

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

MAY 7, 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
John Poulsen (left at 6:45)
Randy Carter

MEMBERS ABSENT

Jillian Hagen (excused)
Christine Close (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman	Mark Keith
Lesley Davis	John Parezo
Debbie Archuleta	Cory Sukert
Charlie Scully	Joyce McDaniel
Peter Vesecky	Peter Huegel
Scott Stanton	Mark Reeb
David Johns	Dan Reeb
Sean Lake	Todd Lutz
Chanel Garner	Don Andrews
Kristian Sigurdsson	Steve Pappa
Brian Moore	Others

1. Call to Order:

Chair Carie Allen called the meeting to order at 3:45 p.m.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the April 2, and April 15, 2003 Meeting:

On a motion by Rob Burgheimer seconded by John Poulsen the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

3. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-33 **Great American Multi-Family Concept**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NEC Baseline & Greenfield
REQUEST: Approval of a 7,380 sq. ft. auto repair facility
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Westpac Realty Company
APPLICANT: Servicestar Development
ARCHITECT: Peter Lazara

REQUEST: Approval of a 7,380 sq. ft. auto repair facility

SUMMARY: Robert Hall, Steve Pappa and Peter Beceki represented the case. The applicants stated they felt there was shading at the main entrance: the ACM would cantilever 24" and there would be blinds in the storefront. They were willing to provide an awning to shade customers at the entrance and exit to the lube area and the customer exit door. The proportions of the red stepped fascia had been changed to tie into the fascia above the garage doors proportionally. The applicant stated the curved element was a corporate signature.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt the building was very nice; however he would like more color. He suggested using reveal joints and tile accents.

Boardmember John Poulsen was concerned that this project is setting the theme for the remainder of the center. He suggested they tie into the vacant K-Mart building across the street.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer agreed that it is difficult for the Board when they see the pads first. He wanted to see an additional color used. He confirmed the applicants were proposing clear glass, he suggested using colored glass. He suggested using a different color above the yellow element.

The applicants were willing to change the building colors; however, they stated the clear windows allow people to see the merchandise as they drive by.

Chair Carie Allen felt this building would look better built out than the elevations show. She liked the color on the revised elevation, not the color board.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR03-33 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 **revised exterior elevations submitted at the meeting**, 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. **Revise the site plan and floor plan to match the offsets shown on the elevations.**

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

5. **Provide an elevation of the proposed monument sign for approval by Design Review staff.**
6. **Building colors to match colored rendering. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
7. **Reveal joint width to be 3/4" minimum. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
8. **Provide building sections showing the stepped fascia with 6" offsets. Show red steel band. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
9. 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 dishes shall be fully screened by a parapet wall. Ground mounted mechanical units 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.
10. 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.
11. 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. Light standards (poles) for pad sites are to match the light standards used within the shopping center.
12. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
13. Provide an additional color to the building. To be approved by Design Review staff.
14. 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.: (side A)

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-34 **Cal-AM Manufactured Home Sales**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 4750 East Main
REQUEST: Approval of display and sales of manufactured homes
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Norton Karno
APPLICANT: John Parezo
ARCHITECT: John Parezo

REQUEST: Approval of a display and sales of manufactured homes

SUMMARY: John Parezo and Cory Sukert represented the case. Mr. Parezo stated there would be a maximum of 7 units on display. They were trying to give a permanent look to the display units.

Vice Chair John O'Hara was concerned that the sales office needed to have more quality. Main Street is a very important, heavily traveled street.

The applicant stated they did not want to "out play their customer". They felt the building would look much nicer than the elevations depict.

Vice Chair John O'Hara stated that this Board had recently approved a modular building for a bank at Power Road and McDowell. He was concerned that this building would not come up to that level.

Boardmember Randy Carter was concerned that on other mobile home sales lots in the past when the sales lot is gone, the sales office remains. He suggested they use a wainscot, and pop-outs around the windows, a foam cornice. He wanted the building to look classier. He wanted the awnings redesigned, they were too tight. He felt they were using quality materials but they needed to be better designed. This looks like a re-habbed mobile home.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer felt that if this were another business other than mobile home sales, the Board would not approve the sales office. He did not feel this building showcases their industry well. He felt it looked like a stereotypical modular building. He felt that with such a small building what the Board was asking for would not cost that much. He was also concerned with the sales units. He felt they would look permanent. He was concerned that the Board would never see the display units. He wanted to know how they would relate to each other. Would the units be of similar color and character? He felt this site would be different from a typical vehicle display lot. He felt it was a shame the display units were nicer than the sales office.

