break the roof line. He suggested a thicker cornice. He did not like the pop-outs around the windows, especially with the rounded corners. He thought the building blended too much into the residential behind it. He suggested a 2 story or 1-1/2 story entrance feature. Had the applicant considered a bow string truss for the roof? He thought the building was being pulled apart. He thought the windows had no rhyme or reason.

Boardmember Carter agreed a building this small should be residential in character, but wanted it to look like an upscale residential product.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was also concerned about the residential/commercial character. He thought the detailing on the building was not well done. He thought the entrance should be pulled farther out so that water draining from the roof would not be a problem. He wanted larger roof overhangs on the sides. He thought the edge of the gable should change: maybe a hip or a dormer.

Boardmember Vince DiBella agreed the roof plane needed to be broken. He thought the building looked like a long box with things attached to it. He agreed there was no reason to the window placement.

Mr. Reina stated the windows were based on interior need. He stated the doctor has an established business and does not care if he is visible.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen agreed with previous comments. She thought that if the building was going to be residential in character the detailing needed to be small. She thought the fat trim was too massive for the building. She did not like the height of the roof. She thought the

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

curved form of the entry did not work. She thought the elements should tie together. Was the building a small residential character office or commercial character?

Chair Pete Berzins agreed that having a higher ceiling was much nicer from a patient's view point.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR04-42 be continued to the September 1, 2004 meeting.

Reconsider the following design elements:

Window fenestration, residential scale, overhangs, gables, gutters, downspouts, roof detailing, roof vents, wainscot, reveals and flashing, entry feature form because it was not right with the gable roof, placement of the entrance, study colors; need to be complementary/earth tones.

**VOTE:** Passed 6 – 0

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

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

**CASE #: DR04-43**                      **Banner Baywood Medical Center**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**              6644 E Baywood  
**REQUEST:**                              Approval of a free standing parking garage, a seven-story tower addition to the main hospital building, a new arcade along the south side of the existing office buildings, an addition to the central plant, a new cooling tower and a new radiology room  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**              District 5  
**OWNER:**                                Banner Health  
**APPLICANT:**                        John V. Berry, Beus Gilbert PLLC  
**ARCHITECT:**                         Vincent Leskosky, Westlake Reed Leskosky

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 3-story parking garage and a 7-story tower addition

**SUMMARY:** John Barry, Laura Snow, Vince Leskosky, and Hocine Imadali represented the case. Mr. Barry stated the applicants had worked closely with the neighbors during the Special Use Permit review by the Board of Adjustment.

Laura Snow stated the hospital is at capacity and they need to expand in order meet current needs. She stated that the bed tower proposed would meet the community's needs through 2013.

Vince Leskosky explained how the garage and the bed tower would fit into the master plan and how the hospital is planning on future growth and expansion. He explained that every department within the hospital needs to grow. He also stated every department has to be connected. He stated there would be significant internal remodeling.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed that a safety factor would be built into the foundation of the garage so it would be possible to have future floors. However, they do not have any plans to have the garage be taller. Staffmember Laura Hyneman explained that that portion of the campus does not have a BIZ overlay zone, so they would have to rezone the property in order to raise the height of the garage.

Mr. Leskosky explained the design of the garage and the bed tower. He stated the tower was being built at the maximum height and would have three shell floors for future needs. He explained the changes to the garage. The accent color on the garage comes from the Heart Hospital. He explained the tower would have richer colors and materials at the ground floor. There would be slate columns, copper sconces, and paving material in the sidewalk.

Hocine Imadali stated the neighbors wanted the colors of the new tower to match the existing hospital. He stated the canopy color could be different.

Boardmember Randy Carter liked the tower. He stated his only criticism was the color of the building. He felt that going to a beige building is depressing. He stated it is a long walk from the patient garage to the hospital and the beige building make you feel like you're going to an institution.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen thought the interiors were well done. She liked the new façade.

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

Boardmember Vince DiBella liked the new materials being proposed. He thought the existing site circulation was a disaster.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed there was a lot of landscape material around the garage. He agreed they should have additional color on the building. He suggested using pavers or potted plants to enhance the path to the hospital entrance. The applicants stated there would be a garden area at the entrance.

