

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CITY OF MESA

MINUTES OF THE  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

December 5, 2007

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  
Craig Boswell

MEMBERS ABSENT

Vince DiBella (excused)  
Delight Clark (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

|                    |                      |
|--------------------|----------------------|
| Kim Steadman       | Bob Briggs           |
| John Wesley        | Rick Moore           |
| Lesley Davis       | Martin Sandino       |
| Mia Lozano Helland | Rick Price           |
| Debbie Archuleta   | Jon Bellian          |
| Jennifer Gniffke   | Scott McCaee         |
| Joe Welliver       | Michael Hill         |
| Josh Mike          | Don Nance            |
| Joy Spezeski       | Nate Caine           |
| Diane Ross         | JD Berryman          |
| Richard Dyer       | Charly Carpenter     |
| Erin Justice       | Jeffrey Gustin       |
| Don Cox            | Will Gladbach        |
| Les Partch         | Curtis Krausman      |
| Ernie Newsome      | Vic Shill            |
| Walter Schroeter   | Marilynn Wennerstrom |
| Marji Aron         | Christine McRight    |
| Bill Thompson      | Doug Himmelberger    |
| Blake Thompson     | Others               |

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5,2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

1. Work Session:

**CASE:** Urban Oasis  
715 N Country Club

**REQUEST:** Review of a multi-family residential project

**DISCUSSION:**

The applicants requested the case be continued to the January 2, 2008 work session

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5,2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Arnett Office Warehouse  
3757 E Main

**REQUEST:** Review of a 6,443 sq. ft. retail building

**DISCUSSION:**

The applicant stated this is not a commercial project.

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- The plane should step in and out
- Show the shadow lines on the follow up submittal

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- On the rear elevation only wrap the corners with the wainscot and use the material on the other elevations
- Corner of west elevation seems unresolved
- Maybe vary the height of the wainscot
- Change up the stone
- It is a very marginal building

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Agree he should do more with the front elevation
- More volumes
- More movement of planes
- More vertical volumetric massing

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- If he put up a fence he wouldn't need the wainscot all the way around the rear elevation

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5,2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Riggs Brothers  
3821 E Main

**REQUEST:** Review of two commercial buildings totaling 2,094 sq. ft.

### **DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- CMU wall on three sides

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- The landscape plan and theme should be similar to the Arnett project to the west
- This is a marginal building
- Don't build to the level of the older buildings along Main
- Should be more innovative
- Want to see the monument sign with the follow up submittal
- The way the vehicles are displayed needs to be innovative

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Concern with flatness of the buildings
- The glass should be blue as depicted
- There needs to be more depth in the plane changes
- It looks like a modular building
- The colors could be nice if done well
- The wall along Main should be more imaginative

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5,2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Pecos 77 Business Park  
Eleven office buildings and three industrial buildings totaling 119,072 sq. ft.

**REQUEST:** Review of a

### **DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Doesn't like the tile roof with the other buildings
- The project needs to be cohesive
- As long as the project is done well the applicant should be able to build the style they want
- The buildings are 27'tall and the height limit in industrial districts is 40'
- Doesn't like pine trees in the desert

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Agrees the design should be cohesive
- Likes the asymmetry
- Likes the materials
- Appreciates that the loading zone is between the buildings

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- Likes that the trash enclosures are set so far away from the neighbors

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Submit the site line studies with the follow up submittal

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Acacia in to a screening tree
- Use a different tree along Woodland
- The landscape palette should be compatible with the Pecos Gateway project
- She agreed the buildings should be all modern if that is the style the applicant wants
- Plant trees on the berms
- The line of shrubs in the foundation base is awkward
- The shrubs shown in the landscape islands should be a smaller species

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5,2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Corporate Center Falcon Vista  
5537 E Thomas

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

### **DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Very interesting buildings
- They will look black, white and red
- All three colors should not be so strong
- Likes the building, but not sure this is the right area for it