The applicant passed around a photo of a residential product they felt this sales office would look like.

Chair Carrie Allen was concerned with the look of the sales office. She suggested a porch. She confirmed the applicant was willing to do a wainscot, a stucco cornice, awnings, pilasters at the corner, and more break out areas.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

MOTION: It was moved by John O'Hara that DR03-34 be continued to June 4, 2003:

The motion failed for lack of a second

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR03-34 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. **Revise the building design of the sales office building to incorporate a well-integrated shading and weather protection structure at each publicly accessible entrance.**
5. **As per Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance, for phased development there shall be a continuous concrete curb and minimum five (5) feet landscape strip between the developed area and the undeveloped areas.**
6. **At this time, the north portion of the site defined by the C-2 Zoning District designation is not permitted to be used for manufactured home sales or inventory storage. This area to be treated and maintained with at least two inches (2") deep of decomposed granite or similar material for dust control. The C-2 portion of the site shall be maintained clear and free of weed growth, litter, material storage or any other use not authorized through an approved plan.**
7. **Any future development or use of the C-2 portion of the site is required to go through the standard preliminary application process, including the Pre-Submittal conference and other development application, as required, prior to any use.**
8. **If the manufactured home sales use ceases to exist is discontinued or is vacated on this site, the entire sales office structure, as well as all sales units shall be removed from the site within six months.**
9. **The retention basin in the C-2 area at the rear of the site is subject to the design requirements of Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance, including irregular contouring and integral landscaping.**
10. **An elevation and cross section showing the retention basin between the entrance doors on the south side of the sales office needs to be submitted to Design Review staff for review and approval prior to submittal of construction documents for plan review.**
11. **Chain link or vinyl coated chain link fencing is not permitted. Any interior site or screening walls proposed would be subject to a separate submittal for Design Review.**
12. **Applicant to work with staff to provide a wainscot on all 4-sides; strengthen the entry elements; break up the elevations, enlarge the awnings, and modify the cornice and fascia.**
13. All outdoor storage areas for materials, equipment, and service entrance section

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- (SES) shall be recessed or fully screened from view by a masonry wall the same height as the utility cabinet.
14. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
 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 4 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is a unique concept for manufacture home sales.

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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-35 **San Miguel Apartments**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Guadalupe & Loop 202
REQUEST: Approval of a 300 unit apartment complex
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Ruiz Engineering
APPLICANT: Pew & Lake P.L.C.
ARCHITECT: David Johns

REQUEST: Approval of a 300 unit apartment complex

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

David Johns, Scott Sand and Sean Lake represented the case. David Johns explained that the 3 story building was design to step down to 2-stories in a number of areas around the building. The building was also designed to emphasize that a majority of the buildings are 2-story townhouse units. He felt the punched balconies gave the 2-story buildings character.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was concerned that the only real interest came from the color. He liked the colors. He felt the clubhouse was too tall and out of scale. He wanted more "movement" on the 2-story building. He would like to see the Sun Glow used on the rear of the 2-story building.

Boardmember John Poulsen liked the colors; however he was concerned that the building doesn't have much articulation or variation. He felt that if the building were painted beige the Board would not approve it. There was no variety of building materials. He wanted to see more "movement". He was concerned that they were 3-story buildings finished with only stucco. He was concerned with the long-term durability of the building.

Boardmember Randy Carter was concerned with the rear of the 3-story building. He confirmed there would be a 1' difference in planes to accomplish the color change. He was concerned with the architecture of the building without the change in color. He confirmed that in the future the building could not be painted a single color or even different colors without approval from the Design Review Board for the changes. Boardmember Carter wanted the rear elevation of the 3-story building to be better articulated. He wanted the fascia to tie into the gable. He felt there were continuity problems with the elevations of the buildings. He wanted the architecture to match the flamboyance of the colors. He suggested using a wainscot to break up the severity of the bottom floor. The rooflines and fascias were too varied.

Vice Chair John O'Hara liked the colors; he wanted to see more articulation. He was concerned with how the buildings would look in 10 years.