Laura Snow stated family members drop patients off at the main entrance and then park.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen stated that the people who are entering the hospital most often are the visitors who enter numerous times during the patients stay. She felt pavers and landscaping would be comforting for them. A garden feel around the hospital would be beneficial. She thought the main entry for visitors would be the west side of the tower closer to the garage. She felt this entrance should be enhanced because as designed it looked like just the corner of the building.

Chair Pete Berzins confirmed the patient glass would be like the existing tower; mostly clear bronze, with frit glass at the lounges.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen confirmed there would be a 10' to 12' wide walkway connecting to the women's center and the exterior would be landscaped.

Hocine Imadali stated they would work with staff to enhance the side entrance.

Boardmember Randy Carter wanted to see landscaping from the garage to the entrance. He confirmed it was a corporate decision to use beige.

Vince Leskosky stated that with each addition to this hospital has a different look but they relate to one another.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR04-43 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:
  - a. Future proposals to expand the number of buildings or increase the floor areas of existing buildings above that shown on the submitted garage and seven story tower drawings shall require review and approval by the Planning and Zoning Board and City Council.
  - b. All modifications and repainting of existing medical campus shall be reviewed by Design Review staff.
  - c. Provide required shrubs in parking islands and new planters.
  - d. Substitute a deeper color for "Beige" shown on the color board.
  - e. Provide landscaping in the 5' wide area between the arcade and the drive aisle. Landscaping should be an attractive blend of low growing plants.
  - f. No helipad to be located on top of this garage or new seven-story tower.
  - g. Provide trees and shrubs around perimeter of retention basin west of parking garage. Replace missing or displaced decomposed granite ground

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

- cover in retention basin.
  - h. Screen the new and relocated electrical generators north of the existing garage.
  - i. Install required screening trees along the north property line with the first phase of development.
  - j. Temporary parking area used during construction of new garage shall comply with all City and County codes and regulations.
  - k. Additional attention to be paid to the design of the west entrance to the bed tower. Details to be approved by Design Review staff.**
  - l. Revise the canopy colors.**
  - m. Provide color and paving at the entry points.**
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 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 (Boardmember Rob Burgheimer not present for this case)

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The Board determined the project was reasonably well-designed. For the reasons stated on the record which include

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

**CASE #: DR04-44**                      **Painted Mountain Townhomes**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**              6202 E McKellips  
**REQUEST:**                              Approval of 311 townhouse units  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**                District 5  
**OWNER:**                                Mehan Construction  
**APPLICANT:**                         Mehan Construction  
**ARCHITECT:**                         Jerry Torr  
    Seventh Angel Design Studio

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 311 unit townhome project

**SUMMARY:** Greg Bowen, Rob Terrel, and Jerry Torr represented the case.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the revisions were an improvement. He wanted to see stronger color changes. He wanted common colors but more than just tones of beige. He was concerned that there needed to be some regulation of how many of the same types and colors could be used together. Boardmember Burgheimer thought the rotunda and garage changes were better.

Boardmember Vince DiBella thought the detailing was better. He agreed with staff concerns.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen was concerned with some of the trellises, which had very small bases. It was suggested they could use low walls at the entries. Boardmember Hagen confirmed there would be landscaping and trees between the buildings and the street. Mr. Bowen confirmed that a homeowner's association will control the types and maintenance of the landscaping.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed the driveways would have pavers. He thought the entrances seemed very narrow. He thought the changes since the first meeting would enhance the product and made it a more sustainable project.

Chair Pete Berzins likes the shutters and wanted a requirement that some percentage of the project have the shutters. He was concerned with the color palette. He thought there needed to be more variety as you drive the street. He wanted more contrast in the color choices and a variety of roof tiles.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer recommended five color schemes with three colors on each color scheme. He also suggested complementary colors rather than just tonal changes. He thought the choices were too monotone for a project of this size.

There was discussion regarding neighborhood approval of the color changes. Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the applicants should send out new letters to the neighbors stating the Design Review Board would be reviewing revised colors. Rob Terrel wanted the Board to approve the colors and then they would take the approved colors to the neighbors. The Board was concerned they could end up in an endless circle color review unless the neighbors were actually at the Design Review Board meeting. It was stated that the signed agreement with the neighborhood stated the applicants would use earth tones.

Boardmember Burgheimer wanted variation of roof color schemes and stone.

