

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
NOVEMBER 3, 2004

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Lower Level of the Council Chambers 57 East First Street, at 3:45 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman	Stefan Richter
Lesley Davis	Virginia Marquardt
Debbie Archuleta	Ellery Brown
Charlie Scully	Douglas Brimhall
John Wesley	Peter Bober
Amy Vieth	Sheldon Shaw
Glenn Anderson	Ed Hansen
Philip Spiller	Scott Hesse
Brent Henderson	Gary Brown
John Vitale	Korey Wilkes
Raymond Rychly	Krista Herring
Robert Pizorno	Robert Comsoni
Shirley Bender	Allen Wilis
Jerry Davis	Tim Rasnake
Philip Hawtin	Barry Barcus
Bob Saemisch	Todd Tranor
Rick Cartell	Others

MEMBERS ABSENT

1. Call to Order:

Chair Pete Berzins called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the October 6, 2004 Meeting:

On a motion by Tim Nielsen seconded by Vince DiBella the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

3. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-79 **Sportsman's Warehouse**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: West of the SWC US60 and Greenfield
REQUEST: Approval of a 50,000 sq. ft. retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Lumberjack Capital
APPLICANT: Liz Gaston
ARCHITECT: Jim Larson, Larson Associates
 Glenn Anderson, GA Architect, L.C.

REQUEST: Approval of a 50,000 sq. ft. retail building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Randy Carter that DR04-79 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
5. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
6. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04- 81 **Walgreen's**
ADDRESS: 6002 East Main Street
LOCATION: NEC of Main and Recker
REQUEST: Develop new Walgreen's drugstore
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Aric Browne, Manager, Ethan Christopher Arizona LLC
APPLICANT: Tracy Follmer, The Pederson Group
ARCHITECT: Sheldon Shaw, RKA

REQUEST: Approval of a 14,560 sq. ft. Walgreen's drug store

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Randy Carter that DR04-81 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 submitted to Design Review staff for approval at least one week prior to submitting for building permits:
 - a. Provide a revised landscape plan in conformance with Chapter 15 standards for foundation base, including minimum number of trees and minimum foundation base area and landscaping for all elevations, including along the drive-through lane and rear service elevation.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department, (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.).
4. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
5. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building, unless modifications are approved by the Design Review Board.
6. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size set of design plans, and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project will be an attractive addition to the shopping center.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-84 **Queen of Heaven**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1500 E Baseline
REQUEST: Approval of a 8,967 sq. ft. mortuary facility
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: The Catholic Cemeteries of the Phoenix Diocese
APPLICANT: Gary Brown
ARCHITECT: Peter Vesecky, PE, RLS

REQUEST: Approval of a 8,967 sq. ft. mortuary facility

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Peter Vesecky and Gary Brown represented the case.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed the maximum height of the roof would be 30 and the spire can go to 36'. He thought the north elevation was very plain and wondered why they didn't use stone on that elevation.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed there were reveals in the stucco to add shade and shadow.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen agreed some elevations were lacking and thought the color scheme was monotonous. She thought there should be additional colors on the north and west elevations.

Boardmember Randy Carter thought the building needed a little more character. He was concerned that the fascia was all at one level. He suggested using an additional color at the fascia, detailing at the windows, and a deeper wainscot. He also thought there should be more detailing around the windows. He wanted the fascia on the sanctuary to match the rest of the building. He was concerned that the fascia on the upper roof did not match the lower roof. He recommended that the applicant use the same cornice on the higher portion as was proposed on the lower.

Chair Pete Berzins confirmed the arched glass area on the north would be regular glass. Mr. Brown stated that they were trying to blend the building with the rest of the cemetery. They wanted the building to be understated. Chair Berzins preferred the color on the rendering to the color on the material board. Mr. Brown stated the color matched the mausoleum.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR04-84 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications:
 - a. Revise the landscape plan to show existing landscaping along Baseline Road so staff can verify compliance with the minimum requirement of 2 trees and 6 shrubs for every 25' of street frontage per section 11-15-3 of the

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance.

