

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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

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

MEMBERS PRESENT

Tim Nielsen - Chair
Wendy LeSueur – Vice Chair
Tom Bottomley
Robert Burgheimer
Vince DiBella
Craig Boswell
Delight Clark

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

OTHERS PRESENT

Lesley Davis
Dorothy Chimel
Mia Lozano Helland
Jeff Conkle
Debbie Archuleta
Tom Ellsworth
Krissa Lucas
Jennifer Gniffke
Joe Welliver
Josh Mike
Richard Dyer
Jeff Malmstone
Mike Scarbrough
Brenda Penner
Jason Ottmer
Cliff Coffaro
John Reddell
Tom hardy
Catherine Sanders
John Bellian
Barry Barcus
Kim Marohl
Justin marohl
Bob Winton
Marc Davis
Fred Bustamontie
Tim Chester
Gary King
Martin Sandino
Ladell Call
Ann Call
Doug Chapman
John Harrison
Bob Briggs
Kent McClure
Ralph Pew
Others

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

1. Work Session:

CASE: Urban Oasis
715 N Country Club

REQUEST: Review of a condo project

DISCUSSION:

The applicants brought a laptop to show the Board their proposed changes. They did not provide any actual drawings for the file.

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Don't have to remove the windows everywhere
- Should have variety
- Suggested providing complimentary colors in pairs or blocks
- Be careful with how the roof proportions work

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Likes the additional variety
- Could the sidewalks at the patios be varied at least a foot
- Maybe extend the patios

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Would it be better to have one gated entry with a crash gate or exit only gate
- Concerned with roof elevations and how mechanical units will be screened

Another work session is necessary for this project once the applicant has made revisions.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Residence Inn
E of Crismon south side of Hampton

REQUEST: Review of a 6-story hotel

DISCUSSION:

There was no one present to discuss the case and staff had not received any revised submittals.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Falcon Vista Corporate Center
5537 E Thomas

REQUEST: Review of a 147,612 sq. ft. commercial office project

DISCUSSION:

The applicants stated the project was now being proposed at 3-stories instead of 5-stories.

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Need variety of materials
- Likes the recess of the windows on the south side

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Still thinks the colors are too strong
- Likes the red and the green but the white is too strong
- Need to consider what stucco looks like long term in white
- EIFS would look better
- Look using a metal inset reveal
- Don't just do a routed reveal
- Likes the idea of champagne rather than bronze for window frames

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Prefers the revised colors
 - Likes the combination of materials
- Concerned with how the stone element engages
- Likes the scale
- If the red and white are both EIFS they need to be a different finish so they look like a different material
- The reveals need to be the same on both buildings
- Prefers the simpler reveals; the other is too busy and predictable

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Choice Bank
1756 S Crismon

REQUEST: Review of a bank with drive thru lanes

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Could they use more of the masonry; possibly at the entry?

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Appreciates the screening of the tellers
- Really likes the masonry; agrees there should be more and it should be more visible

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Agrees there should be more masonry
- Maybe flip the masonry so it is the face instead of the columns
- Could they adjust the column so it is more of a cantilever?
- Look at the placement of the attached signs
- Provide light fixture cut sheets with follow up submittal and show where they will be placed on the revised elevations

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Likes the variety
- Appreciates the bank being willing to work with the existing design rather than doing a prototype

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Berge Dodge
6133 Auto Park Drive

REQUEST: Review of a new car dealership

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Needs more color
- Maybe the entry area could be red
- Clear anodized mullions should be nice

Boardmember Delight Clark:

- Look at using colored glass

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- It is very bland
- The entry seems understated
- The garage area is fine
- The front seems like the service side

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Could the color change?
- Could the curtain wall be revised?
- Look at punching up the east and west elevations to make them more visible from the freeway

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Alexan Gateway Commons
3143 S Power

REQUEST: Review of a 240 unit apartment complex

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- The whole project is stucco with metal mesh and metal awnings
- Could the stucco finish be varied?
- Need another material; maybe at the stair element

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Likes the project
- Concerned the building material may not be right for such a modern design
- Maybe a metal roof or less variegated tile
- Does the building need a gable at all?