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

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR04-44 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, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications:
  - a. Revise the stone entrance towers on each building by adding visible "faux" or actual supports (such as heavy timber brackets and beams), by providing attractive window detailing, enhancing roof detailing and enhancing the detailing at the ceiling/bottom of the feature. Variety is encouraged.
  - b. Revise the design of the windows located partially below stone towers. Resize and/or relocate the windows so that there is a solid wall panel beneath the tower or add a lintel above the window.
  - c. Revise the application of stone veneer to the front elevations so that it expresses the "Tuscan" theme of the project.
  - d. Revise the side elevations of all buildings to reduce the visual impact of large blank walls and odd blank vertical planes above the eave line. Possible design solutions include reconfigured roofs to reduce mass of the wall (without affecting the interior space or room heights) and/or adding clearstory windows to give a purpose to the high walls. The final design should create an attractive building elevation.
  - e. Enhance the windows throughout the project by adding details such as sills, surrounds or trim.
  - f. Revise the design of the two story covered patio. Design should incorporate detailing which enhances the theme of the project and places the "heavy stone" material at the base and the lighter wood and stucco above.
  - g. Revise the fireplace chimneys where chimneys are mirrored images.**
  - h. Place color on units so there are to be no more than three of the same style units together.**
  - i. Use 2 color schemes on the three six-plex units.**
  - j. Driveways shall be composed of pavers.**
  - k. Provide five (5) colors schemes with three (3) complementary colors per scheme. Color schemes to include roof tiles and stone choices. To be approved by the Design Review Board at the September 1, 2004 meeting.**
2. Perimeter wall shall comply with the Residential Development Guidelines.
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. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
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.

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

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 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 Board determined the project was reasonably well-designed. For the reasons stated on the record.

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

**CASE #: DR04-48**                      **Sonic**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**              2847 South Ellsworth  
**REQUEST:**                              Approval of a 1,536 sq. ft. restaurant, with 5,618 sq. ft. canopies  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**                District 6  
**OWNER:**                                Evergreen Ellsworth & Guadalupe  
**APPLICANT:**                        Stephanie Rowe  
**ARCHITECT:**                         Stephanie Rowe

**REQUEST:** Approval of a Sonic drive with a 1,536 sq. ft. building and 5,618 sq. ft. of canopies

**SUMMARY:** Stephanie Rowe represented the case.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed they were using Duffrin stone on the building and sign base.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed the colors were mandated by the developer. He thought the color of the tower elements was too pink. He wanted the color revised to be a little stronger.

Boardmember Vince DiBella was concerned the canopy. However, he understood it was Sonic.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR04-48 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:
  - The area east of the drive through lane is required to be landscaped. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.
  - **Revise the colors to stronger colors, if approval can be obtained from the developer. 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. 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 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.

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

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0 (Boardmember Jillian Hagen left prior to this case)

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The Board determined the project was reasonably well designed. For the reasons stated on the record.



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

- a. Revise side and rear elevations to provide four-sided architecture, including addressing the plain east elevation of Building A, screening of the S.E.S., and thickening the raised parapets.
  - b. Review and approval of outdoor patio/dining area fence by DR staff (if future fence is proposed).
  - c. **Revise the north and south elevations by using a color change and change in plane. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
  - d. **Approval of the revised parking as depicted on the site plan presented to the Board at the meeting.**
  - e. **The attached signs to be 24" in height; or increase the building height, including the tower, one foot to accommodate the 36" high signs proposed.**
  - f. **The monument sign is approved.**
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 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

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The Board determined the project revised per conditions above was well-designed. For the reasons stated on the record.

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

**CASE #: DR04-50**                      **Pierpont at San Tan Parcels 1 & 2**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**            **N of NEC of Power and Warner**  
**REQUEST:**                            Approval for Commercial/ Industrial project at Pierpont at San Tan  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**            District 6  
**OWNER:**                                Franklin D. Richards Jr.  
**APPLICANT:**                        Frank Richards  
**ARCHITECT:**                         Sherman Cawley, Cawley Architects

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 50,864 sq. ft. office project and a 32,230 sq. ft. office/warehouse complex

**SUMMARY:** Sherman Cawley and Lance Richards represented the case. Mr. Cawley explained they would be using founders block and integral block on the larger buildings and painted split face and single score on the smaller buildings.