Chair Carie Allen did not like the colors. She preferred the rear elevation of the 2-story building. She was concerned the colors would be trendy. She agreed that without the colors the buildings did not have much interest.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Poulsen was concerned that the buildings will not look as interesting when they are built as they do in the drawings. He was concerned that in 10 years this building will not appear to have quality and substance.

Boardmember Burgheimer felt the clubhouse looked like someone other than the person who designed the rest of the buildings designed it.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by John Poulsen that DR03-35 be continued to the June 4, 2003 meeting

The Board's main concerns were:

- Articulation of the two and three buildings.
- Continuity of design between the fronts and rears of the buildings: cornices, gables, pop-outs, and building base.
- Redesign of the elevations on the 3-story buildings.
- The relationship of the balconies to the third floor windows.
- Inconsistency of balcony openings.
- Relationship of roof eaves to third floor windows.
- Relationship of ground floor windows to upper floor windows. Suggested the windows be recessed or provide a change in material.
- Design of the clubhouse tower.

Boardmember Burgheimer then stated that stucco buildings are not necessarily bad however, there needs to be variation in form and color not just color to break that up. If the buildings don't move they need to have another building material such as masonry or tile accents. He suggested recessing the ground floor windows. This is a large complex it needs more.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: To allow the applicant time to address the Board's concerns.

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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-36 **Arbor Medical Center**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: Arbor Avenue and 63rd Street
REQUEST: Approval of a 2.38 acre medical office complex
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Mike Hamberlin
APPLICANT: Sherman Cawley
ARCHITECT: Sherman Cawley

REQUEST: Approval of a 2.38 acre medical office complex

SUMMARY: Sherman Cawley represented the case. Mr. Cawley stated this case had been through the Planning and Zoning Board and he felt the site planning issues had been worked out with staff. He stated that the offices had been pre-sold. He then gave the Board revised elevations and went through the staff report and explained how he had addressed staff concerns. Boardmember John O'Hara did not feel this proposal was of the same quality as other buildings in the area.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt the buttresses stop flat and look applied, they don't tie into anything. He felt the buildings were very severe. He did not feel the project was of the quality of other buildings in the area, including the building to the south. Boardmember Carter liked the cornices but felt they don't tie into any other elements. He felt the buildings proportions were not good. He did not like the transition from the cornice to the wall, to the buttresses.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer did not feel the revised elevations had changed enough. He liked the building materials but thought they were over done. He did not like the proportions of the buildings. He felt there was too much roof. The scale of the buildings was huge, and did not feel the building needed to be 26 feet tall.

Mr. Cawley stated client wants the height and scale, the client wants the buildings to be impressive.

Boardmember Burgheimer wanted the bottom piece on the east elevation pulled out. He felt the building was too monochromatic, he wanted another tone at the entry arches. He wanted the scale brought down, the roof engaged with the piers. He felt there was too much use of stone.

Mr. Cawley stated the client felt the stone piers were impressive.

Chair Carie Allen liked the colors and the quality materials. She felt there were too many piers. She preferred the A versions of the window placements.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by John O'Hara that DR03-36 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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- at the meeting, 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 additional interest to the building elevations.**
 - a. **Incorporate sill details, and head details at the windows.**
 - b. **Provide an additional color at the entrances.**
 - c. **Revise the termination of the pilasters or buttresses.**
 - d. **Eliminate some of the stone pilasters as extend the material into a wainscot.**
 - e. **Placement of the pilasters to be more like revised alternative "3A".**
 - f. **Provide additional pilasters, wainscoting, or pop-outs on the south elevation of Building E.**
 - g. **Provide cut sheets of proposed building lighting. Wall mounted lighting should be compatible with the character of the building.**
 - h. **Redesign the storefront detail in openings that contain both windows and doors.**
 6. **Provide elevations of proposed screen walls; refuse enclosure walls for approval by Design Review staff.**
 7. **Provide monument sign for approval by Design Review staff.**
 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. 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 4 – 0 (Boardmember John Poulsen left prior to this case)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is reasonably well-designed.

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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-37 **UPS Distribution Facility**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NEC Higley & Baseline
REQUEST: Approval of a 17.4 acre UPS Distribution Facility
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: UPS of Ohio
APPLICANT: UPS Chanel Garner
ARCHITECT: Robert Kubicek

REQUEST: Approval of a 17.4 acre UPS Distribution Facility

SUMMARY: This case was added to the consent agenda by the Design Review Board, and then removed from the agenda because someone in the audience wanted to discuss the case.