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Likes the colors and how they work with the roof tile
- Likes the texture of the type of roof tile which is smoother than most

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Gateway Commons
3143 S Power

REQUEST: Review of an office retail project

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- The sides and rears look stripy
- Maybe provide a change of plane
- Does not want painted mesh; it should be stainless with a factory finish
- Did not like the right side of the retail building
- The glass on the top of the towers needs to be the same on all four sides

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Agreed the building is too stripy
- The arch elements seem very thin and out of proportion
- Could the curved arch be more of an arch
- Look at using a railing

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- The columns and stone arch element could be raised to break the bottom of the roof line on the retail buildings
- Agreed that if they are going to have a curve it needs to be a real curve
- Wrap the corners on the retail buildings

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Circle K
2030 W Southern

REQUEST: Review of the raze and rebuild of a Circle K

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- The Prickly Pear Plum color should be more compatible with the building and more complimentary to the stone
- There is too much red

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- The architecture and design matches the site at Power and Brown
- They may not need the stone in this area of the City; look at using a different material
- Would like a whole new color palette that works better with the red
- Maybe use a really nice light fixture instead of the emblems at the corners
- Could they revise the cornice?
- There needs to be some foundation base landscaping to soften the hard edge of the building

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Could the canopy have a change of plane
- Could they lose the red stripe along the bottom of the canopy
- The landscaping looks very dense

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Doesn't like the emblems at the corners
- The canopy is really unattractive
- The bollards need to be done better
- The canopy columns are too spindly
- Provide landscaping around the bollards
- The red stripe on the canopy needs to be rethought
- The canopy needs to be integrated into the architecture of the building
- They have two different landscape palettes

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: McKellips Office
2554 E McKellips

REQUEST: Review of an office building

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- The proportions are bad
- The trellis is spindly
- The shallow gable is oddly proportioned
- Look at where color changes occur
- Need more color variety
- The window placement looks unresolved
- The gable looks tacked on
- The dark squares and center element just below the roof don't work
- Provide solar protection for the high windows
- Very flat

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Agreed with Boardmember Bottomley
- If you want the rusticated look then go for it
- Does the building need to be that tall?

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Agreed with Boardmember Bottomley
- There are too many things happening
- Eliminate the racing stripes
- Lose the medallions
- Big tall windows on first floor then rectangle windows on the mezzanine level are awkward
- Integrate the stone into the design
- Make the east elevation exit an employee only entrance and less prominent than the public/main entrance
- The Board has to know the building materials

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Development in an OS zoning district should act as a buffer from more intense land uses
- Should have more residential character
- The building is too tall

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Another work session may be necessary for this project.

CASE: Spotless Carwash
2844 E McKellips

REQUEST: Review of the raze and rebuild of a carwash

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The yellow may be too strong
- Looks very similar to the project at Gilbert and Baseline. He really liked what was approved for that building. He was disappointed it was not built as approved. The applicant stated he was not involved in the actual construction.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Concerned with how the roof will drain
- It looks nice

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Osco remodel
415 S Higley

REQUEST: Review of the conversion of an abandoned Osco into multi-tenant retail and auto repair

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- No glue lam beams
- The wood has turned very brown and aged at the SWC of Main and Lindsay; which is the same thing proposed on this building
- This remodel is an improvement to the existing buildings; however, it looks very industrial

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Appreciated that the car repair was being located at the least visible area of the building

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Very concerned with the trellis; he thought it would bow with time
- Could the yellow color be toned down a little
- Would really prefer the steel trellis to wood
- Maybe the trellis could start shorter then go long

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- There is a difference between wood aging and lack of maintenance. The problem historically is that the wood does not receive the maintenance it needs over time

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Osco Remodel
3547 E Southern

REQUEST: Review of the conversion of an abandoned Osco into multi-tenant retail and auto repair

