

**CITY OF MESA**  
**MINUTES OF THE**  
**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**  
**DECEMBER 4, 2002**

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 (arrived 3:44)  
(left at 4:45)  
John Poulsen  
Tara Plese  
Randy Carter  
Jillian Hagen (arrived 4:07)  
Robert Burgheimer

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman  
Veronica Gonzalez  
Debbie Archuleta  
Charlie Scully  
Joe Murray  
Sean Lake  
Richard Dyer  
Dave Lawrence  
Susan Stewart  
S.G. Ellison  
Richard Sinnard

MEMBERS ABSENT

1. Call to Order:

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

2. Approval of the Minutes of the November 6, 2002 Meeting:

On a motion by Rob Burgheimer seconded by John O'Hara the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

3. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR02-60**                      **Desert Colors – Monte Vista Village Center**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**              SWC Baseline & Ellsworth  
**REQUEST:**                              Approval of a 15.88 acre shopping center  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**                6  
**OWNER:**                                Monte Vista/Joint Venture  
**APPLICANT:**                        Ellermann & Schick Architects  
**ARCHITECT:**                         Joe Murray

**REQUEST:**      Approval of a 15.88 acre shopping center

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

Joe Murray and Dave Lawrence represented the case.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman explained that the signage as shown on the elevations exceeds the area allowed by the Sign Code. The applicant has submitted an application for a Comprehensive Sign Plan through the Board of Adjustment. Should the "Safeway" sign not be approved, staff was concerned with how the stucco element might be redesigned for a smaller sign. Joe Murray explained that if the sign band were reduced for the Safeway sign, they would adjust that portion of the panel to keep the overall project proportional.

Boardmember Robert Burgheimer felt that this overall concept is about masses not about stripes or bands. He was concerned that whatever may be done is consistent with the remainder of the project. He felt that the project has a nice balance as currently shown. He did not want to see a band or depression in the sign band. He confirmed the placement of the colors on the buildings. The purple would be an accent color that goes along any metal trim work, columns, trellis, and the awnings underneath; the muted yellow is also a metal accent color underneath the canopies in the shops portion. He confirmed yellow would be used underneath the sign band for the shops where the steel awning is, and the metal decking would be a galvanized color. The curved portion above the entrances to the Safeway and also the entry gate at the pedestrian access would have the metal roofing. There would be two integral color block samples, the lighter color would be the shell of the building and the darker color would be used as an accent block on the columns and the cart screen walls. Boardmember Burgheimer then questioned whether the "spires" would be allowed or if they exceed the height limit.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman suggested that the Board add a condition approving the height of the spires.

Boardmember John Poulsen felt the building design was interesting, he liked it.

Boardmember Tara Plese liked the use of colors. She suggested using a darker color for a possibly smaller Safeway sign to mitigate the problem.

Boardmember Randy Carter suggested that when this applicant comes back with their sign proposal they show the Board how they are addressing the smaller sign, if the Board of Adjustment does not approve the size as proposed. Boardmember Carter stated that in the past there have been instances where applicants have proposed integral block and then when

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

the project is actually constructed the integral block is replaced with stained block which loses a great deal of richness. One case in particular was the Target center at Power and McKellips. He wanted to make sure that this applicant would actually use the block proposed with this application.

Joe Murray stated that the Power and McKellips project was their project as well as a project of this developer. He stated that the problem with that project was that the contractor did not order the block in time to get the integral block. He stated that they wanted integral color, Weingartner wanted integral block for maintenance reasons, but some times things happen.

Boardmember Carter did not want to approve this project if there was a chance the block would be painted. He wanted a commitment from the applicants that they would actually build with integral block. He did not feel it was fair to the City to have painted block because the contractor waited until the last minute to order the block.

Joe Murray stated they wanted integral block, Dave Lawrence made the commitment.

Vice Chair John O'Hara liked the project.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen liked the landscaping.