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Likes the varied portion
- Doesn't like the flat middle portion
- Likes the colors, but not in this area
- Maybe tone down the colors
- Could they use a richer material?
- Too much stucco
- Maybe slate or integral cmu

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- In the upper desert area a hard urban edge building with such bright colors may not be what the neighbors want

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Building is interesting
- Revise the colors
- Landscaping should be grouped more
- Use understory plants
- The placement of the plants is too random
- Lantana should be replaced with something else
- Use Desert Uplands plant list

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5,2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Taco Bell  
2760 South Alma School

**REQUEST:** Review of a raze and rebuild of an existing Taco Bell

**DISCUSSION:**

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Nice building
- Appreciate reinvestment in the area

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- The colors are very strong, they could be dated very quickly

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- They are a little over done
- Do they need the pattern in the faux window panels?

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Don't need the bell inside the faux window

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5,2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Bergeron Engineering  
1159 N Country Club

**REQUEST:** Review of an 8,118 sq. ft. phase 1 and 4,208 sq. ft. phase II office/retail project

### **DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Likes the sails on the old building
- This building is very safe
- Could it be bolder?
- This corner could really make a statement

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- The colors are used in horizontal bands, break them up
- Colors could be more vivid

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- While it is marine use, they need to provide a place for the boats inside
- Concerned with parking boats overnight in the parking lot

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Could they do something related to the boats that makes a statement?

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Concerned the colors may be too muted

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5,2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Greenfield and Main Commercial Development  
4517 E Main

**REQUEST:** Review of a 29,922 sq. ft. commercial building

### **DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- Should have cross access agreements

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Could they eliminate the processed yellow?

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Bright blue and bright yellow don't work with the rest of the color palette
- Doesn't like travertine tile on a building
- Maybe exposed masonry
- Light fixture too modern for the architecture, look for something that goes with the building style

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Lighter creamier yellow
- Don't use the blue
- Doesn't need to match the adjacent shopping center
- Maybe a stone or tile
- Maybe desert sandstone

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5,2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Bank of America  
SWC Signal Butte & Southern

**REQUEST:** Review of a 7,180 sq. ft. bank with drive thru lanes

### **DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Could the building be more modern? It does not have to match the shopping center
- Don't like the cornices, they look fussy
- Use simple modern forms

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- No cornice on columns or above the stone, eliminate the ledge cornices
- May be OK in some places
- Stone columns should be a foot or two taller
- Like the black anodized metal with the charcoal

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Floor plan is prototype but the design is patterned after the Target
- Why is the stucco above the glass so heavy?
- Make the areas with signage pop and be more dominant
- Roof area over the drive-through looks heavy

Staff will provide a color elevation of the Mountain Vista Marketplace for comparison.

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5,2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Hospice Care  
5404 E Southern

**REQUEST:** Review of a 16,400 sq. ft. hospice care facility

### **DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- Concerned with the crickets on the roof

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer:

- Revised entry is better
- The cornice doesn't look right, especially on the higher elements
- Score lines could create embellishments and create a band

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- The sloped roof element needs to be a different plane from the rest of the building

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5,2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Residence Inn  
E of Crismon on south side of Hampton

**REQUEST:** Review of a 6-story hotel

**DISCUSSION:**

The applicant asked that this case be continued to the January 2, 2008 work session

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5,2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

### 2. Call to Order:

Chair Tim Nielsen called the meeting to order at 5:42 p.m.

### 3. Approval of the Minutes of the November 7, and November 16, 2007 Meetings:

On a motion by Craig Boswell seconded by Wendy LeSueur the Board unanimously approved the minutes of the November 7, 2007 meeting.

On a motion by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Wendy LeSueur the Board unanimously approved the minutes of the November 16, 2007 meeting.