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- No glue lam beams
- The wood has turned very brown and aged at the SWC of Main and Lindsay; which is the same thing proposed on this building
- This remodel is an improvement to the existing buildings; however, it looks very industrial

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Appreciated that the car repair was being located at the least visible area of the building

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Very concerned with the trellis; he thought it would bow with time
- Could the green color be toned down a little
- Would really prefer the steel trellis to wood
- Maybe the trellis could start shorter then go long

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- There is a difference between wood aging and lack of maintenance. The problem historically is that the wood does not receive the maintenance it needs over time

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Mesa 40
Power Road south of Elliot

REQUEST: Review of nine industrial buildings totaling 236,704 sq. ft.

DISCUSSION:

The applicant stated they were presenting A, B, C and Lots 1, 2, 3. The remainder of the project would come to the Board at a future meeting.

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Buildings are very long
- Could the block be used so it is not so repetitive

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Colors don't all go together
- The peachy shades will look very pink
- Either change the peach shades or the tan
- With painted tilt, integral block would look a lot nicer

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Concerned with thinness of the darker panels around the glass
- Likes the changes in plane

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

2. Call to Order:

Chair Tim Nielsen called the meeting to order at 6:15 p.m.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the December 5, 2007 Meeting:

On a motion by Craig Boswell seconded by Rob Burgheimer the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

4. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-129 Mesa Center Point Plaza

LOCATION/ADDRESS: NEC Signal Butte & Guadalupe
REQUEST: Approval of three buildings totaling 18,167 sq. ft. that includes the development of a dry cleaner, retail, and day care facility.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Mesa Center Pointe Plaza, LLC
APPLICANT: Marc Davis, T² Architecture Group, LLC.
ARCHITECT: Brian Moore
STAFF PLANNER: Monique Spivey/Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of three buildings totaling 18,167 sq. ft. that includes the development of a dry cleaner, retail, and day care facility

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda due to a conflict by Chair Tim Nielsen.

During the discussion of this case Chair Nielsen turned the meeting over to Vice Chair Wendy LeSueur.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Delight Clark that DR07-129 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. Identify the colors/materials proposed for the exterior light fixtures and storefront.
 - b. Finish the backside of the parapet to match the front wherever the parapet project above the lowest primary roofline of the building.
 - c. Return parapets a minimum of 2' wherever the parapet projects above the lowest primary roofline of the building.
 - d. Provide pedestrian connections in logical locations to the future adjacent shopping center. Pedestrian paths need to be decorative wherever they cross drive aisles.
 - e. Provide a revised landscape plan that is more fluid and has a more sculptured approach with plant choices and with the placement by grouping plant materials.
 - f. Provide an additional texture on the building, such as masonry or stone to create more interest and depth.
 - g. Revise the columns on the building to remove the lighter color at the base. Either introduce another material for the required texture or extend the darker reddish tone to the ground.
 - h. Provide elevations of the screen walls provided along Guadalupe.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Design is to be consistent with what will be installed for the overall development.

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. Landscaping and screening must comply with all requirements established in Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance.
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
6. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket *and painted green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building. SES is to be internal or recessed and painted to match the building.
8. Provide two half-size color elevations, site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0 – 1 (Chair Tim Nielsen abstained)

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-138 CW Xpress

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 104 N Val Vista

REQUEST: Approval of a 3,145 sq. ft. car wash, a 9,800 sq. ft. service and retail building, and a 12,000 service building

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2

OWNER: 5080 LLC

APPLICANT: JJ Land Scottsdale

ARCHITECT: Lava Architecture

STAFF PLANNER: Kim Steadman

REQUEST: Withdrawal

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR07-138 be withdrawn

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR07-140 Piper Plastics

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 4818 & 4762 E Indigo

REQUEST: Approval of a 56,131 sq. ft. manufacturing building

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5

OWNER: Randall Wajtysiak

APPLICANT: Nick Tsontakis

ARCHITECT: Nick Tsontakis

STAFF PLANNER: Kim Steadman

REQUEST: The case be tabled

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR07-140 be approved with the following conditions:

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR08-01 Bergeron Engineering
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1559 N Country Club
REQUEST: Approval of an 8,118 sq. ft. phase 1 and 4,208 sq. ft. phase 2 office
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Phil Bergeron
APPLICANT: Gary King
ARCHITECT: KDA Architects
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis/Monique Spivey

REQUEST: Approval of an 8,118 sq. ft. phase 1 and 4,208 sq. ft. phase 2 office retail

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR08-01 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 proposed glass color for the storefronts.
 - b. Identify the location of the SES and provide wing walls that are designed to integrate with the building design.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket *and painted 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, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR08-02 Broadway Fiesta

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 423 S Signal Butte
REQUEST: Approval of two retail buildings totaling 27,769 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: DeRito Partners Development
APPLICANT: Michelle Santoro
ARCHITECT: KDRA Architecture
STAFF PLANNER: Josh Mike

REQUEST: Approval of two retail buildings totaling 27,769 sq. ft.

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR08-02 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 elevations of the screen wall for the cart storage area.
 - b. Provide horizontal raking of CMU joints, as per elevations
 - c. Provide decorative pathways where the pedestrian path crosses the drive aisle.
 - d. Provide bicycle parking in front of Shops A.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Review and approval of the Comprehensive Sign Package by the Board of Adjustment or the Zoning Administrator.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
6. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket *and painted green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
8. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR08-03 **Pecos 77 Business Park**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 8659 E Pecos
REQUEST: Approval of eleven office buildings and three industrial buildings totaling 119,072 sq. ft.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Pecos 77 LLC
APPLICANT: Jeff Will
ARCHITECT: Will Architects
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of eleven office buildings and three industrial buildings totaling 119,072 sq. ft.

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda by citizens present.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley abstained.

Jeff Will and Ralph Pew represented the case. Mr. Will stated there would be an 80' landscape strip along Woodland and the 8' wall would sit on top of a 4' berm, making the overall height 12'. Mr. Will stated the buildings were 27'-6" in height. The only revisions they had made since the work session were to the landscape palette and to make the buildings all compatible. He stated they were matching the screen wall for the adjacent project. He explained that with the setback of the buildings from the neighbors and the height of the wall only the top 10' of the buildings would be visible to the neighbors.

Doug Chapman the Chairman of the Queen's Park Political Action Committee stated they had a referendum to reverse the City Council decision to allow this project this close to the residential properties. He also stated "they had other projects to the east and to the north they had worked with, and this project is completely out of control. The developer is deciding to do what he wants to do and the City of Mesa seems to be very happy to accommodate. What he meant by that, with no offense to Will Architects, if he was building that project he would have no problem with it at all if it sat up against a rail road track or a freeway. The challenge is that, if you refer to the lower chart on the left, where you can see the three industrial warehouses you know that to the right a little down and to the right is where his house sits and there are four or five homes that will face into this industrial complex. The challenge we have with this is not that it's there, it's the design of the project is a major problem and has been from the very beginning. In the zoning process they complained about the design, the site plan from the very beginning. Being that it was too harsh up against the homes and they said well you have to address that at Design Review, here we are and they have removed all of the tile from the roofing structures. The two buildings that face my home and the entire subdivision; Queen's Park is 49 custom homes on one acre lots. There is no continuity to their fence line with the previous project, where he says they've matched the previous project there is no continuity to the fence line with the previous project. Where he says they've matched the previous project, maybe in landscaping yes but the wall sits up 120' back from the road, this one sits approximately 80', that's like a 40', so your going to come around the corner and your going to see this ugly 40' fence jut out directly toward the homes, so this project is much closer to the homes."

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

“So they were specifically asking from a design, site review process here that this is way too harsh to go up against the front doors of residential.” He stated “they were perfectly willing to work with the developer, but he has decided he wants what he wants. They had asked him to remove the two buildings that were closest to the homes, as did the previous developer, he has refused, and now we come here and everything that was on the table that made it nice and pretty from a standpoint of if you’re facing straight on has been removed. And when I say everything, those aren’t the same buildings, those aren’t the same colors, the materials have changed and this is the first time basically they have seen these plans.”