Chair Carie Allen felt the project was well done.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tara Plese that DR02-60 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. **Future review of pad buildings by the Design Review Board.**
6. **Provide additional landscaping along the west and south property lines:**
  - South - the new design standards require 6 trees and 16 shrubs per 100 linear feet of property line, 810' = 49 trees and 130 shrubs with supplemental plant material required to provide total vegetative cover equal to 50% of the area. The previous landscaping standards required 1 tree and 1 shrub per 15' of property line, 810' = 54 trees and 54 shrubs. Either standard may be used.
  - West - the new design standards require 6 trees and 16 shrubs per 100 linear feet of property line, 810' = 49 trees and 130 shrubs with supplemental plant material required to provide total vegetative cover equal to 50% of the area. The previous landscaping standards required 1 tree and 1 shrub per 15' of property line, 860' = 58 trees and 58 shrubs. Either standard may be used.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

7. **Revise landscaping plan to match plaza plan on sheet T-1.**
8. **Future approval of signage by the Design Review Board.**
9. **The block to be integral color and not stained or painted.**
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.
11. All S.E.S. panels, utility pedestals and vaults shall be painted to match the primary building color.
12. 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.
13. 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.
14. The exterior light sources shall be fully shielded, shall comply with the Chapter 6 of the City Code "Outdoor Light Control" and outdoor lighting provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
15. 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.
16. Light standards (poles) for pad sites are to match the light standards used within the shopping center.
17. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
18. **The Board approves the height of the spires as shown on the drawings.**
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 7 – 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** The development as proposed with conditions is well designed and the height of the spires is mitigated by the setback from the street.

Recorded on Tape No.: 144 – 1 (side A)

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE #: DR02-62**                      **CVS Pharmacy**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**              Guadalupe and Crismon  
**REQUEST:**                              Approval of a 13,013 sq. ft. drug store  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**                District 6  
**OWNER:**                                 Ron Walker  
**APPLICANT:**                         Susan Stewart, L.E.A.D.S  
**ARCHITECT:**                         Richard Sinnard

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

**SUMMARY:**    Susan Stewart, Richard Sinnard, and S.G. Ellison represented the case.

Susan Stewart stated that they designed this project to meet the new Design Guidelines. They exceeded the 30' X 30' entrance, in fact it is 60' at the widest point and 35' at the deepest. Their interpretation was that the Code referred to the pedestrian entrance and the building's south and east elevations were non-pedestrian entrances, therefore they would require 10' of foundation landscaping. They provided 12' to give more pedestrian room to maneuver around the columns. They felt they had sufficient room for pedestrians to pass and for car overhangs. To address staff's concerns about the landscaping island required to screen the trash enclosure, they had designed the island to allow the Sanitation truck to pick up their trash, back-up and then continue into the shopping center to pick up trash from the other, future trash enclosures in one pass. On the rear of the building they enhanced the building by using ledgestone to screen the equipment. The step theme on the façade had been carried out across the rear and stands out 4" from the face of the building. The design of the entry vestibule was a southwest theme and blended with the Augusta Ranch ledgestone and darker colors. The ledgestone was capped and they wrapped the cap around the entry vestibule. The step theme was continued in the parapets and around the back of the building. They had removed the pitched roof and overhang from the front of the store that had been originally proposed for this site.

Boardmember Robert Burgheimer stated that he did not like this project for a couple of reasons: first, he felt that CVS needs to change what they are proposing, he wanted to see all of the previously approved CVS stores, to determine how much they have changed. He felt that there had not been enough change. He felt that this building is a plain box, and does not have enough articulation on the facades. He felt the building was very flat with a lot of applied stuff. He did not like the entry. His main concern was the flatness. He did not feel that this project was as well designed as the previous cases.

Boardmember John Poulsen stated that if you go west along Guadalupe you will see several examples of the same rectangular box with different elements applied to the elevation. At the November meeting the Board saw a CVS that had a porch element all the way around the side of it. This is a repeat of what they have seen numerous times. He felt that it was time the Board draw the line. He wanted to see some articulation, something other than a box, with a decorative corner and a drive through stuck on the far side. He wanted to see pharmacies do something different.

