

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 6, 2010 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CITY OF MESA**  
**MINUTES OF THE**  
**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**  
**JANUARY 6, 2010**

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Lower Level of the Council Chambers 57 East First Street, at 4:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Tim Nielsen - Chair  
Wendy LeSueur – Vice Chair  
Tom Bottomley  
Craig Boswell  
Delight Clark  
Greg Lambright  
Dan Maldonado

MEMBERS ABSENT

OTHERS PRESENT

Lesley Davis  
John Wesley  
Tom Ellsworth  
Laura Hyneman  
Debbie Archuleta  
Angelica Guevara  
Gordon Sheffield  
Wahid Alam

## MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 6, 2010 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

### 1. Work Session:

**CASE:** McDonalds Restaurant  
5255 South Power Road  
(District 6)

**REQUEST:** Review of a 4,200 sq. ft. fast food restaurant with a drive-thru

### **DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- The drive-thru canopy seems added on
- Bring some interest around to all sides
- Should be integral block
- Concerned with the smallest arch

Boardmember Greg Lambricht:

- The blandest elevation is along the street
- The canopy looks tacked on
- Blank walls
- It is pretty bland
- Add some color
- Maybe turn the fin wall element into a real tower
- Bring the tower up and use a slightly different color
- Make the canopy playful and fun

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- Do more to screen the cars in the drive-thru from Power Road
- Only one element projects above the roof line and it doesn't project high enough to see it from the other elevations

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Prefer integral block
- Nice size columns then a very thin canopy
- Make the canopy part of the building
- Use screeds to enhance the building. Create a design with the screeds

## MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 6, 2010 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- The yellow is a very processed yellow
- Bring color around to the west
- Come back in February

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- It is nice and unique
- Colors are electric compared to the rendering
- Like the large tapering arch
- The arch at the primary entrance seems weak, maybe thicken it and bring it out a little
- The smallest arch is weak

Boardmember Delight Clark:

- Smaller arches don't overhang the wall projection on the sides like the larger one does. The proportions are off.

## MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 6, 2010 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

A. Call to Order:

Chair Tim Nielsen called the meeting to order at 4:33 p.m.

B. Approval of the Minutes of the December 2, 2010 Meeting:

On a motion by Greg Lambright seconded by Craig Boswell the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

## MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 6, 2010 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

### C. Other business:

#### Review of Design Guidelines for Commercial Districts

Staffmember Laura Hyneman responded to the board's suggestion that they review the new Zoning Code prior to discussing Design Guidelines. She stated the old Code had a separate chapter on Design Guidelines. In the new Code the Design Guidelines are within the requirements of each district. Also the new code differentiates between requirements for auto-oriented and urban developments. She was interested in the board's comments on the changes. She stated the requirements for auto areas are very similar to the old Code, especially the setbacks.

Chair Tim Nielsen confirmed that staff was reviewing the new Code line by line. After staff completes the review changes would be made and a public review draft will be released. Zoning Administrator, Gordon Sheffield stated the concepts will stay the same in the draft but the wording and possibly diagrams will change. He stated that requirements in the auto related sections haven't changed much. Chair Nielsen confirmed with Planning Director John Wesley that applicants would need to rezone their property to have an Urban designator.

Boardmember Greg Lambright asked what would happen if, hypothetically, a current auto related site was along the light rail corridor wanted to remain an auto related use. Mr. Sheffield stated the site would be considered "mixed" – auto & pedestrian. The City would not initiate rezoning of the site to add the Urban designator.

Staffmember Hyneman confirmed the tables were complicated because it was intended to put a lot of information in the tables.

When discussing Building Form Standards, Chair Nielsen wondered why applicants need to meet 2 of 4 of the requirements and not 4 of 4. Mr. Sheffield stated the intent was to provide owners with options to choose from without being too restrictive. Staff does not want to dictate design. Chair Nielsen thought integrated landscaping as part of the building form should be included in this chapter.

Boardmember Lambright suggested applicants get credit for creative landscaping, such as courtyards or gardens. He also thought that elevations facing major streets need to address the street properly. He thought solar orientation needed to be addressed. He thought the Code should suggest using natural materials because they require less maintenance. He also thought there should be exception to the building projection requirements, specifically, projections should be allowed to go to the property line when appropriate.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley agreed there needed to be options for Building Forms. He suggested a summary statement to provide flexibility and clarify the intent of the regulations. He thought design needs to achieve a balance. He suggested adding an objective statement to assist designers and staff to select the appropriate requirement.

Boardmember Lambright suggested adding an objective above each statement addressing

## MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 6, 2010 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

shade, pedestrian areas and design theme, for example, with an overall objective for the chapter.

Boardmember Dan Maldonado thought there should be allowances in the requirements for creativity on specific sites as an alternative to simply meeting a check list.

With regard to Section 11-6-4 B, the board thought that metal buildings should be allowed if they met the building form and design standard requirements.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur thought there should be a focus on contoured berming rather than simply specifying the height of the berming. She thought screening elements for parking areas should encourage berming rather than just walls. She thought the code should encourage berming.

Boardmember Bottomley thought lighting should be addressed. He explained that night architecture can be very important because lighting can make buildings welcoming at night. The lighting should be lively, accentuate architectural elements, create interesting shadows and make people feel safe.

Staffmember Hyneman noted that the new Code requires walls between multi-family projects and commercial. This is a new requirement. She wondered if the City should be requiring more walls. Boardmember Lambright stated that sometimes walls are necessary. Boardmember Bottomley stated that other times they just create places for people to hide and make the area less safe.

Boardmember Lambright stated the challenge with adding berms to a site is that there is so much retention required. To provide more capacity and add visual interest to retention basins he suggested using stacking retaining blocks in a meandering pattern or green screens.

Boardmember Maldonado suggested that berming is an enhancement. He thought fewer trees and shrubs were needed if berming was provided. He thought the screen walls and the landscaping need to work together.

Boardmember Bottomley stated that one problem with berms is that the landscape material on top of the berms often fails and then the berms are removed after time and replaced with walls. He suggested that staff needed to make sure the choice of plant material would not be a maintenance problem.

Regarding the requirement that the primary entrances of buildings in the Urban Districts shall be oriented to within 45° of parallel to the street frontage in Section 11-6-5

Boardmember Bottomley questioned why the City is dictating 45°. He asked about main entrances that do not face the street? He suggested saying the entry element not entry door should face the street. Boardmember Lambright suggested that the requirement should allow an entry way to be recognizable from the street rather than specifying the orientation.

Chair Nielsen thought contouring of site berms should be addressed. He thought staff needed to integrate engineering standards to design standards. He thought engineering details need to be revised to allow more urban development.

Boardmember Bottomley wondered if there were a way to integrate architectural interest into

## MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 6, 2010 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

the engineering design standards. For example, allow variety, color, relief and texture on an inlet wall, a culvert or sidewalk.

Mr. Sheffield stated Transportation is acknowledging that streets need to be design for pedestrians and bicycles as well as cars. He stated the City is looking at Form based codes that will look at the big picture. Form based codes include details on how streets relate to buildings as well as how buildings relate to streets.

D. Adjournment:

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta  
Planning Assistant

da