Ladell Call then spoke and stated “he lived in Queen’s Park and had developed a site to the east of the project where the neighborhood is.” He thought Mr. Chapman summed it up very well. He had lived in Mesa pretty much his whole life and he could not believe this was happening. It violated the zoning code outright. Never anywhere in Mesa has an industrial warehouse project been built across the street from anything residential. They are going to tell you that the codes say that you can, clearly if you research it, you can’t. The only thing that is there leaves it wide open, so the City decided that this was going to be OK. He stated they were here tonight to ask the Board to throw it out until after the referendum.

Kent McClure then spoke. He stated “we are talking about tilt-up buildings you can slap all you want on it, paint and a little decoupage but it’s a tilt-up, industrial, harsh building with a parking lot between the buildings and their homes. You walk out their front doors and he understands there was no guarantee their beautiful view should be taken away and that’s not what their argument was, but this was incompatible. The look, the feel, the safety. And the reason they want to insist on having their wall 40’ closer to the homes was just unbelievable and the Mayor ramrodded this through, he stated he didn’t know what his association is with their representatives, but he doesn’t want to listen to reason, doesn’t want to listen to zoning, this is incompatible and it needs to be redesigned. He stated he was a contractor, totally pro development but it is incompatible to put this project up against R1-43, up against their homes, and their property rights should be considered. The aesthetics, these ugly tilt-up buildings up against residential, should not be condoned.”

Ralph Pew then spoke and stated the pending referendum would be resolved in March. The issue before this Board is nothing different or unusual for the Board. It is not unusual for this Board to hear a case before the zoning case is finalized. In this case the City Council has voted to approve the zoning for the sight, the setbacks, and the placement of the wall. The question before this Board were the aesthetics of the architecture, the color, the thematic design, those types of things. Regarding the comment that this should wait until after the referendum, the City Attorney’s office had determined that this process could go forward; however, no building permits can be issued until the referendum issue is decided.

Staffmember Lesley Davis stated the Board had suggested the tile be removed from the two buildings at the work session to make the project more cohesive. It was not the applicant trying to do something without direction.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated there have been other cases in the City where industrial has been built next to residential. This architecture is a more enhanced project than many industrial projects approved in the City. He stated the Board thought the tile roofs looked out of place and the entire project should be cohesive. They had thought that

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

bringing down the roof and removing the tile was a better solution. He confirmed the finished floor would be very close to the grade of Woodland.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed the landscape buffer would be accessible to the public. He thought the landscaping and berming were fine.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur thought the revisions to the landscape plan had addressed the Board's concerns about the park like setting of the landscape buffer.

Chair Tim Nielsen thought the applicant had done what they could to mitigate the impact of the project.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Wendy LeSueur that DR08-03 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:
 - e. The design of any proposed monument signs must receive Design Review approval.
 - f. Provide the required trees in the foundation base at 1 tree per 50' linear feet of exterior wall per §11-15-3(C) 2 of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - g. Provide elevations of the parking screen walls and the trash enclosures/gates. Design is to be compatible with the proposed building design.
 - h. Provide elevations of the 8' wall along the south side of the project adjacent to the residential. Design is to be consistent with the design of the wall approved for the adjacent development to the east (DR07-85).
 - i. Pedestrian connections shall be a decorative surface wherever they cross drive aisles.
 - j. Remove the Grapefruit trees from the landscape palette and replace with a tree such as Mesquite, which is more consistent with the landscape design for the adjacent development to the east. (DR07-85)
 - k. **The applicant to make sure the landscape buffer is maintained.**
 - l. **The height of the wall and berm to be placed at finished floor height.**
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. The signage on Buildings H and I shall be non-illuminated.
5. Provide a minimum 5'-wide concrete foundation base along the entire lengths of the south side of the screen wall behind building G and north side of the screen wall behind buildings H&I, except where landscaped as shown on the revised Site Plan.
6. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Technical Review Committee.
7. Full compliance with all current Code requirements and regulations, except as amended through the PAD overlay (Z07-043).
8. All street improvements and street frontage landscaping to be installed in the first phase of construction.
9. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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.)