- b. **Review the west and north elevations, provide additional stone work or color**
 - c. **Provide an additional, stronger color to the color palette.**
 - d. **The fascia on the upper portion of the roof should match the lower fascia.**
 - e. **Add Detailing around the windows, pop-outs or recess the windows.**
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 to match the primary building color.
 6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
 7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 - 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-89 **Retail Building**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1152 E Broadway
REQUEST: Approval of a 1,960 sq. ft. retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: Kenneth Crane, PLS Financial
APPLICANT: Tim Rasnake, Archicon
ARCHITECT: Jere Planck

REQUEST: Approval of a 1,960 sq. ft. retail building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Randy Carter that DR04-89 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 (**all details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review Staff**):
 - f. Provide additional a band at the bottom of the EIFS area (specified as paint color "Traditional Tan") above the storefront that steps in from the fascia to break that plane.
 - g. Revise the suspended metal canopies to provide additional interest and shade by widening them and increasing the depth of the canopies over the entrances and adding supports that match the ones over the service doors.
 - h. Incorporate additional detailing on the east and west elevation on the portion of the building that is 20' high with decorative tile in a pattern that mimics the square detail at the support for the suspended metal canopies.
 - i. Provide a cap for the stone wainscot.
 - j. Provide a decorative metal trellis or trellises with vines on the west and east elevations to break up the large blank wall.
 - k. Replace and landscaping that has died or is not thriving.
 - l. Revise the leader box detail to be a square to match the square support detail for the suspended metal awnings.
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 Real Estate Services for the extinguishment or abandonment of the alley way shown as part of this development.
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 to match the primary building color.

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
8. Provide two half size color elevations, two half size black and white elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: Although there were minor concerns with the design of the building elevations, the Board felt that the building design was reasonable for such a small building.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-91	Zahara at Las Sendas
LOCATION/ADDRESS:	NWC Power Road and Thomas Road
MAJOR CROSS STREETS:	Power and Thomas
SUMMARY OF REQUEST:	Site Plan Modification for nine building Office Development
COUNCIL DISTRICT:	District 5
OWNER:	Towne Centre, LLC
APPLICANT:	Philip Gelb
ARCHITECT:	Erik Peterson, Peterson Architecture & Associates

REQUEST: Approval of a nine office building totaling 49,500 sq. ft.

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Neighbors John Vitale and Shirley Bender spoke regarding the case. Mr. Vitale thought there should be berms along the north property line so the offices could not look into the school. He also wanted this applicant to install raised medians with landscaping along Thomas Road. He thought traffic was an issue and wanted a minimal number of driveways onto Thomas. He thought the City should have strongly encouraged the applicant to buy the property to the west. Shirley Bender was upset that the project is named Zahara at Las Sendas because the project is not in Las Sendas. She was also concerned with the driveway on Thomas. She thought having a median would help but then she was concerned that people would make a "u-turn" at Rafriver. She wanted the traffic to enter and exit onto Power.

Krista Herring and Philip Gellen represented the case. Ms. Herring stated the offices were proposing a view fence so the people on the school property can look up at the building instead of a solid wall. She stated berming would be provided. Mr. Gellen stated the access from Thomas had been worked out during the Planning and Zoning process. Ms. Herring stated they were willing to add additional colors to the buildings; the towers could be taller of the Board wanted; and they were also willing to put canopies over the main entries. Ms. Herring stated they wanted the buildings to be cohesive, which was why there were so few color changes.

Boardmember Vince DiBella thought the rendering looked nicer than the elevations. He wondered why the raised stone parapet was so high when there was no mechanical equipment inside the tower to hide. He preferred the eaves on the rendering.

Boardmember Randy Carter did not think the project did justice to the Red Mountain neighborhood or Dessert Uplands. The buildings were absolutely rectangular and the windows were ill-proportioned. The window locations and sizes were a concern because desks would be visible through the glass because they would be placed against windows with cords hanging between the desk and the window. He thought the building materials were nice, but were not used well. He stated the clerestory towers should be a nice lobby entrance, and should be expressed to the outside of the building. There were some doors on three sides of the buildings, so did that mean there would be three tenants? He stated that Red Mountain and Las Sendas are very natural and the layout of this project was too urban and too rigid. He wanted to see deviations in the buildings, less stone, more architecture. He stated it would be very difficult to have exam rooms with the glass window as shown.

