

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
FEBRUARY 5, 2003

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

Carie Allen - Chair
John O'Hara- Vice Chair
Robert Burgheimer (left at 6:40)
John Poulsen
Jillian Hagen
Randy Carter

MEMBERS ABSENT

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman
Charlie Scully
Debbie Archuleta
Dave Nicolella
Richard Dyer
Anthony Farier
Eric Nelson
Steve Kramer
Rich Finlay
Briney Kirby
Jim Kenney
Dean Waren
Gregory Bryan
Stan Connick

S.G. Ellison
Susan Stewart
Dick Presto
Dean Baraess
Laura Ortiz
Kelly Hilgard
Sam Sprague
Sherman Cawley
Greg Hitchens
Dave Johnson

1. Call to Order:

Chair Carie Allen called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the January 8, and January 22, 2003 Meetings:

On a motion by Randy Carter seconded by John Poulsen the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

3. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2003, DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-05 **Johnson Motorsports**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 310 North Val Vista
REQUEST: Approval of a 7,250 sq. ft. motor sport sales facility
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: Dave Johnson
APPLICANT: Greg Hitchens
ARCHITECT: Greg Hitchens

REQUEST: Approval of a 7,250 sq. ft. motor sports sales facility

SUMMARY: Greg Hitchens and Dave Johnson represented the case. Greg Hitchens stated the case had received a DIP through the Board of Adjustment. The site is between two homes which are on property zoned C-2. He stated this project is not retail, Mr. John sells and services motorcycles. He agreed that there are attractive homes to the north. He stated the reason they did not add windows to the north elevation of the showroom is because they did not know what may be built to the north. He stated they were willing to make the south elevation more pedestrian friendly.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer understood the function of the building is designed for motorcycle repair but wondered why the building is so tall. Mr. Hitchens stated the bay areas are tall because they provided room for a lift for auto repair. He understood the simplicity of the east elevation but felt this simple form could be more interesting. He felt the scale was monumental for a motorcycle shop. He would have preferred a residential scale to better fit the neighborhood. He wanted to see additional color or texture on the east elevation.

Boardmember John Poulsen confirmed that the windows on the south and north elevation do not recess, the shadow represented on the elevations is paint. On the front of the building he confirmed that the difference in depth between the three panels is 6". Mr. Hitchens stated that they were willing to increase that depth as requested by staff. Mr. Poulsen felt the building was very flat. He understood they were using a pre-cast system, but felt the front elevation needed relief. Along the sides he wanted more done, especially on the south elevation.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed the metal roof would terminate in a drip edge. He wanted the front elevation to have more depth between the panels. He wanted a reveal along the top of the pre-cast slabs, some detailing to make the design richer. He was concerned with the thinness of the fascia. He suggested a different color for the center panel on the east elevation.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen was concerned with the side view of the front elevation, she wanted the profile thickened.

Vice Chair John O'Hara agreed with the previous comments.

Chair Carie Allen understood that this is a small lot; however, she felt the building was too plain. She also, felt the building was too tall in the rear. She wanted the windows to be recessed.

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2003, DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Randy Carter felt the roof color as shown on the color board was very intense.

The Board preferred the green as shown on the elevation. The Board suggested sage.

Boardmember John Poulsen confirmed it was possible to push back the side panels on the east elevation, 2' to 3'. He suggested the top of the building and the wainscot along the side elevations, be thickened so that it protrudes out slightly.

Boardmember Randy Carter suggested tapering at least 1" around the windows.

Boardmember Poulsen suggested using a reveal joint to differentiate between the wainscot and the area above the windows on the side elevation. Then thicken the edge, where the fascia would be, then stagger the front and thicken the façade.

Chair Carie Allen confirmed that the rear building was a possible future building.

Boardmember John Poulsen did not want that building to be 25' tall.

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by John O'Hara that DR03-05 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
5. **This building may not be used as a warehousing facility; the C-2 zoning district does not allow this use.**
6. **Reconfigure the berm so that it more effectively screens the parking area. Incorporate dense, evergreen shrubbery, such as the "Green Cloud Sage" with the berm to provide screening.**
7. **Revise landscaping plan to show required number of trees and shrubs along the north, west and south property lines (except where adjacent to the parking area. Add two large canopy, non-deciduous trees to the plant list and incorporate into the landscaping design along the north, west and south property lines. Landscaping plans to be approved by Design Review Staff.**
8. **All outdoor equipment and service entrance section (SES) shall be recessed or fully screened from view by a masonry wall the same height as the utility cabinet. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color. Details to be approved by Design Review Staff.**
9. **Revise the elevations. Increase the projection of the center element on the east façade to 24" and add storefront to the north side of the building.**
10. **Taper the clearstory window at least 1".**
11. **Provide a 4" to 6" wide score line between the top band and the wainscot.**

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2003, DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