10. The Service Entrance Sections (SES) are to be recessed and painted to match the buildings.
11. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
12. Provide two half-size 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 (Tom Bottomley abstained)

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR08-04 Greenfield Main Commercial Development

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 4517 East Main Street
REQUEST: Approval of a Commercial Building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Joe Dotty
APPLICANT: Vincent P. Di Bella
ARCHITECT: Saemisch + Di Bella Architects
STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of a commercial building.

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda due to a conflict by Boardmember Vince DiBella

MOTION: It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR08-04 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Provide color specifications for the storefront to match what has been represented on the color building elevations. Details to be approved by Design Review staff.
 - b. Provide color/material specifications for glazing to match what has been represented on the color building elevations. Details to be approved by Design Review staff.
 - c. Substitute an alternate tree for the Olea Europaea (Olive) that does not produce wind-borne allergens.
 - d. Provide documentation of a cross-access agreement.
 - e. Compliance with all conditions of approval for Site Plan Modification Z08-01.
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 green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
5. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
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 – 1 (Boardmember Vince DiBella abstained)

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR08-05 Hospice Care
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 5404 E Southern
REQUEST: Approval of a 16,400 sq. ft. hospice facility
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Great Days Investment
APPLICANT: Robert Briggs
ARCHITECT: Robert Briggs
STAFF PLANNER: Kim Steadman

REQUEST: Approval of a 16,400 sq. ft. hospice facility

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR08-05 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 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. Note the finish colors on the elevation drawings.
 - b. Delete reference to asphalt shingles.
 - c. Correct color call-outs on the elevation drawings.
 - d. Replace the Palo Verde tree in the NE corner with another appropriate tree.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket *and painted 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, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR08-06 Taco Bell

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2760 S. Alma School Rd.
REQUEST: Approval for a rebuild of a Taco Bell
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: MG Mesa Associates
APPLICANT: Martin Sandino
ARCHITECT: Jeff Looker
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

REQUEST: Approval of a rebuild of a Taco Bell

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR08-06 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 elevations of the proposed screen wall adjacent to Guadalupe and indicate location on the landscape plan as well as the site plan. Design of the wall must comply with §11-15-4 of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - b. Design of the trash enclosure and gates must be compatible with the building design.
 - c. Lighting cut sheets were provided for attached fixtures, but not for parking lot lights. If any are proposed, type/style should be compatible with what exists in the shopping center.
 - d. Landscape plant material is required adjacent to the drive-thru per §11-15-3(C) 2.
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 Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit (SCIP).
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, 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 JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Appeals of Administrative Review

ADR07-55
KFC Signage 2210 E Baseline

This case was resolved with staff prior to the meeting.

Other Business:

Presentation by Gordon Sheffield on the Zoning Ordinance Update: Module 1; land use classification.

Staffmember Gordon Sheffield stated the consultant for the zoning ordinance update has spent the last 16 months researching the zoning code and City policies. The consultant has also talked to the community to see how the code works, how it lines up with the general plan, and if the code is doing what it is intended to do. He stated they would be breaking the zoning ordinance into four modules. This is Module 1, which is for use regulations. Then there will be one for design guidelines, and design standards, the third module will be for supplemental provisions, then one for administration and definitions. He stated he was making presentations to this Board, the Planning and Zoning Board, City Council, the Downtown Development Committee, the Historic Preservation Committee, the Housing Advisory Board, and the Development Advisory Board.