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed the window mullions would be bronze. He thought the tower cap should be as wide as the parapet. He thought the building massing should move in and out. He thought the buildings were too static, he suggested they should be staggered or juxtaposed. He confirmed the tower windows would be small clerestory and from the interior you would see the backside of the parapet. He thought there should be more color variation.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen stated the buildings are the same, so that makes the project cohesive. They should have a variety of colors and materials. The tower breaks up the ridgeline so they don't need the parapet in front of it because they compete with each other. She thought the whole piece should be redesigned. She confirmed the storm water retention would be located underground. She thought the north side of project could have more berming. There is a retaining wall on the school site; the applicant would be adding another wall with the view fence. Mr. Gellen stated the site drops 13' from east to west so each building step down. Boardmember Hagen stated additional trees are required along the north property line. She thought the tree choice was appropriate. She confirmed the mechanical units were behind the towers.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed the placement and design of the covered parking.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the site plan was too rigid. He did not think all nine buildings should be the same. He stated the whole tower element should be redesigned. The buildings were very square or rectangular. He confirmed that the northern driveway along Power Road existed. He thought the view fence was a better choice than a solid wall, but wanted input from the adjacent school. He suggested 36' box trees used along the north, next to the school. He agreed a median was needed in Thomas Road. He thought the project should have more variation of colors and materials. He thought the fascia line to come down. He agreed the windows were badly designed for an office project. Where would the desks and cords go? He did not want this office project or the property to the west to have egress to Raffriver. He thought the colors were nice.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR04-91 be continued.

Continued to the December 1, 2004 meeting.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: To allow the applicant to redesign the project.

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

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-93 **Broadway 101 Commerce Park**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC Dobson & Broadway
REQUEST: Approval of a 78.25 acre commerce park
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: Broadway 101 Venture LLC
APPLICANT: Butler Design Group
ARCHITECT: Jeffrey Cutberth

REQUEST: Approval of a 52.62 acre commerce park

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Scott Haas and Kory Wilkes represented the case.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer liked the elevations; however, he thought the entire project was very industrial looking. He thought the project was a mixed use of office and industrial. He thought the site plan was too regimented. Staffmember Laura Hyneman explained that the project is located in an area, which is designated as "General Industrial" on the General Plan. The project is not located in an area designated as "Business Park" which suggests the site should be developed as a campus. The "industrial look" of the project conforms to the General Plan. The applicant explained project was planned for flex industrial. The offices along Broadway would be support offices for industrial businesses. Retail uses would be limited to 10,000 sq. ft. per building and 50,000 for the entire project. They anticipated retail uses would be furniture manufacturing or flooring with sales and display from the front of the building and warehouse/distribution in the rear.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen appreciated the landscaping along Broadway. He wanted the step up at the corner to be higher to break up the roofline. He thought the white service doors would get very dirty. The applicant was concerned with making the building too tall. They did not want to paint the doors to match the building because the doors come with in durable prefinished white color, which will be easily seen by the delivery trucks.

Boardmember Randy Carter thought the pop up in the parapet should be raised 1' to 2'.

Boardmember Dave Richins was excited to see this project on this site. He agreed the corners should be raised. He did not want to see safety yellow bollards at the doors. The applicant agreed they did not want yellow. He questioned whether they were planning to use the rail spur. The applicants stated they would have to work with the railroad. Boardmember Richins liked the landscape plan. He would like to see landscaping in the median along Broadway.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Dave Richins that DR04-93 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications:
 - a. Chain link fence to be replaced with wrought iron or masonry when the

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

adjacent building is constructed.

- b. Increase the height by 1' to 2' of the end caps and the center portion of the buildings facing Broadway.
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 to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers 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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: 2 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04- 62 **Amberwood Development Office Building**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 4300 E. Brown Rd. W of NWC of Greenfield and Brown
REQUEST: Approval for Amberwood Office Development
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Amberwood Homes
APPLICANT: Allen Willis
ARCHITECT: Edwin Nickerson

REQUEST: Approval of two office building 5,892 sq. ft. and 6,720 sq. ft.

SUMMARY: Alan Wilkes represented the case.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen liked the enhancements and changes made after the previous submittal. He suggested varying the stone to break up the horizontality of the buildings. He suggested score lines in the stucco. He also suggested taking the stone from the rear and using it to enhance the front entrance.

Boardmember Randy Carter thought this project fit into the neighborhood. He confirmed the darker color would be used on the wood pop-outs and verified that the rear arched pop-out was not stone. He thought there should be some integration between this project and the Greenfield medical/dental project. He suggested sharing the fascia detail. He thought the roof fascia should be a cornice. He acknowledged the two projects had similar materials but the buildings had dramatically different designs; he thought the building should be integrated.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the stone that would not be seen on the rear sides of the buildings should be used on the entrance features. He suggested a darker paint color for the recessed area where there was no wainscot. He thought this site and the other two parcels should have had design guidelines. He wondered how the corner property would ever fit between these two projects. He confirmed the A/C units would be ground mounted and screened by landscaping. He thought the units to be screened with a masonry wall.

Chair Pete Berzins confirmed that Boardmember Burgheimer thought the applicant could remove the stone from the rear of the building and use it to enhance the front.