12. **Provide a fascia where the metal roof ends at the wall over the motorcycle sales space.**
13. **Revise the roof color to a sage or copper patina.**
14. **Revise the landscape plan: add taller trees, possibly Palo Verde or Mesquite to the plan.**
15. Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened by a parapet wall equal to or exceeding the height of the mechanical units. To the extent permitted by law, satellite dishes shall be fully screened by a parapet wall. Ground mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened from public view by a combination of a decorative wall and dense landscaping. The screen wall shall be equal to or exceed the height of the mechanical units.
16. 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.
17. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
18. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 20' height at the perimeter. Light standards (poles) for pad sites are to match the light standards used within the shopping center.
19. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
20. Provide two half size color elevations, two full size and two 8-1/2 X 11 sets of 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 development as proposed with conditions is

Recorded on Tape No.: - 1 (side B) and - 2 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-06 **CVS Pharmacy #5812**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC McDowell & Recker
REQUEST: Approval of a 13,013 sq. drug store
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: The Kramer Family L.L.C.
APPLICANT: L.E.A.D.'s
ARCHITECT: Rick Sinnard, CSHQA

REQUEST: Approval of a 13,013 sq. ft. drug store

SUMMARY: Susan Stewart and S.G. Ellison represented the case. Ms. Stewart explained that they had been instructed by the Planning and Zoning Board to work with the proposed Longbow project. They used the examples of the buildings shown on Longbow's landscape guidelines because there were no Design Guidelines for Longbow yet. They were trying to fit between office and industrial but still show that they were retail. They incorporated scored block, scored stucco, and metal tubing, which Longbow had shown. She stated that they were willing to add to the tubing but there were weight issues to be studied. For the canopy they were proposing to revise the drive-thru canopy details. She explained that there is a radius on the front vestibule.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer felt the building was too industrial and plain. He was concerned that this building would start the trend for the Longbow project. He wanted this corner to be softer, maybe more block on the building, more color, more detailing.

Boardmember John Poulsen agreed the building is too industrial. He understood what they were trying to do. He wanted the building to be softer. He suggested a different roofline.

Susan Stewart asked the Board to look at the building in context with the landscape plan. She felt that the foundation planting and other landscaping would help soften the building.

Boardmember Randy Carter stated that on previous CVS pharmacies he had admired their use of color. He understood they had a tough job trying to design this pharmacy with almost nothing as far as what it should look like. He confirmed with staff that the Design Review Board would be reviewing Design Guidelines for Longbow. Staffmember Laura Hyneman explained that what staff has seen, was raw exposed concrete, rusted metal accent features. The architect for the Long Bow project staff had seen is the same firm that designed DC Ranch. Boardmember Carter did not see stone, concrete, "Corten" steel used on this building. He was concerned with this project being the corner stone of Longbow.

S.G. Ellison felt that this project would be a transition not a corner stone.

Boardmember Carter felt that this corner would become very important to the City. He wanted to see some of the textures used in DC Ranch. He wanted the red to be cortin steel, not a painted surface. He would like to see additional colors.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen thought it was nice to see something completely different from the typical pharmacy. She thought the building was contemporary not industrial. She agreed that DC Ranch was beautiful; however she thought the split-faced block was nice. She would

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

like to see natural red rather than painted. She liked the composition. She would like to see more of the “Barrigan” – like wall features on screen walls to make the walls more sculptural or monumental for the corner. She liked the simplicity of the color palette. She thought it would blend in with the desert. She wanted to see more landscape treatments with the screen walls.

S.G. Ellison stated that they could do that especially at the corner.

Vice-Chair John O’Hara confirmed that the adjacent self-storage would eventually be removed. He agreed that this building would not be the corner stone. He felt that most of the traffic entering Longbow would come from the freeway. He liked the style of the building, and the crisp look.

Chair Carie Allen liked the building. She felt it was different from typical corner pharmacies. She liked the colors and the design. She liked the landscaping. She felt the sign needed to be changed. She would prefer rusted metal used for the metal building elements.

Boardmember Randy Carter stated that one thing he was concerned with was the placement of the attached signs. Susan Stewart stated the signs would be centered. Boardmember Carter would like the two planes differentiated.

Boardmember Hagen suggested notching out the corner radius like a pop-out. Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that the reveals in the EFIS would be $\frac{3}{4}$ inch wide.

Boardmember Randy Carter wanted to see the wall light fixtures detail continued. He wanted to see “Corten” steel rather than steel tubing painted red.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated he liked the modernism of the building. He felt there needed to be more detailing. He liked the silver light fixtures. He felt the building was so simple the red would look corporate; he wanted the red to be more mottled. He suggested doing something with reveals and deepening them. He agreed that breaking up the corner radius would help. He thought the building needed just a few things. He liked their direction and wanted to encourage this change in design.

Mr. Ellison stated that the trellis element and the tube steel would create light and shadow patterns. He stated they could replace the red paint.

Boardmember Burgheimer felt that using some natural material would help the building.