Chanel Garner and Michael Chantel represented the case.

Mark Reeb came forward prior to the consent agenda vote and stated he was in support of the case; however, he was concerned with the use of chain link fencing. He stated he develops industrial projects in Mesa and he has been required to build masonry walls. He understood the use of chain link if the fence is only temporary, if it is not temporary he felt they should be required to use masonry just like everyone else.

During the public hearing portion of the meeting Chanel Garner stated that they had spoken to Mr. Reeb and it was agreed the chain link fencing would be used on a temporary bases until the next phase expansion at which time they will address the issue, or possibly when the orange grove to the east develops. As far as the landscaping along the north side it was due to the first Phase of expansion and would go away when they expand and they would be coming back to the Design Review Board for Phase II and they would meet Code requirements for landscaping.

Chair Carie Allen confirmed that Mr. Reeb was in agreement with what Ms. Garner said.

Mr. Reeb stated he understood this would be a temporary situation. He understood that some people feel there is no need for screen walls between industrial uses, but he felt that there are a variety of uses that can occur within industrial uses; office, retail, manufacturing, construction yards. He felt that an opaque wall was necessary.

Discussion ensued regarding the landscaping to be planted within the Phase II portion of the development. The applicants would be planting trees at the corners of the Phase II portion as well as directly opposite the Phase I building.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman then explained that the reason staff negotiated to allow less landscaping along the perimeter was in order to get better building elevations. The applicant stated they were unable to upgrade their elevations due to cost, so it was negotiated that in order to provide a better building the applicants would be allowed to postpone some of the perimeter landscaping for Phase II.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

The Board felt that was a good trade-off, and thanked UPS for providing an attractive building.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by John O'Hara that DR03-37 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. **Wash bay canopy colors to match proposed distribution building: Metal fascia to be painted ICI #327 "Nutria"; columns to be painted ICI #484 "Abbey Cream".**
6. **Guardhouse colors to match proposed distribution building: Metal fascia to be painted ICI #1245 "Main Harbor"; concrete walls and doors to be painted ICI #484 "Abbey Cream".**
7. **Provide information regarding the unidentified trees flanking the customer entrance. Species should be complement the entrance and provide interest for the customers.**
8. **Provide landscaping shown on landscaping plan submitted with first phase of development. Remaining required landscaping to be installed with the second phase of development.**
9. **Provide a screen wall for the customer parking area per Chapter 15, section**
 - **Screen parking areas and drive aisles from street(s) with masonry wall and/or berm with supplemental shrubs and ground covers.**
 - **The screening device shall vary in height (32 inches to 40 inches) and stagger in plan (at least 24 inches) at intervals of at least fifty (50) feet along street frontage.**
10. 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.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 20' height within 50' of the perimeter.
14. Fire risers and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
15. 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.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is an attractive industrial building in an area planned for mixed use development.

Recorded on Tape No.: 2 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-41 **Vista Plaza Lot 4 Retail Building**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NWC Southern & Val Vista
REQUEST: Approval of a 7,040 sq. ft. retail building on a vacant pad
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: Lexon Developer Services
APPLICANT: John Surin
ARCHITECT: Kristian Sigurdson

REQUEST: Approval of a 7,040 sq. ft. retail building on a vacant pad

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

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Randy Carter that DR03-41 be approved with the following conditions:

- 1. Include landscape planters in front of the four columns at the front of the building. The landscape planters at grade shall be setback at least two feet (2') from the face of the curb. Include shrubs and/or groundcover consistent with the landscape plan as submitted.**
- 2. Replace any dead or missing trees along the west property line for this site so there is a continuous row of at least nine (9) trees at a minimum 24" box size.**
3. 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.
4. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
6. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
7. 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.
- 8. The S.E.S. panel on the north elevation must be recessed or fully screened from view. A revised floor plan, site plan and elevation must be approved by Design Review staff prior to submitting to Building Safety Division for plan review.**
9. Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened by a parapet wall equal to or exceeding the height of the mechanical units. Ground mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened from public view by a combination of dense landscaping and decorative wall, which shall be equal to or exceed the height of units.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

10. 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.
11. **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. A lighting study may be required at the Plan Review stage to ensure lighting at the rear does not interfere with the existing residential properties.**
12. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior, 20' height at the perimeter, and 14' maximum height at perimeter adjacent to residential properties. Light standards (poles) for pad sites are to match the light standards used within the shopping center.
13. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
14. 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 compatible with the existing retail buildings on site.