Module one is a radical change from the laundry list of what is allowed that now exists to a matrix. It is intended to provide as much information on one or two pages as possible. The user would look up the use and find the different uses that go across that relate to the use and find references to special conditions that relate to that use. The goal is to provide as much information as possible on a few pages. He was asking the Board to give direction on how to improve the module. He explained how the matrix would work. The Board thought the matrix was a good idea. He stated they were proposing to change the names of the districts to better represent what the district is for such as light industrial instead of M-1.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated he liked the changes in names. He was concerned that definitions be detailed so that there are not a lot of uses subject to interpretation. He wanted the definitions to be broad. Gordon stated one of the things they were trying to do is eliminate the laundry list of allowable uses to eliminate so many interpretations.

Staffmember Gordon Sheffield explained there would be five tables; residential, public and semi public, commercial, employment, transportation uses and accessory uses. He explained there would be permitted uses, uses that require a Special Use Permit, and uses that require a Council Use Permit, and limited uses which would have a caveat, so you would look to the footnotes to see what the caveat is. He stated they would be consolidating uses together, such as automotive uses, liquor stores, convenience stores, large scale grocery stores, instead of just retail. Staff is also trying to introduce live-work uses.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed there would still be overlay districts. In fact Mr. Sheffield stated there would probably be some new overlay districts, such as one related to transit. He then briefly explained the PC district. He stated it would require projects with at least 160 acres.

Mr. Sheffield then asked the Board if they were in favor of the new format. The Board thought simpler was better.

Chair Tim Nielsen asked Mr. Sheffield to explain what the biggest difference would be for users. Mr. Sheffield stated a reversal in the trends of increasing landscaping and setbacks. He stated the revisions would be transitioning the community, especially in certain core areas, from a suburban oriented zoning code to more of an urban code; a code that looks at building projects up rather than out; and more emphasis on mixed-use. Chair Nielsen confirmed that the code would address in-fill with different setback requirements for older areas of the City.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley wanted to see more latitude for creativity.

Mr. Sheffield stated that the new code was hoping to make it easier to determine where your use could go and what the setback and landscape requirements would be. It would also better determine what uses are appropriate in specific zoning districts, rather than allowing everything allowed in more restrictive districts to go into the less restrictive districts, such as M-2 which allows everything from office service to commercial, with the exception of large retail uses. He stated it probably wasn't a good idea to have a day care in an M-2 district next to a factory or quarry.

Do use classifications and limited uses adequately reflect the purposes of those uses? The idea was by varying those activities we can get closer to what the district is trying to achieve through the general plan and the zoning district. He was asking every board if there were other uses which the authority to allow the uses could be delegated down; such as tattoo parlors which now require a Council Use Permit. Could those reviews be handled by someone else, or even be a permitted use in certain districts. Gordon asked the Board to read through the Module 1 document and E-mail him with any comments or suggestions. He then asked the Board if they thought detached accessory living quarters should be allowed by right. The requirements would then be that the structure be within the buildable area of the lot, that it be a maximum of 30% rather than 50%, and may require a third parking space. This change would also allow separate utilities. There would be a new requirement to make the new structure architecturally compatible with the original dwelling structure. Boardmember Tom Bottomley confirmed that this change would not change the maximum roof area requirement for the zoning district. Mr. Sheffield stated they were looking possibly revising the maximum area requirement independent of the question of detached accessory living quarters.

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 2, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Discussion of remodel of Fiesta Mall:

During the discussion of the Fiesta Mall Freeway Landmark Monument Sign the Board asked when they would be seeing the remodel plans for the former Macy's store that had been demolished. They were told the remodel had been reviewed by staff. Boardmember Rob Burgheimer questioned why staff had approved the plans instead of having them reviewed by the Board.

Staffmember Dorothy Chimel stated staff had determined that since the remodel was less than 20% of the overall mall it could be reviewed administratively per a policy presented to and accepted by City Council. Boardmember Burgheimer stated he supports the 20% rule; however his concern was consistency. He thought that in the past where projects were this large the Board had reviewed the projects.

Staffmember Chimel agreed staff may have erred on this case given the visibility of the building. She stated that when the remodel portion of a project is this large the project probably should go to the Board.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated he had no problems with special projects having special treatment but the requirements need to be transparent so everyone can see why.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da