Susan Stewart stated that the red banding around the middle of the building is popped out 4 to 6 inches.

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested another color on the step. He felt the corner was a little too plain.

Mr. Ellison stated that the foundation base is a textured material as you enter; it would be flagstone or brick.

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested the columns have reveals or banding.

Boardmember Poulsen confirmed the screen walls were stucco with a split face cap. Mr. Ellison stated they were willing to use scored split face.

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Hagen suggested using stucco in a color but make the walls sculptural so that there not flat panels of wall but they overlap or layer. She wanted them to reinforce the contemporary nature of the building in the wall. She also wanted them to reinforce the metal elements on the building. She suggested doing the rounded radius corner in metal.

Boardmember Carter suggested an expanded metal that sits out from the stucco wall to accentuate the curve.

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested mill finish windows to bring more metal into the building.

Boardmember Carter wanted the drive-thru to echo the awnings and trellis work.

MOTION: It was moved by Jillian Hagen and seconded by Randy Carter that DR03-06 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
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. **Paint drive-through tube to match building field color.**
5. **The horizontal and vertical joints in the stucco walls will be at least 3/4" wide.**
6. **Revise the 2" x 2" trellis tube spacing in the covered walkway to 4" on center or provide alternative shading material, providing at least 50% shading.**
7. **Redesign the drive-through canopy. Reflect the horizontal character of the covered walkway in the design. Design to be approved by Design Review Staff.**
8. **Revise the monument sign design: cabinet surround to be 24" wide stucco/EFIS on the sides and top of the sign and masonry base material, single-score integral color masonry, to match the building; cabinet surround color to match the building. Design to be approved by Design Review Staff.**
9. **Reconsider the corner radius; change the building face, color, elevation or material.**
10. **Revise the site screen walls, as discussed by the Board. To be approved by the Landscaping Architect on the Board.**
11. **Introduce the triangular metal pieces consistently around the building. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
12. All outdoor storage areas for materials, equipment, and service entrance section (SES) shall be recessed or fully screened from view by a masonry wall the same height as the utility cabinet. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
13. Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened by a parapet wall

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

equal to or exceeding the height of the mechanical units. To the extent permitted by law, satellite dishes shall be fully screened by a parapet wall. Ground mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened from public view by a combination of a decorative wall and dense landscaping. The screen wall shall be equal to or exceed the height of the mechanical units.

14. 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.
15. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
16. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 20' height at the perimeter. Light standards (poles) for pad sites are to match the light standards used within the shopping center.
17. **Provide an elevation of the proposed screen wall for approval by Design Review Staff.**
18. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
19. Provide two half size color elevations, two full size and two 8-1/2 X 11 sets of 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 development as proposed with conditions is a nice change from the typical pharmacy and should be an asset to the area.

Recorded on Tape No.: - 1 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-07 **Filiberto's Restaurant**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 835 West University
REQUEST: Approval of a 2,513 sq. ft. fast food restaurant with drive-thru
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: Lexon Development
APPLICANT: Irwin Pasternack
ARCHITECT: Dick Presto, Irwin Pasternack

REQUEST: Approval of a 2,513 sq. ft. fast food restaurant with drive-through

SUMMARY: Dick Presto and Dean Barness represented the case. Mr. Presto stated the vacant pad site is very small; the shopping center was developed 16 or 17 years ago. They had a difficult time trying to make the building work. The shopping center management company would not allow the trash enclosure to be placed outside the parcel boundaries for this pad. They had hoped they could place the trash enclosures off-site near an island. They presented three options for the trash enclosures; one was south of the building, which they did not really want because of the smell near the entrance. The other two were along University; one facing west, the other facing east. Mr. Presto explained they had rotated the building in order to fit it on the site. In doing so they had moved the entrance so children were less likely to run into a drive aisle, they widened the entry plaza and created a seat wall, they were able to provide a landscape strip along the drive-thru with trees that will shield the elevation. Mr. Presto stated that in the staff report, staff prefers the trash enclosure, if placed along University, face east toward the main center driveway because it conceals the enclosure from the view at the main center driveway; however, the enclosure would then block the main center monument sign, which would upset the shopping center and Fry's.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer appreciates the problems with this site; however, he could not support placing the trash enclosure along University, it would be bad for the building, bad for pedestrians, bad for street image. He felt there comes a time when you simply can't build. He felt there was too much happening on this site. He felt that someone needed to give, the site was too small. He felt the building was too flat, but he felt the site planning issues outweighed the elevations.

Boardmember John Poulsen agreed the trash enclosure situation did not work, and felt that if the property owner wanted to sell the parcel they needed to negotiate. He felt that there were places within the center that would accommodate the trash enclosures.

Mr. Barness stated that they had closed on the property. He stated that they were willing to agree to additional trash pick-ups if the enclosures were placed on the south side of the building. He stated they had tried 10 different submittals to make the site work.