### 4. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR07-124 Fiesta Mall FLMS**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 1526 S. Alma School Rd.  
**REQUEST:** Council Use Permit for a 94' Freeway Landmark Monument Sign (FLMS) for the existing Fiesta Mall  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 3  
**OWNER:** Macerich Fiesta Mall Adjacent, LLC – Garrett Newland, Vice President Development, Westcor, a subsidiary of Macerich  
**APPLICANT:** Garrett Newland,  
**ARCHITECT:** Kebin Yu  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Jennifer Gniffke (Planning and Zoning Board process)  
Lesley Davis (Design Review Board process)

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 94' Freeway Landmark Monument Sign

**SUMMARY:** Garrett Newland of Westcor represented the case. Mr. Newland stated that since the work session they had revised the sign so the Fiesta Mall portion was larger.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer said he was good with the sign. He thought the Board should review the Macy's site to see if it is compatible with the sign. He was concerned that the sign should match the new direction the mall is going.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur confirmed the sign was compatible with the updated signage for the mall.

Chair Tim Nielsen liked the design of the sign. He was concerned with the durability of the materials, especially at the splices and weld joints. He stated metal is only as good as the sub-structure behind it.

Mr. Newland stated the sign would be made of EIFS over .125 gauge aluminum.

**MOTION:** It was moved by tom Bottomley and seconded by Craig Boswell that DR07-124 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the basic development of the Freeway Landmark Monument as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan and elevations except as noted below.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Design Review Board.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Building Safety Division with regards to the issuance of building and sign permits.

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR07- 125 Design Guidelines for Waveyard**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** NWC Dobson & 8<sup>th</sup> Street  
**REQUEST:** Approval of Design Guidelines for the Waveyard project  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 1  
**OWNER:** City of Mesa/Maricopa County  
**APPLICANT:** W. Ralph Pew, Pew & Lake, PLC  
**LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT:** Wendell Pickett, Greely Pickett  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Kim Steadman

**REQUEST:** Approval of Design Guidelines for the Waveyard project

**SUMMARY:** The case was removed from the consent agenda by a citizen. Ralph Pew represented the case.

Marilyn Wennerstrom stated she didn't wish to speak; she simply wanted an explanation from the applicant of what this was about.

Mr. Pew stated the guidelines would control the design of future submittals for the Waveyard Project. He stated that Waveyard would be a very large project with multiple design themes. He stated the intent of the guidelines was not to be static and rigid but to assist the future applicants to design high quality proposals within Waveyard. He explained there would be a Waveyard Design Committee that would review and approve all applications before they are submitted to the City and the any advisory Boards. Mr. Pew stated the applicants felt very strongly that the multiple design themes needed to remain. He understood the site plan was not being reviewed or approved with this application. He stated this was the first step and they expect to revise, improve, and enhance the guidelines. He also stated the Board would see very early on in the process how the plans would integrate.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was concerned with the site planning, the style issue and how Polynesian, Cop Cod and the style of Florence Italy could come together. He stated these styles could be taken very literally or quite loosely.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur thought these were design directions not guidelines. A lot was still in flux.

Chair Tim Nielsen thought this was a great start for design framework.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Craig Boswell that DR07-125 be approved with the following conditions and the understanding that this is a work in progress:

1. Compliance with Z07-35 (Ord. 4707)
2. Future Design Review Approval of individual projects within the Waveyard Development.

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR07-126**      **Plaza Tapatia**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**      **603 & 619 E Broadway**  
**REQUEST:**                      Approval of a commercial shopping center. Two existing residence buildings will be demolished and one existing commercial building (2,740 s.f.) will be remodeled with an addition of 10,082 s.f.  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**      District 4  
**OWNER:**                              Plaza Tapatia  
**APPLICANT:**                      Tony Tang  
**ARCHITECT:**                      Tony Tang  
**STAFF PLANNER:**              Lesley Davis

**REQUEST:** Approval of a commercial shopping center. Two existing residence buildings will be demolished and one existing commercial building (2,740 s.f.) will be remodeled with an addition of 10,082 s.f.