It was suggested the stone wrap around to the second window, to the break in the roof or to the screen wall at the A/C units.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen didn't know how to make the landscape plans for this project and Greenfield Medical/Dental cohesive. Currently, the thing tying them together was the Ficus along the residential properties. She thought the plants throughout the site should be the same. The trees were shown in a grove effect. Staffmember Laura Hyneman was concerned that they were proposing Desert Willow, which is not a grove tree rather than the ornamental fruit tree suggested by the architect the week before. The Design Review Board at previous meetings had suggested using citrus.

At that point Doug Brimhall, applicant for the Greenfield Medical/Dental project spoke. He stated that on his project they had looked at using flowering pear trees but had gone back to the Desert Willow they had shown originally. Mr. Wilkes asked for a suggestion to replace the Desert Willow. Boardmember Hagen suggested using Texas Ebony. She suggested using the oaks and punctuating the entries with the orchid trees. She stated the style of the walls

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

and the caps should be the same.

Dave Richins thought the building on its own was nice. He was concerned that it was so different from the other project on this corner.

Chair Pete Berzins appreciated the applicant's diligence.

MOTION: It was moved by Jillian Hagen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR04-62 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 submitted to Design Review staff for approval at least one week prior to submitting for building permits:
 - a. Coordinate the landscape plan, screen walls, monument sign and ground cover material with the Greenfield Medical/ Dental Office project (DR04-75) to ensure a complimentary design for the group commercial center.
 - b. **Revise the rear elevation to terminate the stone at the roofline break or the A/C screen wall.**
 - c. **Use color to differentiate between the façade faces.**
 - d. **On the front elevation provide an additional color for the pop-out pieces or continue the stone up to differentiate those.**
 - e. **Provide screen walls around the A/C units.**
 - f. **Revise the landscape design so the grove trees are Texas Ebony. The parking lot trees to be mostly live oak with orchid trees used as accents for the entry points.**
 - g. **The site walls are to be as shown with differing stone and paint colors from the Greenfield Medical/Dental project (DR04-75); however, the cap and the column pieces are to match that 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. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
5. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
6. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size set of design plans, 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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is reasonably well designed and similar to Greenfield Medical/Dental.

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Recorded on Tape No.: 2 (side A)

CASE #: DR04-75 **Greenfield Medical/Dental Office**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1244 North Greenfield
REQUEST: Approval of an 8,000 sq. ft. medical/dental office building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Greenfield Medical & Dental LLC
APPLICANT: Douglas Brimhall
ARCHITECT: Douglas Brimhall

REQUEST: Approval of an 8,000 sq. ft. medical/dental office building

SUMMARY: Doug Brimhall represented the case.

Boardmember Randy Carter thought the building was fine. He stated the parapet would be required to be high enough to hide the roof-mounted mechanical equipment.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen liked the building. He was concerned with the landscaping integrating with the Amberwood project.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen stated she thought the grove effect should be created with a double row of Texas Ebony. She confirmed the roofline had been corrected since the original proposal.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed there would be at least 6" difference between the wall planes and at the stone portions there would be a 2" pop-out with stone caps. The masonry returns had been widened from 16" to 24".

Boardmember Randy Carter thought the stone columns should be widened.

Chair Pete Berzins thought it would be very difficult for the corner owner to tie into these two other projects.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR04-75 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 submitted to Design Review staff for approval at least one week prior to submitting for building permits:
 - a. Coordinate landscape, site walls, groundcover, signs, etc. with the office project currently under review (Amberwood; DR04-62) in the same group commercial development.
 - b. Reconfigure stone elements to eliminate "spindly" forms.
 - c. The parking canopy at the rear should be pulled back at least one space on each end to allow room for tree growth. A landscape island containing at least one tree and three shrubs should be shown at the end of each row of parking.

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- d. Ensure that the storefront and window frame systems are shown as dark bronze anodized and not clear anodized.
 - e. Ensure that the roof scupper outflow will be deposited onto a splash block, cistern, or appropriate hard surface and not onto landscaping, ground cover or pedestrian areas.
 - f. **Change the grove trees to Texas Ebony.**
 - g. **Provide Live Oak trees in the parking lot.**
 - h. **The site walls to be consistent with Amberwood (DR04-62).**
 - i. **The entry monuments to be consistent with Amberwood (DR04-62).**
 - j. **Modify the south and west elevations at the entrance points to a minimum of 14" thick.**
 - k. **The two base colors to be the same on both projects. Coyote Paw and Slopes.**
 - l. **The spindly forms to be at least 18" outside of the stone to the outside of stone.**
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
 3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department, (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.).
 4. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
 5. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building, unless modifications are approved by the Design Review Board.
 6. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size set of design plans, 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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is reasonably well designed and is similar to Amberwood Development.