Boardmember Poulsen confirmed the applicant had not tried to get permission to have only one enclosure.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that with additional landscaping the trash enclosure could be screened.

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Burgheimer questioned why they had 8 parking spaces that are on their parcel. He suggested eliminating the 8 spaces, since they had a reciprocal parking agreement and then they would have more room for trash at the south side of the building.

The response was that there are existing drive aisles.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman suggested placing the trash enclosure along University and the recycle bin at the south of the building.

Mr. Barness stated they were willing to do that.

Boardmember Poulsen confirmed that the scalloping along the top of the rotunda would be Styrofoam and stucco. The teal band would be a 2" pop-out.

Boardmember Randy Carter would prefer the band be recessed.

Mr. Presto stated they were matching a detail from the shopping center.

Boardmember Randy Carter suggested talking to Sanitation to request only one trash enclosure. He had some concerns with the building: He felt the north elevation was too plain, he suggested duplicating the wave pattern on the south elevation on the north elevation, over the drive-through. He wanted a canopy over the drive-thru. He wanted the banding recessed. He wanted a thicker cornice, and more detailing to the entrance.

Boardmember Burgheimer suggested a break on the north elevation to pull it out or push it in 8".

Boardmember Jillian Hagen was concerned with the north elevations. She wanted to see more detailing and massing. She preferred one trash enclosure, and suggested pursuing that with Solid Waste. She agreed the cornice needed to be thicker. She felt the rotunda was very large and suggested providing an awning to bring it down to a more pedestrian scale.

Vice-Chair John O'Hara agreed there should be one trash enclosure.

Chair Carie Allen agreed they should pursue having one trash enclosure. She confirmed the colors were given to them by the property owner. She confirmed that the purple colors on the color board are actually a rose color and they are accent colors. She agreed with the previous Boardmember suggestions regarding the north elevation.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Jillian Hagen that DR03-07 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development plan, **indicated as "Partial Site Plan F"** as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
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 FEBRUARY 5, 2003 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. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
5. **At the time construction documents are submitted to the Building Safety Division for plan review submit a copy of the recorded off-site parking agreement with the surrounding commercial shopping center to ensure at least 19 parking spaces will be permanently available within 300 feet of the pad site for the exclusive use by the proposed restaurant.**
6. **Approval of the revised trash enclosure locations must be obtained by the Solid Waste Division prior to submittal of construction documents to the Building Safety Division for plan review.**
7. **Trash enclosure screen walls should be compatible with the materials and colors of the existing parking lot screen wall along the north edge of the parking lot.**
8. **Revise the north elevation, to provide either a canopy or cover for the drive-thru window. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
9. **At the main entrance, provide a break on the higher section by pulling out or pushing in where the attached sign is. Elevation to be approved by Design Review staff.**
10. **Thicken the cornice all the way around the building. Elevation to be approved by Design Review staff.**
11. **Revise the west elevation rotunda and bring out a shade piece at the entrance doors. Elevation to be approved by Design Review staff.**
12. **Provide one trash enclosure to the north and the recycle enclosure at the south. Approval by Solid Waste and Planning Divisions.**
13. **Recess the horizontal band around the entire building. Elevations to be approved by Design Review staff.**
14. **Provide 36" box trees around the trash enclosure and vines. Landscape plan to be approved by Design Review staff.**
15. All outdoor storage areas for materials, equipment, and service entrance section (SES) shall be recessed or fully screened from view by a masonry wall the same height as the utility cabinet.
16. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
17. Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened by a parapet wall equal to or exceeding the height of the mechanical units. To the extent permitted by law, satellite dishes shall be fully screened by a parapet wall. Ground mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened from public view by a combination of a decorative wall and dense landscaping. The screen wall shall be equal to or exceed the height of the mechanical units.
18. 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.
19. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
20. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 20' height at the perimeter. Light

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- standards (poles) for pad sites are to match the light standards used within the shopping center.
21. Screen all parking areas and vehicular circulation aisles adjacent to the public right of way. The screen walls along the street frontage should be varied in alignment, broken up with naturally contoured berming and staggered dense shrubs to achieve a continuous screen of no less than 36 inches above the highest adjacent grade. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
 22. Provide two half size color elevations, two full size and two 8-1/2 X 11 sets of 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 development as proposed with conditions is reasonably well designed and complements the existing center.