Boardmember Randy Carter thought the colors were monolithic. He confirmed the project was 1-1/2 miles from Williams Gateway Airport.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer would like to see variation in the center piece. He suggested reversing the color or stopping the band. He thought the building was too linear. He wanted the buildings to all match in color and did not want the smaller buildings painted.

Boardmember Dave Richins thought there was a lot of parking, far more than required. He preferred to see more landscaping.

Boardmember Vince DiBella thought the office buildings were nice. He agreed the project was monolithic.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Dave Richins that DR04-50 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 approved by Design Review staff prior to submitting construction documents on this project:
  - a. Indicate the main building entries to the Phase II units from the sides facing the parking areas rather than facing the drive aisle.
  - b. Provide canopies or shade devices over the doors and openings on the west side of the two west buildings in Phase II.
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.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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 5 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The Board determined the project was attractive. For the reasons stated on the record.

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

**CASE #: DR04-51**                      **Stapley Marketplace 1B**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**              Lot 1B Stapley & US 60  
**REQUEST:**                              Approval of a 7,200 sq. ft. retail building  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**                District 4  
**OWNER:**                                Stapley 1B LLC  
**APPLICANT:**                        Bollinger & Cardenas Architects  
**ARCHITECT:**                         David Cardenas

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 7,200 sq. ft. retail building

**SUMMARY:** Sean Lake and Jeff Kost represented the case. The applicants presented revised elevations to address design issues raised in the staff report. The revisions included: a flair in the stone columns; addition of a cap; addition of stone on the rear; and a color change on the cornice. Mr. Lake explained that the red awning will tie in with the restaurants and the colors come from the commercial center.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was concerned with the 33' building height. He also did not like the greenish color. He thought the west elevation needed to change and suggested wrapping the windows around the corners to the north and south. He thought they should present a more attractive elevation to the Denali office buildings.

Boardmember Vince DiBella thought the flaring of the columns helped.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed the cap on the stone matches the cornice color.

Boardmember Randy Carter did not like the proposed colors. He thought the building needed more color to draw attention to it. He did not like the way the roof of the rear elevation dipped in the middle, he thought it should step up. He thought there should be windows facing Denali. He thought they needed more colors to fit in with the flamboyant projects in front of them. He agreed the green color needed to change. He suggested changing the black doors to mill finish or anodized.

Chair Pete Berzins wanted them to bring down the scale of the building a foot or two, and agreed that adding color would bring attention to the building.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR04-51 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 revised exterior elevations with the following modifications:
  - a. Revise the landscape plan to comply with Foundation Base Landscaping requirements per section 11-15-3(C) of the City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.
  - b. Provide additional detailing on the west (rear) elevation, particularly to break up the dark mass above the metal canopies. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.
  - c. **Revise the color palette. To be approved by Design Review staff.**

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- d. **Lower the proportions of the building by a few feet.**
  - e. **Revise the west elevation by adding glazing or architectural embellishments so that it does not look so much like a rear elevation. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
  - f. **Replace black door frames with mill finish or anodized aluminum.**
- 
- 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 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

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The Board determined that this project, revised per conditions, was well designed. For the reasons stated on the record.

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

**CASE #: DR04-52**                      **Falcon Estates**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**            4400 block of East McLellan  
**REQUEST:**                            Approval of a 26,730 sq. ft. four-plex project  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**                District 5  
**OWNER:**                                John Bellerose  
**APPLICANT:**                         Dorothy Shupe, Dream Catchers  
**ARCHITECT:**                         Randy Carter

**REQUEST:** Approval of 6 four-plexes totaling 26,730 sq. ft.

**SUMMARY:** Boardmember Randy Carter declared a conflict of interest. Dorothy Shupe and Tom Bottomly represented the case. The applicants distributed three color variations of the elevations to the Board. Dorothy Shupe stated the owner was willing to change the combinations of colors.

Boardmember Dave Richins liked the new color variations. He wanted to see two buildings in each variation.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer generally liked the project. He thought the project looked part Santa Fe and part Victorian. He thought the carriage lights were Victorian. He wanted additional color options for the roofs. He was concerned with the proportions of the windows. He agreed with staff, that the units look like an office. He suggested the window proportions should be thinned up, with different spring lines. He thought the roof color should be lightened. He thought the dark roof tile color contributed to the heavy office look. If they wanted to look Victorian then he suggested round columns. If they want to look Santa Fe then they need new light fixtures. Tom Bottomly stated the variation in the window header height was to break up the horizontal plane.