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

**MOTION:** It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-126 be approved with the following conditions:

3. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
  - a. Revise the elevations to identify paint color locations consistent with the color elevations provided.
  - b. Either internalize the building downspouts on the south elevation or provide a more decorative downspout painted a single neutral building color.
  - c. Mechanical/HVAC units must be fully screened by the parapets per §11-15-4 of the Zoning Ordinance.
4. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Solid Waste and Facilities Division and Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Utilities, etc.)
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 painted to match the building with screen walls on the sides that also tie in with 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    5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR07-127 Hampton Building**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 7538 E Hampton  
**REQUEST:** Approval of a 32,006 sq. ft. office/retail building  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 6  
**OWNER:** V.L. Shill  
**APPLICANT:** Victor Shill  
**ARCHITECT:** Victor Shill  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Jennifer Gniffke

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 32,006 sq. ft. office/retail building

**SUMMARY:** The case was removed from the consent agenda. Victor Shill and Tom Schultz represented the case.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley was concerned with the proportion of the arches. He thought they should be raised two feet, and that the thickness above the arch should be increased by two feet.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer agreed with Boardmember Bottomley's comments. He thought the changes would enhance the building.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR07-127 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 the code-required foundation base along the north side of the building.
  - b. Work with staff to revise the proportions of the arches by raising the arch and or the parapet.
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.
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 DECEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR07- 128 Baywood Two Professional Offices**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 6147 East Main Street  
**REQUEST:** Approval of four office buildings totaling 42,122 sq. ft.  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 5  
**OWNER:** Michael Hamberlin  
**APPLICANT:** Les Partch  
**ARCHITECT:** Les Partch  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Josh Mike

**REQUEST:** Approval of four office buildings totaling 42,122 sq. ft.

**SUMMARY:** The case was removed from the consent agenda by an adjacent neighbor.

Les Partch represented the case. Mr. Partch explained the parcel would be raised up 3' to bring it level with the curb at Main.

Walter Schroeter then spoke and stated that raising the level of the land would block the view of his building. He also stated the applicant was proposing an Oak tree at the northwest end of the project, which would block the view of his sign. He requested that tree not be used. Staff member Kim Steadman stated the tree could be moved; however, it could not be removed.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought that mobbing the tree could help.

Boardmember Craig Boswell confirmed that the visibility would be blocked for traffic driving westbound on Main.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Wendy LeSueur that DR07-128 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. Addition of a pedestrian path from Building 4 to the east building of the development to the south. The surface is to be decorative across drive aisles.
  - b. Work with staff to revise the landscape plan to provide visibility for the monument sign for the adjacent project.
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

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 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, T<sup>2</sup> 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:** No one was present to represent the case. The Board waited until the end of the agenda to see if anyone arrived to represent the case; however, no one did.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-129 be approved with the following conditions:

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR07- 130      Springhill Suites**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**      10309 E. Hampton Avenue  
**REQUEST:**                      Approval of an 83,328 sq. ft. hotel  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**      District 6  
**OWNER:**                          Jas Khangura  
**APPLICANT:**                  Elisabeth Hunt  
**ARCHITECT:**                  Jim Allred, TAAG Architects  
**STAFF PLANNER:**          Kim Steadman

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 6-story, 83,328 sq. ft. hotel

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

**MOTION:** It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-130 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. The materials and finishes have not been adequately identified. Provide a revised 11x17 color board with paint chips, manufacturer, and ID number for each material/finish. Provide cut sheets and finish information for lighting fixtures.
  - b. Revise the elevation drawings to show sandstone at the entry. The Board requested more than just a low wainscot. DR staff to review and approve.
  - c. Staff review and approval will be required for any revision to the design of the cantilevered canopy.
  - d. Fully recess the SES into the building, or provide an architectural surround. DR staff to review and approve.
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.