Recorded on Tape No.: - 2 (side A & B)

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-08 **Walgreens**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Ellsworth & Guadalupe
REQUEST: Approval of a 14,560 sq. ft. drug store
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: LKY Development
APPLICANT: Evergreen Devco
ARCHITECT: Kurt Reed Associates

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

SUMMARY: Laura Ortiz and Kelly Hilgard represented the case. Ms. Ortiz explained some of the changes on this project from previous Walgreen's submittals. The changes include: use of Dufferin stone on the pilasters and canopy columns, and the addition of panels painted a darker color, with a key stone made of Dufferin Stone. The tower has been pushed back and integrated into the building to minimize the glass. The tile canopy wraps the front, and the south and east elevations. They designed the drive aisles so that the Walgreens is segregated from the remainder of the shopping center. Regarding the stipulations, on condition #5 they were willing to change the width of the throat at the entrance and exit to the drive-thru lane; however they did not feel their trucks could maneuver in a 16' throat, they wanted to work with staff to narrow the throat. On condition #6 they were working with the Transportation Department to try to get permission for the driveway. On condition #7, they were planning to provide pedestrian access from Ellsworth. On condition #13, regarding the SES they did not feel they could recess the SES or screen it. She stated the SES would be painted to match the building. Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that screening the SES is a Code requirement. Ms. Ortiz suggested building an enclosure pop-out around it on three sides.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer felt this proposal looks too much like every other Walgreens. He wanted the case to come back for further review. He felt the pop-outs were interesting but it looks like a collision of two different styles. It looked like two different architects worked on the building. In fairness to other applicants he felt that more changes were needed. It looked like a prototype with just enough surface treatments to get it through. He wanted to see more substantial changes. He did not have a problem with the materials or colors, he did want the SES screened.

Boardmember John Poulsen agreed that not enough changes had been made. He liked some of the elements, but it looks like a Walgreen's. He wanted to something more bold. He wanted to see more colors.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed with staff the Board had reviewed four Walgreens with the corner tower. He felt that it was time for something new. He stated he did not see the same richness of materials and colors on this project that the Board has seen recently on CVS and Eckerd projects. He felt that Walgreen's needs to change the shape. He suggested using trellis work instead of covered walkways, developing the large "movie" poster pop-outs on the sides, changing the cornices, changing how the entrance is treated. This is the same building, the same walkway on the sides, the same glass front, the same roofline, and the same cornice style as previous Walgreens. The building materials were nicer, but he wanted to see new design. He wanted to see a richer palette of color and style.

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Jillian Hagen, agreed that there needed to be more change. She liked the porch element, and felt that it was "carriage house" architecture, however, she did not feel the materials or the rear portion echo that image. She liked the stone; however she felt that if they were going with ranch style they needed a rougher, more rustic feel. She suggested using iron work shutters, arched window forms, she felt that the tower needed somewhat of a pop-out so that the wall can transition into it. Regarding the picture window on the tower, it needed to be subtler, like a peephole window. She liked the iron work on the back fencing detail. She felt that iron work might be a better compromise for the panels, and do the iron work in a contrasting color to get more richness of contrast and color.

Vice Chair John O'Hara liked some of the changes; however, he felt that if this building were built and there were no signs people driving by would still know it was a Walgreen's. He felt that they needed to push the envelope.

Chair Carie Allen agreed with the previous comments. She liked the building; however, she felt it has been done enough. She agreed that this building would be recognized as a Walgreen's without any signage. She felt there needed to be more changes.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-08 be continued to February 18, 2003 at 9:00 a.m.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

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

Recorded on Tape No.: - 2 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-09 **The Village at Las Sendas**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NEC Power and McDowell
REQUEST: Approval of a 11.285 acre office-retail center
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Power & McDowell Associates L.L.C.
APPLICANT: Sam Sprague
ARCHITECT: John Bellian

REQUEST: Approval of a 11.285 acre office retail center

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

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR03-09 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
5. **Provide building elevations of Retail 1 showing proposed attached signage.**
6. All outdoor equipment and service entrance section (SES) shall be recessed or fully screened from view by a masonry wall the same height as the utility cabinet. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
7. Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened by a parapet wall equal to or exceeding the height of the mechanical units. To the extent permitted by law, satellite dishes shall be fully screened by a parapet wall. Ground mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened from public view by a combination of a decorative wall and dense landscaping. The screen wall shall be equal to or exceed the height of the mechanical units.
8. 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.
9. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
10. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 20' height at the perimeter. Light standards (poles) for pad sites are to match the light standards used within the shopping center.
11. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

the building.

12. Provide two half size color elevations, two full size and two 8-1/2 X 11 sets of 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 development as proposed with conditions is well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-10 **McKellips Professional Center**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 400 block of East McKellips
REQUEST: Approval of a 3.25 acre medical office complex
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Focus Development
APPLICANT: Dean Sulzer, Cawley Architects.
ARCHITECT: Sherman Cawley

REQUEST: Approval of a 3.25 acre medical office complex

SUMMARY: Sherman Cawley represented the case and presented the Board with a revised elevation that did not have a gabled roof feature for the elevation along McKellips. It had a parapet that projected in front of the tile. Also the piers would be battered only at the entrances. Regarding the employee break area, Mr. Cawley stated that they wanted to make the courtyard as large as possible to accommodate variety and provide landscaping around the perimeters.