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested using exposed muntins in the windows. He thought there was a lot of roof. He suggested changing the pitch to 2 or 3 to 12 rather than 5 to 12. He was concerned with the thickness of the fascia and wainscot. He confirmed there would be window wells in the basement. He confirmed the reason the patios were in the front was to address CPTED concerns for more visibility. He suggested using screen walls in the rear to provide privacy. He thought the front patios were too small. He suggested making them real front porches; maybe one of the windows could become a sliding door.

Boardmember Vince DiBella liked the color variations. He was concerned with proportions of roof to building base. He suggested the windows be smaller and there be more of them.

Chair Pete Berzins liked the roof, but not the roof tiles being all the same color. He thought the entries should have more porch appeal. He was concerned there was not enough parking. He wanted to see detail of the parking structures. He liked the color variations, but wanted a variety of roof colors. He questioned the amount of guest parking.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Dave Richins that case DR04-52 be continued to the September 1, 2004 meeting.

The motion died for lack of a second

**MOTION:** It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR04-52 be approved with the following conditions:

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

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:
  - a. Incorporate at least one additional color palette into the project. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.
  - b. Create a defined outdoor private space near the entrance to each unit. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.
  - c. **The revised colors are approved. Provide color boards to Design Review staff.**
  - d. **Incorporate a screen element or patio in front of each unit without encroaching into the landscape setback. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
  - e. **Revisit the scale of the roof. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
  - f. **Provide a variety of tile roof colors. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
  - g. **Revise the proportion of the windows. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
  - h. **Covered parking canopy to be compatible with building. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
  - i. **Expand the front porches. To be reviewed 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 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 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 3 – 1 (Dave Richins voting nay)

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The Board determined that with the recommended changes this was a reasonably well designed project, and was consistent with building elevations approved by neighbors. For the reasons stated on the record.

Boardmember Richins voted nay because he wanted the Board to see the changes. He wanted it in the record that he did not approve of the PAD ownership.

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

**CASE #: DR04-53**                      **Lady Bug**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**              1641 E University  
**REQUEST:**                              Approval of a 4,100 sq. ft. office building with night and  
Weekend storage of fleet vehicles  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**              District 2  
**OWNER:**                                 Lisa Miller  
**APPLICANT:**                         Lisa Miller  
**ARCHITECT:**                            ARC One

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 4,100 sq. ft. office building with night and weekend storage of fleet vehicles

**SUMMARY:** Lisa Miller and Josh Oehler represented the case.

Boardmember Randy Carter thought the building was very daring and the colors were dramatic. He hoped it would create interest for the neighborhood.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer liked the building. He was concerned that if the details were not handled well the building would not work. He stated the actual construction has to be well executed: how they handle the metal canopy, the flashing, the crash bar heights, the type of glazing, where the light fixtures go, the expansion joints. He did not like the stepping of the windows. He suggested getting rid of the second piece of glass. He wanted the applicant to use EIFS rather than "western one coat". He thought the back of the parapets should be finished.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed that the purple and the gray portions of the building would be on different planes. He agreed that "western one coat" would not create the desired affect.

Boardmember Dave Richins was concerned with traffic going through the neighborhood. He wanted the trucks to use the alley to the west to get to the traffic light on University. He was concerned that the landscape palette be all drought tolerant.

Chair Pete Berzins thought the project was interesting. He liked that it was not just a box.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR04-53 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:
  - a. Provide an elevation of the 6' high masonry screen wall along Hill St for approval by Design Review staff. The wall should be an attractive feature of the landscaping design.
  - b. Paint SES and wing wall single color. Color shall be chosen by the Architect.
  - c. Retention basin design shall comply with the Design Standards.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- d. **The building to be EIFS, not “western one coat”.**
  - e. **Use only drought tolerant plants. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
  - f. **Investigate the use of the alley with the Transportation Department.**
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 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

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The Board thought this project, if well built, could be an exciting addition to the area. For the reasons stated on the record.

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 4, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta  
Planning Assistant

da