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR07-131 Superstition Canyon**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 9565 E Southern  
**REQUEST:** Approval of a 201,640 sq. ft., 200 unit apartment project  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 6  
**OWNER:** George Tibsherany  
**APPLICANT:** Don Cox  
**ARCHITECT:** Lawrence W. Pepper  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Joe Welliver

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 200 unit apartment complex

**SUMMARY:** The case was removed from the consent agenda. Don Cox represented the case.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought the elevations looked dated and unimaginative. He thought they were too repetitive and bland, and needed more variety. He thought the building looked stripy and stacked. He also thought the roof design needed variety. He suggested using an additional material. He stated the 2-story units were not so bad, but the 3-story units really looked stacked. He thought the 3-story units needed different balcony treatments.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer supported Boardmember Bottomley's comments. He agreed the project was not highly innovative, or imaginative. He thought it was a marginal project, but the question was, was it good enough. He confirmed the retail and office would be coming to the Design Review Board at a future meeting. He questioned why the building was only stucco. He suggested using pre-cast concrete pieces.

Chair Tim Nielsen stated that at the work session the project had two different styles and the applicant had revised that as directed by the Board. He thought the Board needed to give the applicant specific direction for changes.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Tom Bottomley seconded by Craig Boswell that DR07- 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. Queen Palms are to be used only within the pool area.
  - b. Provide color of pre-cast concrete cap & stucco wall for Staff review and approval.
  - c. Provide color of pre-cast concrete cap, stucco column and steel tube for Staff review and approval.
  - d. Work with Design Review staff to introduce additional material for all buildings.
  - e. Work with Design Review staff to provide variety for the railing and balcony

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

design on the 3-story buildings.

- f. Look at pre-cast piece at the base of the buildings, but not as a wainscot all the way around.
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 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR07-132 Gateway Bank**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 6860 E Warner  
**REQUEST:** Approval of a 5,705 sq. ft. bank  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 6  
**OWNER:** GCB Investment Properties  
**APPLICANT:** JD Berryman, K & I Architects  
**ARCHITECT:** Kristjan Sigurdson  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Joy Spezeski

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 5,705 sq. ft. bank

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

**MOTION:** It was moved by and seconded by that DR07-132 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 type of glass used for windows
  - b. Design Review Staff to review and approve details for the entry awning piece
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. Approval of a Site Plan Modification to accommodate the proposed site plan.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket *and painted green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half-size color elevations, revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR07-133 Gateway Commerce Center**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 7551 E Pecos  
**REQUEST:** Approval of three industrial buildings totaling 102,265 sq. ft.  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 6  
**OWNER:** Buttrum Westside Commerce Center  
**APPLICANT:** Michael Hill  
**ARCHITECT:** Scott Neiss  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Joshua Mike, Planner I

**REQUEST:** Approval of three industrial buildings totaling 102,265 sq. ft.

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

Boardmember Tom Bottomley had concerns with the colors as represented on the elevations. He was OK with the colors on the color board.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-133 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 lighting cut sheets. Fixtures need to be an architectural fixture that enhances the elevations.
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 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR07- 134 Addition to Clearview Business Park**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 1529 S. Clearview Ave.

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 6,244 s.f. addition to a previously approved 18,688 s.f. industrial building.

**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District

**OWNER:** Homeland Development I, LLC

**APPLICANT:** Tom Schultz

**ARCHITECT:** Victor Lamar Shill

**STAFF PLANNER:** Lesley Davis

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 6,244 sq. ft. addition to a previously approved industrial building

**SUMMARY:** The case was removed from the consent agenda. Victory Shill and Tom Schultz represented the case.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley confirmed the addition would match what was already approved. He was concerned that the building looked flat. Mr. Shill showed the Board a rendering of a building in Gilbert that is the same design.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR07-134 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Solid Waste and Facilities Division and Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Utilities, 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, 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

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR07-135 Gateway Airport Commerce Park**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 7361 S. 89<sup>th</sup> Pl.