Boardmember John Poulsen was concerned with having employee areas along McKellips. He suggested removing one parking stall at the farthest ends of the parking lot and moving the employee areas there. Mr. Cawley stated that the Code required a 25' building separation so they wanted to use that area for the employee area; also it would be shaded by trees. He felt that the tables could be placed anywhere within the "courtyard". Boardmember Poulsen confirmed that the windows would be recessed. He confirmed the roof slope would be 4 to 1. He wanted the roof slope to be 5 to 1.

Boardmember Randy Carter was concerned with the pitch of the roofline. He preferred the pitched roof be used on the McKellips frontage. Boardmember Carter was concerned with the fascia coming straight out from the wall. He wanted it to come around and be integrated with the other plain. He felt the project needed additional color. He wanted the fascia color to be a different, and a richer roof tile color.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen preferred the original elevations. She wanted to see additional colors. She suggested using a bolder color at the entrance. She also wanted the piece that pops out from the building painted a different color. She suggested ending the pavement farther away from the wall and adding additional landscaping.

Mr. Cawley was willing to change the roof pitch and go to a 3-color scheme.

Vice Chair John O'Hara agreed there should be additional color.

Chair Carie Allen liked the project. She agreed with the previous comments.

MOTION: It was moved by Jillian Hagen and seconded by John O'Hara that DR03-10 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.

2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
5. **Provide an additional, accent color to the color palette. Color to be approved by Design Review staff.**
6. **Remove a small portion of the pavement behind the wall in the employee break area and add additional landscaping in its place at each break area adjacent to McKellips Road. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
7. **Increase the roof pitch to 5 to 1.**
8. All utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
9. 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.
10. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 20' height at the perimeter and 14' adjacent to residential uses.
11. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
12. Provide two half size color elevations, two full size and two 8-1/2 X 11 sets of 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 development as proposed with conditions is reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: 3 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-11 **New Retail & Restaurant Building**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 6000 block of East Southern
REQUEST: Approval of a 10,062 sq. ft. restaurant and retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Red Mountain Retail Group
APPLICANT: Art Ramirez
ARCHITECT: Art Ramirez, Ethos

REQUEST: Approval of a 10,062 sq. ft. restaurant and retail building

SUMMARY: Eric Nelson represented the case. He stated the building architecture and site plan had been redesigned to address staff concerns. He stated the restaurant was now proposed at 5,500 sq. ft. and the retail was now proposed at 4,410 sq. ft. At those square footages the required parking would be 80 and they were providing 80 spaces on-site. Mr. Nelson stated they had added 3' pop-outs including the planters and upper parapets. He stated staff had requested 7 parking spaces be removed. One of the reasons for this request was to eliminate parking stalls where customers were backing into the primary drive aisle. He stated they had rotated the spaces at an angle to only allow for access for people heading west in that driveway. They removed one space at the rear of the building. At the east side of the building they pulled one parking stall out so there would not be as much overhang onto the sidewalk. They also moved the sidewalk. They removed one parking stall at the front of the building to provide one landscape planter islands.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that the traffic signal for entering the center was located at that drive to the west.

Boardmember John Poulsen did not like the proposal. The site layout was difficult. He felt that a restaurant was probably a good use but combining the retail tenant spaces was bad. The sidewalk along the sides of the building would feel stark and hot. The site was too tight. The building was boring. From the back of the building the facades would look very unattractive. He felt much more could be done with this building. He felt that this proposal was a bare bones minimal building.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt that the revised elevations were worse than the originals. Mr. Carter stated that customers of the Wal-Mart use the access drive to get to the traffic light. There are very few median breaks along Southern therefore this is where people go to turn left onto Southern. He felt that the parking stalls at the rear of the building would be very dangerous. He felt that as a restaurant this could be very successful, but trying to squeeze so much onto the site doesn't work. The original elevations are too flat, and too horizontal.

Mr. Nelson then stated that they have CC & R that limits what they can do architecturally. He agreed that the architecture was very poor.

Boardmember Carter felt that this site was very important and all four sides of this building would be very visible. He wanted the case continued.

Boardmember Randy Carter stated that if the restaurant were successful there would be people standing outside waiting for seating. This proposal provides nowhere for those people to wait.

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Mr. Nelson stated that they had a reciprocal parking agreement with Wal-Mart, but they were trying to provide all the parking on their site so that customers did not have to cross drive aisles to get to their building. He stated that the CC & R also required most of the parking be provided on their site. He stated they were flexible on elevations, and building design.

Staffmember Charlie Scully felt that trying to develop multiple multi-tenant uses on pad sites is not the best use of a pad. He felt that this site would work well for just a restaurant, and then there would be enough room for the wider walkway, foundation landscaping and pedestrians.

Boardmember Hagen reiterated that restaurants need to have a place outside the building for customers who are waiting. She understood that this parcel was oddly shaped but the parking and building design were awkward. She felt that the building could be manipulated to have a shape or form that would respond to possibly the private drive, and they might be able to get more efficient parking if they put the building in a different. The building could change form the parking stalls can't. If the building started to have curvilinear forms and responded to something it probably be a lot more interesting. The parking was not efficient. She could not support putting the parking stalls in the rear. They were dangerous and the reduced the amount of landscaping that could be placed at the rear of the building.