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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-45 **Val Vista Gateway**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1945 & 1955 South Val Vista
REQUEST: Approval of two 50,000 sq. ft., 2-story buildings
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Val Vista Gateway LLC
APPLICANT: BCMA Architects
ARCHITECT: BCMA Architects

REQUEST: Approval of two 2-story buildings

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda.

Brian Moore represented the case. Mr. Moore stated they were changing the building type to be more marketable. He stated the existing buildings are very similar and they did not want to vary too much from the original design.

Boardmember Randy Carter liked the landscaping in the courtyard; however he felt that few people would see. He was concerned with the areas visible from Baseline and Val Vista. The slate entry feature is only 22' wide, he wanted more color around the building, especially where visible from Baseline and Val Vista. He was concerned that the canopies won't be visible from the street because they aren't curved or at 45°, so the color would not really be seen. He suggested using a stripe or accent. He felt these buildings needed differentiation from the existing projects to tie in with the surrounding neighborhood, not just with the remainder of this center. He wanted more than flat slabs painted one color with a stripe.

Boardmember John Poulsen wanted to see more landscaping. He felt the elevations with no awnings were very stark. He confirmed there is an existing office to the northwest of this proposal. He wanted the landscaping along the north elevation to match what was proposed along the south.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer wanted more variation, the building looks the same on all 4-sides. He felt there should be a change where the stairwell comes through. He liked the slate, but wanted it used on other areas of the building. He felt the elevations needed to be broken up. He was concerned that they were only building the south building in Phase I. He confirmed that the parking and the courtyard would be built in Phase I. He felt the building was too plain and repetitious.

Chair Carie Allen was concerned with the idea of adding color to break up the building, she suggested using more of the slate around the building.

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR03-45 be continued for redesign.

Discussion then ensued regarding the Board's concerns with the proposal.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

More slate be used on the building and for the stairwells to be redesigned.

Phase II should have temporary landscaping, and provide the landscape plan for Phase II. Articulate the suspension for the canopies, pull the stair well out from the building. Provide canopies on the north elevation of the Phase II building. Provide additional trees, especially in the foundation bases.

The motion was withdrawn.

NEW MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by John O'Hara that DR03-45 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 conditions of Zoning Case Z03-10.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
6. **Provide a second row of 24" box trees along the northwest property line adjacent to the residential development. Tree species should have full canopy, should be non deciduous and should be compatible with existing landscaping palette.**
7. **Revise the building elevations:**
 - **Slope or curve the metal canopies and articulate the canopy support**
 - **Add slate accents to building**
 - **Express location of the stairs on the exterior of the building**
 - **Elevations to be approved by Design Review staff.**
8. **Revise landscape plan:**
 - **Provide landscaping on north side of building to match what was proposed on the south side of the building.**
 - **Provide temporary landscaping buffer for Phase II around the perimeter and corners of the vacant pad**
 - **Provide additional trees in the foundation base**
 - **Landscaping plan to be approved by Design Review staff.**
9. The service entrance section (SES) is located within the building.
10. 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.
11. 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 MAY 7, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

12. 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.
13. Light standards (poles) for development sites larger than 1 acre shall be a maximum height of 25' for the interior and 14' height at the perimeter when adjacent to residential uses.
14. 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.
15. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
16. 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.: 1 (side B) and tape 2 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-21 **Eckerd Drug Store**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC McKellips Road and Stapley Drive
SUMMARY OF REQUEST: Development of 14,308 sq. ft. Eckerd Drugstore
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Unicorn International
APPLICANT: Don Andrews
ARCHITECT: Don Andrews, Andrews Design Group

REQUEST: Approval of a 14,308 sq. ft. Eckerd drug store

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

MOTION: It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Randy Carter that DR03-21 be approved with the following conditions:

1. **Compliance with all provisions of the Board of Adjustment concerning the Variance approved at their meeting of April 8, 2000, (BA03-009) to allow setback reductions for the subject proposal.**
2. **Any freestanding monument signs to be reviewed and approved by Design Review Board staff. Any such signs should include a brick base and wrap around border with the top element comprised of raised seam copper roof-type materials to match the main building.**
3. **Submit a revised Landscape Plan to Design Review Staff showing vines on the west building elevation as per the Variance requirement (BA03-009). Delete the shrubs in the five foot (5') strip between the west building elevation and the wall and replace with decomposed granite.**
4. **Prior to submitting construction documents, confirm the location of the refuse enclosures with the Solid Waste Division.**
5. 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.
6. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
7. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
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.
11. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 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 5 – 0

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

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

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR03-28 **Eckerd Drug Store**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Southern & Ellsworth
REQUEST: Approval of a 14,129 sq. ft. drug store
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Unicorp National Developments
APPLICANT: Andrews Design Group
ARCHITECT: Don Andrews

REQUEST: Approval of a 14,129 sq. ft. Eckerd drug store

SUMMARY: Don Andrews represented the case. He stated they had stepped the tower to reduce the mass; the round columns were requested by the owner of the center. The colors were chosen to provide sharp contrast.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer liked the contrast of color. He felt the round columns looked like a mistake. The proportions of the arches in the entrance feature are too similar. He suggested the center arch go up. He suggested the tower on the north elevation be a darker contrast color.

Boardmember Randy Carter agreed the tower should be darker. He wanted the columns to be thicker.

Vice Chair John O'Hara agreed with previous suggestions. He also appreciates that the building looks different from other Eckerd cases previously approved.

Chair Carie Allen liked the white, but not the darker color.

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR03-28 be approved with the following conditions:

1. **Compliance with the conditions of Site Plan Modification (Zoning Case #Z03-08) recommended for approval by the Planning and Zoning Board at their meeting of February 20, 2003, and approved by the City Council at their meeting of April 7, 2003.**
2. **Compliance with the Site Development Standards of Chapter 15, including a minimum fifteen foot (15') front entry elevation foundation base with an additional two feet (2') for vehicle overhang where 16' parking stalls are proposed for a total of seventeen feet (17') on the west elevation. The building footprint needs to be shifted to the east to accommodate the minimum foundation base requirements on the west.**
3. 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.
4. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
6. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership. Contact Jo Ferguson, Senior Planner (480) 644-2642.
 7. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
 8. 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.
 9. 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.
 10. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
 11. **On the west elevation the center white tower be wider or taller. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
 12. **The round columns be changed to rectangular or square and be beefed up to match the other columns on the building. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
 13. **The tower on the north elevation to be a darker color. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
 14. **Flashing color at the tower slope transition, to match the tower. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
 15. 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 4 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The development as proposed with conditions is unique and reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: 3 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR02-30 Fletcher Tire
LOCATION/ADDRESS: NEC US 60 and Crismon
REQUEST: Permission to use red store fronts rather than bronze
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 5
OWNER: Fletcher's Tire & Auto
APPLICANT: Gerald Kesler
ARCHITECT: Gerald Kesler

REQUEST: Permission to use red store fronts rather than bronze

SUMMARY: Staff member Laura Hyneman explained that this project had been previously approved by the Design Review Board. The project was coming back for discussion because the applicants had installed red storefronts that were not approved by the Board.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer felt the red storefront was not a big problem. He was concerned with the overall issue of changes that are made in the field without any approval.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that the question of colored mullions within commercial developments has come up before. 99c stores wants blue mullions, Staples wants red, in the past the Board has said "no, you have signage for your building, the Board has wanted the storefronts to be compatible with the building".

Chair Carie Allen felt they should use the bronze depicted in their original submittal.

Boardmember Randy Carter did not have a problem with colored mullions as long as the Board discussed the color on a case-by-case bases. He did feel that in some cases the colored mullions were a detriment to the existing center. He felt that changing the storefronts in the field without any permission from any one was a bad decision.

MOTION: It was moved by John O'Hara and seconded by Randy Carter that DR02-30 be approved as submitted:

VOTE: Passed 3 – 1 (Chair Carie Allen voting nay)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The Board felt that the red was acceptable since the amount of storefront on this building was not very large.

Recorded on Tape No.: 3 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2003 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Other Business:

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated the recently adopted Design Guidelines were being revisited in order to discuss any concerns that have come up. She asked the Board to let staff know if there were any issues they would like discussed.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated there would be an orientation for new Boardmembers on June 23, 2003. If they never attended an orientation they were welcome to attend.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da