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 10,831 s.f. office / warehouse building

**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 6

**OWNER:** A. Brent Payne

**APPLICANT:** Tim Rasnake, Archicon, L.C.

**ARCHITECT:** Jere Planck, Archicon, L.C.

**STAFF PLANNER:** Lesley Davis

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 10,831 sq. ft. office/warehouse building

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

**MOTION:** It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-135 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Solid Waste and Facilities Division and Development Services Department (Engineering, Transportation, Utilities, 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, 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

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR07-136**    **Compass Bank**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**    **8355 E. Guadalupe Rd.**  
**REQUEST:**                    Approval of a 3,595 s.f. bank with five drive-thru lanes.  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**        District 6  
**OWNER:**                      Compass Bank  
**STAFF PLANNER:**         Lesley Davis

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 3,595 sq. ft. bank with five drive-thru lanes

**SUMMARY:** Robert Alexander represented the case. Mr. Alexander agreed to move the screen wall and group the trees.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought there should be a 2' to 3' overhang. He also thought the downspouts needed to be eliminated or be decorative rather than the standard downspouts depicted. He preferred the red roof. He thought the landscaping needed to be designed.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley agreed the downspouts looked tacked on. He preferred concealing them, but thought they could be used if they were within a pilaster. He thought the arch element needed to be raised on both sides of the building. He thought the curved wall should be broken up and stepped back.

Chair Tim Nielsen agreed the building needed an overhang. He stated the overhang would provide a shadow line and eliminate the need for the gutter. He thought the stone archway should be engaged to come up above the roofline. He stated downspouts are very difficult in Arizona.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur agreed that raising the arch element would look nice.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Wendy LeSueur that DR07-136 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. Landscaping must be in conformance with requirements established in Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance. This includes the number of plant materials and size of areas to be provided for plants.
  - b. Ensure that the proposed attached fixture will enhance the elevations and that "Cool White" is the appropriate color choice for the fixture.
  - c. Scream lines around the building to be consistent with the pattern provided for the windows to provide additional interest for blank areas.
  - d. Revise the landscape plan to meet code and provide a more designed approach with a less random placement of the plant material. Also provide better massing of plant materials to accent the entry to the building.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- e. Building downspouts need to be architecturally integrated with the design.
  - f. **Revise the roofline to create a 2' overhang.**
  - g. **Resolve the conflict with downspouts and gutters.**
  - h. **Increase the height of the flat arched stone walls to engage the roof.**
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 design of the monument sign must comply with the Design Guidelines and be consistent with existing signage within the adjacent development.
  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 and roof access ladders are to be located within the building. SES is to be internal or recessed and painted to match 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 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR07-137 Primrose School**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2710 S. Crismon Rd.**

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 10,540 s.f. (GFA) pre-school and childcare facility.

**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 6

**OWNER:** Primrose Franchising Company

**APPLICANT:** Curtis Krausman, P.E.

**ARCHITECT:** David Boyce

**STAFF PLANNER:** Lesley Davis

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 10,540 sq. ft. pre-school and childcare facility

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

**MOTION:** It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-137 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
  - a. Provide a landscape plan that indicates all plant material proposed within the fenced areas. Compliance with all requirements established in §11-15-3(C) 2 of the Zoning Ordinance is required unless otherwise approved with a variance from the Zoning Administrator or Board of Adjustment.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Solid Waste and Facilities Division and Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Utilities, etc.)
4. Design of the trash enclosures, gates, parking lot lighting and pedestrian paths must match what has been previously approved for the overall center.
5. Chain link fencing is not permitted.
6. 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.
7. 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.*)
8. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
9. 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 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 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:** Approval of a 3,145 sq. ft. car wash, a 9,800 sq. ft. service and retail building, and a 12,000 service building

**SUMMARY:** This case was placed on the consent agenda for continuance

**MOTION:** It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-138 be continued:

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR07-139 Golden Corral**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 963 N. Dobson Rd. (West Bass Pro Dr.)  
**REQUEST:** Approval of a 11,634 sq. ft. restaurant  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 1  
**OWNER:** DeRito Kimco  
**APPLICANT:** Alison Jowers, Carter & Burgess, Inc.  
**ARCHITECT:** Glen Lehmann, LMHT Assoc.  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Kim Steadman