It was decided the Board needed to continue the case for redesign.

Mr. Nelson requested that his case be heard at the February 18, 2003 special meeting.

Boardmember Poulsen understood that they needed to be compatible with the Wal-Mart; however, he felt it could be better detailed, not a straight front.

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by John O'Hara that DR03-11 be continued to the special meeting February 18, 2003:

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: To allow the applicant to redesign the site plan and the building.

Recorded on Tape No.: (side A)

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-12 **Animal Referral & Emergency Center of Arizona**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1648 North Country Club
REQUEST: Approval of a 17,967 sq. ft. animal hospital
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Pets Choice Inc.
APPLICANT: Stephen Kramer
ARCHITECT: Stephen Kramer

REQUEST: Approval of a 17,967 sq. ft. animal hospital

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

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR03-12 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
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 mechanical equipment must be screened from view from the public street and public parking area.
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. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
7. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 20' height at the perimeter. Light standards (poles) for pad sites are to match the light standards used within the shopping center.
8. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is reasonably

Recorded on Tape No.: 1 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-13 **Golfland/Sunsplash Waterslide**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 323 West Hampton
REQUEST: Approval of a 55' high waterslide and stair tower
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: Mesa Golfland Properties Associates L
APPLICANT: Mesa Golfland
ARCHITECT: Edwin Nicholson, Structural Engineer

REQUEST: Approval of a 55' tall waterslide

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

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR03-13 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
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. Ground mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened from public view by a combination of a decorative wall and dense landscaping. The screen wall shall be equal to or exceed the height of the mechanical units.
5. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
6. Provide two half size color elevations, two full size and two 8-1/2 X 11 sets of revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The Board felt that the height of the slide was not a problem and that it was well-integrated into the site.

Recorded on Tape No.: - (side)

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

OTHER BUSINESS:

CASE #: DR01-91 Bark Avenue

REQUEST: Review of revised site plan and elevations for Bark Avenue Veterinary clinic and retail space.

SUMMARY: Staffmember Laura Hyneman explained some of the changes that have occurred since this case was approved. They have eliminated the integral color block and; removed the accent tiles and replaced them with light fixtures; changed the proportions of the parapet banding; eliminated the dips in the parapet; changed the pilaster treatment; and they are not incorporating interesting design in return.

Boardmember John Poulsen confirmed that the entire retail building was proposed with this request. The kennel, was now proposed to be one large building with courtyards on the west and east sides, rather than two buildings with the courtyard in between the buildings and screened from the restaurant use to the east by the Phase II kennel building. The Board of Adjustment determined the height of the walls along the east and required sound attenuation; this Board cannot approve those changes as requested by the applicant. The walls have to be 16' high and sound attenuated or they have to apply for another variance through the Board of Adjustment. Boardmember Poulsen felt the elimination of the detailing on the west elevation would be visible from McKellips. The foundation landscape planters were proposed under a covered canopy, and there were no species listed. Staffmember Hyneman was concerned that the landscaping would not survive in that environment. This project was subject to the old design guidelines which require 50% foundation landscaping along the north elevation.

Stan Connick, Clay Coady and Ray Moran represented the case. Mr. Connick stated there were a lot of technical problems with the drawings that were approved and were ready for a permit. There were parapets that were 8' high, there were details on the back area of the buildings that were screened by adjacent uses, and there were lavish designs on the sides. He stated the parapet consisted of two bands 2' apart. He felt was the only thing anyone would be able to see was 6". Mr. Connick stated that he had revised landscape drawings, which had not been submitted to staff for the Board's review. He felt the colors were more reasonable. The accent color would be at the bottom and the parapet areas. The parapet heights were the same to screen the air conditioning units. The long narrow area next to the mini-storage would look good because they had to landscape it. He stated that on the rear of the kennel, the blank area would not be seen because there is an existing house on site. He stated the kennel was bland, but he felt that only the parapet would be seen. The trash enclosure was moved to the back of the property. They eliminated an unnecessary hammerhead for the fire trucks. They moved the access driveway to the east. He stated there have been incidents where people have almost been in accidents trying to enter this site. In response to staff concerns regarding dead-end parking, he stated they had provided a means of going to the end being able to turn out and back out. Mr. Connick stated that the property

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

owner's "pet resort" in Paradise Valley looks like that.

The property owner, Clay Coady stated that he would use a lot of landscaping. He stated that there would be a lot of landscaping at the covered walkway; it just wasn't shown on the drawings. He stated there would be a florist in the retail building, who would put pots of landscaping along the walkway. Mr. Coady stated the kennel is a very simple building; there would be 16' high walls. The courtyards were there so that when the kennels were being cleaned the dogs would be brought out into the courtyard.