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

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-85 **Bank One**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC Southern & Crismon
REQUEST: Approval of a 4,494 sq. ft. bank
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Southern & Crismon Property II Ltd. Partnership
APPLICANT: Paul Gilbert
ARCHITECT: John Szafran

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,494 sq. ft. bank

SUMMARY: Robert Pizorno, Todd Train, Ed Hanson represented the case. They stated they agreed to staff conditions. They stated they would prefer to have a parapet on the drive through.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed the building proposed was the standard Bank One prototype. He was concerned that with the strong color of the roof and the brick. He felt it would be very difficult for the other three pad sites to develop anything that was compatible with this building. The applicant explained the few changes from the prototype: the flat entry façade, the hipped roof at the drive through, and the brick columns at the drive through. Additionally, the wall that ties the curved wall into the main building usually is not brick. Boardmember Carter thought the fascia was too thin for the roof and the walls were too tall. These proportions make it look like a box with a blue roof. He confirmed the blue roof was a prototype.

Boardmember Dave Richins also thought the building looked boxy and blue. He felt the roof color was a sign.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the floor plan was OK. He stated a simple building is OK. He confirmed, however, the design was client driven. He stated the proportion of the building to roof was to equal so it appeared too tall. The flat entry parapet was the wrong detail because it needed to break the fascia - and be either shorter or taller. He understood the curve was important to the client, but the proportion was wrong.

He suggested introducing the curve at the window to tie the entry to the building. He thought the 14' fascia was too tall. He suggested using a 3 and 12 roof pitch and pulling the roof fascia down so it has more of a brow. The 2' overhang should be at least 4'. He agreed the "ladrillo grande" brick is a wonderful material, but the lights are not doing anything to enhance the building. He suggested they use a soldier course, sailor course, or a Flemish bond to play with light and shadow. He thought the eave should be metal to match the roof. He confirmed the roof would be standing seam. He was concerned with how the plumbing vents would look in the roof plane. He asked the applicant to show them on the next submittal. He suggested using a ridge vent to break up the roof. He thought the flat section at the top of the roof was odd. Additionally, the 10'-8" high windows were too tall. He stated they could introduce low screen walls in stucco to help express some verticality at the base of the building. He confirmed the windows would be clear glass with bronze anodized framing. He did not like the stucco color with the brick colors.

Boardmember Vince DiBella liked the building materials. He thought the applicant should pull details from the church and the post office.

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Jillian Hagen thought the roof massing was wrong. She preferred the arched stucco element but not at the proportions proposed. She stated the retention area was flat, she suggested berming. She thought there should be a natural looking undulating ground plane.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen agreed with previous comments. He liked the drive though design. However, he thought the fascia was too thin. He liked the brick material but wanted them to do something interesting like a soldier course or rowlock. He stated the curved appendage didn't tie into the rest of the building. He thought the inset at the entrance should be brick.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR04-85 be continued to the December 1, 2004:

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

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

Recorded on Tape No.: 3 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04- 86 **Discount Tire**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: S. of the SWC of Power and McKellips
REQUEST: Development of a 7,853 sq. ft. Discount Tire store.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Hale Properties, LLC
APPLICANT: Virginia Marquardt, Architectural Resource Team
ARCHITECT: James Trahan, Architectural Resource Team

REQUEST: Approval of a 7,853 sq. ft. tire store

SUMMARY: Virginia Marquardt and Stephan Richter represented the case.

Raymond Richley, who lives south of the site, spoke regarding the case. His concern was the noise from impact wrenches used in auto service buildings. He stated the noise from the Sun Devil Auto was not bad but he was concerned that a tire store would be noisier. He wanted a brick fence along the property line like the freeway sound walls. Chair Pete Berzins explained that the bay doors would face north away from Mr. Richley's property. He asked Mr. Richley if he minded looking at such a tall wall. Mr. Richley stated it would be better than noise.