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 11,634 sq. ft. restaurant

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

**MOTION:** It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR07-139 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. Rooftop mechanical units must be fully screened by parapets that are as tall as the tallest unit. Please revise the parapet height or specify a low-profile mechanical unit.
  - b. Screen the gas service line by running it inside the building.
  - c. Run downspouts inside the building, and provide screening for the open scuppers. Staff to review and approve.
  - d. Fully recess the SES (the electrical service entrance section) or provide architectural surround. The utility company does not allow landscape screening of these devices. Staff to review and approve.
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 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 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:** Approval of a 56,131 sq. ft. manufacturing building

**SUMMARY:** Nick Tsontakis represented the case. He stated he did not want to revise the retention to meet the requirement that the basin be organic. He was willing to provide control joints in patterns to break up the elevations.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley wanted strong reveals rather than screed lines. He suggested leaving some of the building cmu. He thought the arrangement of the windows on the EPM building was awkward. He confirmed the rotunda would not have curved glass.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the drawings were very sketchy; there was no scale shown, no building height, and no materials. He wanted to know if there would be lights on the buildings, if the glass would be in or out. He also wanted to see a detail of the canopy. He thought the building had very large blank walls.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur wanted to know what the canopies were made; what the glass would be. She stated it did not appear they had met the landscape requirements. She was concerned with the mixed landscape plans. They were showing some desert plants and some lush plants. She thought they needed more shrubs and ground cover. She wanted the landscape plan to be designed not randomly dropped plants.

Boardmember Craig Boswell thought the building could be interesting but thought the Board needed more details to understand what was happening.

Chair Tim Nielsen suggested butt-glazed glass. He agreed the Board needed more details.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Craig Boswell that DR07-140 be continued to the January 2, 2008 meeting:

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

### Appeals of Administrative Design Review:

**CASE #: ADR07-77**

2838 N Omaha

**REQUEST:** Approval of a sign

**SUMMARY:** Staff member Lesley Davis explained the sign does not meet the 2 to 1 ratio; therefore the Board has to review it. She stated staff thinks the sign is creative and attractive.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Craig Boswell and seconded by Wendy LeSueur that ADR07-77 be approved as submitted:

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: ADR07-79**

TCF Bank – 5958 E McKellips

**REQUEST:** Revision of the tower height and the glass color

**SUMMARY:** Staff member Lesley Davis stated the glass submitted by the applicant was what was approved with the original case. She explained the applicant was asking for an increase in the tower height to 34'.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur thought the tower looked too tall at 32'.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer agreed they would prefer the tower be even lower than the 32' originally approved.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley thought the sign proportions were too even on the 34' tower. He preferred the 32'.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that the request for the tower height increase ADR07-79 be denied:

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

### **CASE #: ADR07-89**

Sports Authority - Riverview

**REQUEST:** Approval of a change in color for the entry tower feature from the Red in the approved Riverview paint palette to their prototype red.

**SUMMARY:** Doug Himmelberger represented the case. Staff member Kim Steadman explained the applicant's had provided elevations showing the color as conditioned by the Board and the color they were requesting. They had also provided a photo of a store in Phoenix with the red they were requesting. Mr. Himmelberger stated there are bold colors on the pad buildings along Dobson.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur thought the colors of the center were nicer than they appear on the elevation provided.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was concerned that if they Board did not approve the change the applicant would simply appeal to Council, and Council would approve the color. He thought the Board needed to be careful what battles they choose to fight.

Chair Tim Nielsen thought the Board needed to be consistent. He stated he really liked the colors and design of Riverview and was concerned that the City keeps coming down in expectation for the Riverview project.

Boardmember Craig Boswell thought the red on the drawing was a lot less intense than the red in the photo.

After lengthy discussion on how the Board could work with the applicant to compromise on the color change.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by tom Bottomley that ADR07-89 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Work with staff on the design of a floating panel of color behind the goal posts with a neutral color from the approved Riverview palette on the tower of the building.

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Other Business:

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

The presentation was continued to the January 2, 2008 at Mr. Sheffield's request.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta  
Planning Assistant

da