Boardmember John Poulsen confirmed that the wainscot was painted stucco, popped-out 2". He wanted to see stone brought back into the wainscot at the north elevation. He also wanted stone on the columns.

Boardmember Randy Carter was concerned that the east elevation of the building would be visible. He wanted additional articulation including pilasters on the building elevations.

Boardmember John Poulsen confirmed that the distance from the east property line to the building was 63'. Boardmember John Poulsen wanted additional trees on the east side of the property. He also wanted pilasters.

Mr. Connick agreed he could add more articulation. He agreed that the stone would be an enhancement. He agreed to be reasonably sensitive, and add some little relief around the doors.

Boardmember Carter stated that the felt staff could work with Mr. Connick to design something nice but it was going to take more than just a little pop-out around the doors. He felt the west side of the retail building need to be articulated like the east side of the building. Boardmember Carter suggested using an arch shape over the windows and goes to the ground, or continue the wainscot.

Boardmember Poulsen and Chair Carie Allen liked the idea of articulating the west elevation with an arch.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen wanted additional landscaping in the courtyard. Mr. Connick showed Boardmember Hagen the landscape plan that was submitted to Building Safety. She confirmed the applicant intended to plant something in the planters along the walkway although they did not show any species on the landscape plan.

The Board felt the landscaping in the courtyard needed to be better designed.

Boardmember Hagen did not like the front elevation of the building. She felt it looked like a strip mall. She thought that widening the arches made it look more commercial. With the previous submittal the Board had tried to get the design to be more residential in character. The arches were too symmetrical, and it looked like there were ten tenants in this building.

Boardmember Carter stated that what he liked about the previous submittal was that this project was a "pet resort" that was being expressed in the architecture. This submittal was typical.

Mr. Connick stated that if each architect creates a significant statement the streetscape could

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

become a bit much. He felt this proposal was reasonably articulated.

Boardmember Hagen stated that on the previous submittal there was a rhythm and character to the arches, on the new submittal the arches are the same size. Boardmember Hagen felt that the massing on the previous building had changed.

Chair Carie Allen asked if the new building was the same height as the previous building?

Mr. Connick stated that what had been approved by the Board was 18', the working drawings ended up 23'.

Boardmember Carter wanted the exposed rafter tails that had been approved previously restored.

Boardmember Carter wanted to see additional colors used. He felt that this proposal had lost the richness of the previous materials and techniques.

Boardmember Poulsen suggested bringing back the accent tiles. He agreed the colors were more washed out.

Boardmember Carter liked the colored storefront. He was concerned with the pattern of the arches. He thought the proportions should be re-worked. Boardmember Carter felt that if they add the stone, add exposed truss tails as previously proposed with a Mediterranean sculptured edge, and do something with the cornice, maybe a foam cornice with some dimension, then pull that around on the west side. On the west side he wanted a wainscot or a colored arch popped-out a minimum of 1" back to the kennel. The rear of the east elevation also needed articulation.

The Board wanted the cornice to have dimension.

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Randy Carter that DR01-91 be approved with the following conditions:

- 1. Revise building elevations. Revise the proportions of the parapet banding. Provide additional architectural detailing on the east, west and Kennel A elevations. Elevations to be approved by Design Review staff.**
 - Provide stone on the wainscot and pillars on the front (north) elevation.
 - Provide exposed tails along the fascia on the overhang across the front and sides of the building.
 - Provide a Mediterranean style cornice along the top of the building.
 - Provide arches popped-out at least 1" in a different paint color or pillars along the east elevation.
 - On the west elevation back to the kennel provide arches above the windows.
 - The arches are to be similar to the arches on the colonnade. Same shape and radius.
 - On the south elevation carry the same arch detail as the east elevation.
 - Revise the landscaping plan. Provide specific plant information. New design should complement the site design and the building elevations. Quantities must meet Code requirements.

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

2. Revise the landscaping plan. Provide specific plant information. New design should complement the site design and the building elevations. Quantities must meet Code requirements. Landscaping plan to be approved by Design Review staff.
3. Provide an elevation of the proposed vehicular screen wall for approval by Design Review staff. Design to match the building.
4. Provide a drawing showing that the SES panel does not encroach into the landscape setback and show required clearance for access.
5. Compliance with the Zoning Administrator case ZA01-89.
6. All roof top mechanical equipment to be completely screened from view by exterior building parapets.
7. Fire risers and roof access ladders are not to be located on the exterior of the building. These elements are to be located within the building.
8. The maximum height of any light standard adjacent to residentially zoned property is 16 feet.
9. Screen the back flow prevention device with a masonry screen wall to match the building. Details to be approved by the Design Review staff.
10. A separate sign package must be approved by compliance with Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 14 Signage Design criteria by Design Review staff prior to applying for a Comprehensive Sign Plan, or building permit.

Boardmember Poulsen then suggested using a darker, to accentuate the arches.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is closer to what was originally approved.

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

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da