Ms. Marquardt stated the store would be open 8 – 6 Monday through Friday and 8 – 5 Saturday. She stated noise studies were available if the Board wanted to see them.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed the Discount Tire Store could not raise the subdivision walls because they are not on their property. He was concerned with the way the entire site was being parceled. He thought there should be landscaping around the perimeter of the entire site. Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated the property had been hard zoned in 1979 and the applicants were only required to go through a preliminary plat process. Boardmember Carter confirmed the remainder of the site was unimproved. He was concerned that there would not be enough landscaping when the site develops. He confirmed the bollards would be Discount Teal.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen thought the trellis piece at the front of the building was very weak. She liked the variation of colors and banding, but thought the front entrance was flat and boxy. She did not understand the screen wall for the bay doors. Mr. Richter stated they were trying to play off the wainscot and storefront, by integrating the wainscot and toping it off with a trellis above. The plexi-glass piece would be held together with steel tubes and connected to the trellis above. The plexi-glass would be painted. Her main concerns were the front façade and the canopy pieces.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed there would be a steel beam at the storefront that supports the trellis. He suggested the north elevation front could be - raised or the bay area parapet could be lowered.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the trellis was thin. He confirmed the red mullions were not used on the Sun Devil Auto. He stated the plexi-glass screen would not work as a screening device. He stated the screen wall needed to be masonry and needed to be longer to screen the bay doors. He was also disturbed with how the center was being developed. He suggested the applicants use sound deadening material inside the building. He wanted the applicants to either provide temporary landscape buffer or work with the center to get them

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

to provide landscaping at the perimeter.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen stated they could sand-fill the walls, but it may not help very much. He confirmed the masonry would be integral block with a moisture seal only. He thought there should be more articulation at the storefronts. He suggested bows or rounded arch for the trellis. He agreed there should be masonry in place of the plexi-glass screen wall. He confirmed the applicants wanted graphics on the plexi-glass, but they had been told it would be considered signage.

Boardmember Dave Richins stated his biggest concern was the compressor room. He expressed his concern that the room should have noise suppression. Ms. Marquardt stated the cmu wall would be insulated.

There was discussion regarding how to accommodate noise attenuation when this applicant is not near the perimeter of the project. Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that even if the overall property owner could be persuaded to provide a higher perimeter wall, trying to work with every adjacent property owner to get their permission to raise their wall has proven very problematic in the past. She suggested landscaping might be a better solution.

Boardmember Burgheimer thought that they should either provide a temporary landscape strip around their site or work with the center developer to provide perimeter landscaping. Mr. Richter stated he was willing to provide temporary landscaping along the west property line; however, it would be a problem along the south, because they need that drive aisle.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR04-86 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications:
 - a. Revise the storefront elevations to include masonry columns and enhanced design for steel canopies at entries.
 - b. Provide revised design for monument signs in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance.
 - c. Provide revised landscape plan with minimum of eight (8) trees shown within building foundation base area. (Within 30 feet of building to be located at designer's discretion.)
 - d. Revise the screen walls on the sides of the building so as to provide an integrated architectural feature.
 - e. **Work with staff to resolve the issue of site landscaping, perimeter landscaping and temporary landscaping..**
 - f. **Approval of the elevations on the revised drawing presented to the Board at the meeting.**
 - g.
 - h. **The screen wall for the bay doors to be removed and create a landscaped planter in that location.**
 - i.
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.)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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 to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: 3 (side A and B) and 4 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04- 87 **BJ's Restaurant**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: West of NWC Power & Superstition Springs
REQUEST: Approval of a 13,718 sq. ft. restaurant
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Perry Mann Investments
APPLICANT: Mark Bowker
ARCHITECT: Kristjan Sigurdson

REQUEST: Approval of a 13,718 sq. ft. restaurant

SUMMARY: Bob Lambardo represented the case. Mr. Lambardo explained that the landscaping at the sidewalk would be provided along the west elevation but not the east because there would be employee parking in that area and the silo would screen the area. He stated that they were not providing more architecture on the east wall because the silo would screen it. He explained the mural and added that they were willing to add another mural to the rear elevation. They would like to keep the downspouts exposed because they thought they added to the industrial warehouse look of the building, but they were willing to do whatever the City wanted. He stated the actual standing seam roof on the bump-outs would be a deep burgundy color. The red color would be used on the front canopy and the vertical elements. He stated the colors could easily be adjusted based on what the Board wanted. He stated that the color elevation was incorrect where it showed the brick on the bump out. The west facing windows would have a slight tint. They wanted customers coming in to see from the parking lot.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed the glass would be solar band grey. He thought the massing of the forms was fine. He agreed with staff that the east and north elevations needed additional detailing. He confirmed the stucco would have a slight texture. He thought the silo set a bad precedent because of its size. He thought the building was strong enough without the silo.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the screen wall on the north elevation should be taller. He suggested another mural on the north to make the building more interesting. He thought the mural was art, not a sign. He thought the silo was over the line and was not integrated into the building. He agreed with staff that the east and north elevations needed more articulation.