Boardmember Tara Plese stated that being new to this Board she could not speak to the issue of "prototype". Her concern was that this building does not appear to be compatible with what is being proposed for the remainder of the shopping center.

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that staff has concerns with the proposed elevations for the shopping center; however, they displayed the proposed shopping center elevations to give the Board an idea of what was being proposed for the surrounding center. She felt that the similarities were the colors and use of stone.

Boardmember Randy Carter did not believe that this particular CVS was as well designed as some of the others this Board has reviewed. He felt that the elevations were a hodge podge. He was also concerned that the applicants for the CVS and the shopping center were not communicating. He was concerned that on the south elevation the cornice continued beyond the parapet steps. On the east elevation the cornice stopped at the parapet steps.

Vice Chair John O'Hara stated that he would like to see the Board take a stand regarding the boxy look of so many projects. He felt that the Board needs to look at free-standing pharmacies and try to get something that doesn't look like a big box on the corner.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen felt that the architecture had a lot of different styles that were not very gracefully blended. She was also concerned with the landscape plan. The plan is a mixture of desert plant material, ornamental plant material, and turf. She felt that it was a hodge podge of materials without a theme. The screen walls were completely straight, the edges of the turf were straight, but the planting did not appear to be formal. She felt that the landscaping and the building were not pulling together in a theme that felt good and solid.

Chair Carie Allen does not like prototypes. She doesn't want boxes on every corner. She liked the building materials proposed, but felt that the building needed more interest and variation. She wanted the applicant for this building to work with the shopping center applicant.

Boardmember Randy Carter stated that their parking as proposed is almost twice what would be required. If they were to eliminate some parking they would have room to provide the landscape strip required in the rear of the project around the drive-through.

Susan Stewart stated that CVS is client/customer oriented so they want as much parking close to the building as possible. She then stated that the upper portion of the building is a thickened wall that projects out over 4", the ledgestone pieces along the south, north and east elevations start out 4" beyond the base wall, the columns are another 4" on top of that, those columns go to the parapet and are crowned with 5' high façade that dies into the cornice. She felt there was a lot of depth. She felt it was difficult to see on two dimensional drawings. She stated that they tied this project into August Ranch Design Guidelines. They photographed a number of buildings in the Augusta Ranch. She agreed that the screen wall along Crismon needs to be broken up and in places landscaping used in its place. They were willing to enhance the turf channel along Crismon. She felt the Board might not understand the varying depths and masses used to pick up light and shadow.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that his first concern was that this applicant communicate with the developer of the shopping center, it does not appear that these two projects are communicating with each other. He did not mean that the two projects should be identical; however, he felt there were conflicts in the styles and no continuity. He did not feel that this building had the same quality as some of the other CVS projects, and he thought the Board had cautioned CVS that they were going to want to see more variation to future CVS projects.

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

He understood that they were trying to respond to a number of different groups, but he felt that someone needed to take a look at the center and make a decision on the style of the center and then decide how they are going to match the center or why they are not going to. He did not object to the materials being used, the problem was how they come together. He stated that the building appears to be very flat.

Boardmember Poulsen stated that this Board reviews one of these projects almost every month and felt like it was dejavu. If it's not CVS, it's Walgreen's or Osco or something else. The Board sees them so often and they are all rectangular boxes with an entrance at the corner, with a façade going off in both directions and then a drive-through back on the far corner. This Board has requested over and over that someone do something different. The previous case which was approved by the Board was a grocery store that did not look like every other grocery store. All the Board wants is for someone to break away from the mould a little. The CVS that the Board reviewed in November did do that a little. The Board did not want to appear like they were picking on this project, but they have been saying we are getting tired of seeing basically the same thing, next time you need to bring in something different. The Board has seen it enough times they want something different, and more creative. Why does the door always have to be on the corner and have the same look. They want to cookie cutter the building, but there are so many of them being built that it isn't fair to Mesa or the rest of the Valley.