Boardmember Dave Richins did not think the silo was an attractive addition to the building. He agreed two murals would be OK. He also agreed the east side needed more architecture. He confirmed the overhang over the cooler would be 10'. He also confirmed the awnings over the windows and along would be Sunbrella, which lasts 5 to 7 years. The applicant understood this would be a maintenance issue for them.

Boardmember Randy Carter did not think the silo enhanced the project. However, he liked the mural. He confirmed the east and south wall screen the metal service door and that there would be a door in front of the cooler door. He stated that there should be a screen wall around the service entrance doors. He thought the wainscot should continue around all four sides of the building. He thought the coolers should be enhanced. He stated the shed roof needed a thicker fascia and thought they should be treated as part of the elevation. He agreed the north elevation should have a mural.

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Tim Nielsen did not think the silo enhanced the character of the restaurant. He thought the site layout looked like they were jamming a nice restaurant into a tight site. He suggested the building be moved to the north and east so there would be room for landscaping between the sidewalk and the buildings, creating nicer experience for people using the sidewalk. The applicant was willing to move the building to the east, but did not want to move it north because it would be set back from the other restaurants along the street. Boardmember Nielsen agreed that the screen walls should be articulated. He thought the murals were fine. He suggested metal awnings over the windows because they would last longer than fabric Sunbrella awnings.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman confirmed the Board was OK with the shed roofs, that the Board would like a screen wall on the rear of the building, and that the articulation could be checkerboard.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Dave Richins that DR04-87 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 **revised elevation, revised site plan with the relocated dumpster**, landscape plan, floor plans and with the following modifications:
 - a. Provide a continuous landscaped sidewalk from the rear parking area to the front entrance.
 - b. Provide additional architectural enhancements to the sides and rear of the restaurant so that the service side of the building is concealed. Conceal cooler door and paint service doors to match the building.
 - c. Provide sample of the red standing seam metal roof. Roof color to be a complement for other colors.
 - d. **Provide a screen wall for the service entrance on the north side between 4 feet and 6 feet high with a brick wainscot.**
 - e. **Dress up the walls with the shed roof, with a wainscot matching the rest of the building and paint or reveals, etc. to integrate both the north and east elevation with the south and west.**
 - f. **Provide an additional mural on the rear of the building under the "Brewhouse" sign.**
 - g. **Remove the silo.**
 - h. **Move the building at least 5 feet toward the east.**
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 to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: 4 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- east. Provide landscape planter at the focal point.
- d. Provide gates on refuse enclosures in front of Building 4.
- 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 to match the primary building color.
- 6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
- 7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project was reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: 4 (side A & B)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-90 **T-Mobile**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2820 E University
REQUEST: Approval of a 496 sq. ft. retail store
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: Edmond and Nada Thomas
APPLICANT: Philip Hawtin, Summit Project Delivery Solutions
ARCHITECT: Chris Muniz

REQUEST: Approval of a 496 sq. ft. retail building

SUMMARY: Philip Hawtin represented the case. Staffmember Lesley Davis showed the Board photos of existing T-Mobile facilities. Mr. Hawtin stated T-Mobile is no longer building the pre-fab buildings shown in the photos. He stated the shopping center had three empty pads. He stated there was not a lot in the center to tie into. Mr. Hawtin stated he had removed the magenta tint from the windows.

Boardmember Vince DiBella thought the building was small enough that it could be different from the center. He would prefer this building have "high tech" materials, such as alucobond rather than stucco. Mr. Hawtin was concerned the C.C. & R's for the center may preclude that.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer agreed stucco on such a small building was not good. He thought the building could be a real gem. He agreed alucobond would be appropriate. He thought there should be something happening at the top of the building; however, this wasn't a great center to begin with. He was concerned there would be bollards all around it. Staffmember Lesley Davis stated there would not be parking in front of the building, and there would be a great deal of landscaping.

Boardmember Dave Richins appreciated all of the landscaping. He liked the photos of the pre-fab buildings.

Boardmember Randy Carter thought the building needed reveal lines and that the fascia did not work with the building. He suggested using curved awnings. He also thought the parapet height should be increased. He agreed the building could be high tech.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen agreed the best part of the project was the landscaping. He thought this could be a trendsetter.

Chair Pete Berzins confirmed there was one of these buildings in Nogales and one planned for Tucson, one for Sun City and three in Phoenix,

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR04-90 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, and floor plans with the following modifications (**all details to be reviewed and approved by Design Review Staff**):

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- b. a. Redesign the building to be more high tech in design and use high tech building materials, such as alucobond. Raise the parapet height to completely screen the mechanical units.
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 to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 7 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is small and with revised elevations would be reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: 4 (side B
)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-92 **Waterford at Superstition Springs**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 7311 E Southern
REQUEST: Approval of 280 apartment units with 10,000 sq. ft. of ground floor commercial/retail space
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Orex Zaremba Superstitions Springs LLC
APPLICANT: Zaremba Residential
ARCHITECT: Todd & Associates

REQUEST: Approval of 280 apartment units with 10,000 sq. ft. of ground floor commercial/retail space.

SUMMARY: Staffmember Laura Hyneman explained that staff was recommending the case be continued to allow the applicant time to address technical issues with the Solid Waste Division, Transportation Division and Engineering. Resolution of these issues may significantly alter the site plan and could change the number of units.

Ellery Brown, Brent Henderson, and Gary Davis represented the case. Mr. Davis stated that reason only 10 units would be a live/work type is based on research on the viability of live/work units in this area.

Boardmember Dave Richins was excited to see a live/work project in Mesa. He confirmed the units could be used for office or basically any C-2 use. He supports the concept. He liked the variation and color. He confirmed there were no actual tenants or users for the work units. He also confirmed the parking for the work units would be along Southern. He also confirmed the signage would be located on the awnings and would be controlled. He was concerned that there could be window signage. The applicants stated any signage would require a permit from the apartment management and Superstition Springs Master Association.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed that type VII is located at the rear of the project. The side elevations of Building V were plain and should have windows facing the pool. Mr. Davis stated he did want windows but there were 5 to 7 trees in that area. Boardmember Carter stated buildings VI & VII looked extremely horizontal, because they had one straight fascia. He suggested using gables or something to break up the roofline. He suggested gables over the stairways and balconies. He thought buildings III & II were well articulated.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen liked the reveals in the stucco and the curved elements. He wondered why the curved elements were not being used on the other residential building types. He did not understand why the banding starts and stops; there wasn't a clear reason for its placement.

Boardmember Vince DiBella liked the variety of the building elevations. He thought building VII was the least attractive He thought the vertical elements such as the stair columns were too thin.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the building with the curved elements was the most attractive. He thought the other buildings looked like most other apartment projects in

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Mesa. He thought the details of the buildings along Southern should be used throughout the rest of the project. He did like the colors.

Chair Pete Berzins agreed with Boardmember Burgheimer. He stated the tenants would see the features.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR04-92 be continued to the December 1, 2004 meeting.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: To allow the applicant time to address Solid Waste, Transportation, and Engineering Division technical concerns.

Recorded on Tape No.: 4 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Other Business:

Discussion of Toyota expansion at Superstition Springs. Staffmember Laura Hyneman explained this case was scheduled for the December 1, 2004 meeting, she was asking the Board to review the elevations and give the applicant direction, so that when it is heard in December it won't need to be continued. She explained that in order to accommodate the number of vehicles they want, they need to go vertical.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed that the black shown on the elevations was void. Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed there would be top deck parking and there would be security lights on that deck.

Boardmember Carter stated he thought the building should have perforated metal for a high tech look, where the voids were shown.

Rick Cartell explained the existing Toyota dealership would be upgraded to have a alucobond, and an EIFS finish system with a broken pattern in a geometric form. They would have a large structure that would become the dominant force on the site, so their direction to the architect was to design the building that would make the parking structure delicate and light. Within the building there would be a service bay and a showroom. He stated Toyota was introducing a new line called Scion, which would be a totally different brand. The service bays would be large for the new brand. The deck would be set back. The columns elements were textured and stepped back. The started out 4' deep then 3' then 2' so there would be shadow lines. There was articulation in the panels, with rusticated joints and stone veneer. There would be a rail element of steel with two pipe columns and fins.

Rob Burgheimer stated this looked like a parking garage with things tacked onto it. The Toyota theme was a series of blocks and different materials. He thought they needed to back up and go with a different massing idea. He suggested stepping the building back so that it wasn't all three stories. He stated that it needed four sided architecture. He did not want to see light standards on the top. He suggested adding a canopy level and light down.

Chair Pete Berzins confirmed the building would be about the same level as the freeway.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed they did not want to connect the two buildings.

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested using the elevators and stairs to express a vertical element.

Rick Cartell suggested using a perforated screen or wire mesh as a series of masses.

Boardmember Carter stated instead of trying to make the structure disappear they should make it a building because everyone will know it's there. He thought it should be more sympathetic to the Toyota architecture. He thought it should be more flamboyant.

Boardmember Vince DiBella agreed the lighting on the top deck was a concern. He did not want to see the lighting from miles away. The Board wanted the lighting shown on the plans.

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da