S.G. Ellison stated he appreciated the Board's comments and felt that they had helped make previous CVS projects do well. He was disturbed, because he felt that every one of their buildings are different, he felt that they adapt to every site they build on and make changes to every building. He also felt that the success of these pharmacies is making them convenience oriented. There was not a lot that they could vary concerning the footprint of the building and still be successful. They have to have an open parking field. If they parking lot is full it's not convenient for customers. He felt that Design Review Boards around the Valley seem to be getting into use specific issues.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman then stated that we have come to respect building footprint "the box" but how you articulate the box is the Board's problem. On the previous case, heard at the meeting the "box" was typical of Safeway; however, the trelliswork and the elevations put it over the top. She agreed that this CVS does not look like the others, but the composition, the proportions, and attention to detail of the other projects was something the Board appreciated.

S.G. Ellison then stated that he felt their client had bent over backward to do what the City wanted.

Boardmember Poulsen stated that every bank in the east valley does not have one shape, with the entrance and drive-through always at the same location. They do see it with gas stations, and they are asking the same question, why do they all need to be the same. Is it critical that all pharmacies be the same layout? If it does have to be that way, how can the building be disguised so that so many street corners don't look the same? If you took off the embellishments, all the pharmacies basically look the same. They are not so much protesting the box, but what they are doing with it. There are so many pharmacies and they basically look the same.

S.G. Ellison stated that their goal is to be different. They have extended the entrances down

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

around the corners on some projects, but if they did that on every store, that would be same. What they would like to see are specific comments to this building.

Boardmember Poulsen stated that it is the Boards goal to approve projects. They want the City to have projects. He felt that CVS has done a good job in the past designing nice looking projects. This project appears to be more bland and ordinary, and more like other projects. He thought the rendering was attractive, although he felt it was a little deceptive. The 4" pop-outs on a building this large are not going to do much.

Boardmember Randy Carter then stated that, in his opinion, the squared steps seemed out of character, the lack of stone over the angled entrance seemed incongruent to the rest of the building. The corner treatment seemed unresolved because of the 4" pop-out, when built they would see a cut-off flat edge, which the Board does not like. How the stone used on the arches is very nice and has a warm feel, but there is no finishing point, it doesn't seem to pull together. It's like they have pasted different styles from Augusta Ranch together but they don't flow like a good piece of architecture needs to.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated that on the sides of the building where the stone is used, he felt that it was being used in the wrong place. Placing it on a flat wall to break-up the wall seemed like a waste of money. He suggested pulling out that area of the side wall and maybe use a different color and use the stone on the front or somewhere where they would get more bang for the buck.

Boardmember Carter agreed that it would be nicer of the area of the side elevation that had the stone were pulled out deeper instead of a 4" pop-out.

Boardmember Plese was concerned that this building is not compatible with the proposed elevations for the shopping center. This building seems more modern and the center has more of a southwestern feel with the sharp edges and metal awnings.

Boardmember Burgheimer agreed that the issue of use was for the Planning and Zoning Board to address. He did feel that CVS should want to look different from Walgreen's and Osco, but this doesn't seem to. He felt that this was a great opportunity for CVS to do something different and better. He felt that the other CVS projects were going in the right direction, but they need more work. He would be willing to meet with them in two weeks to help with their time constraints. He did not want to get into the situation where they were designing their project for them. He felt strongly that the Board's job was to give direction.

Chair Carie Allen then asked if the applicants would be able to meet in two weeks.

Boardmember Carter then suggested using a curved wall around the entrance or something really different. Expand the box, step the elevations in and out.

Boardmember Burgheimer then asked them to look at the way they designed the project in the Desert Uplands to fit in that environment and do that in this location. Look for what is different in this area of town, are there any important buildings they can relate to.

**MOTION:** It was moved by John Poulsen and seconded by Tara Plese that DR02-62 be continued to 9:00 a.m. Wednesday December 18<sup>th</sup>.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**VOTE:** Passed 6 – 0 (Boardmember John O'Hara left prior to vote)

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

Recorded on Tape No.: 144 – 1 (side A and B)

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

### Other Business

Discussion of "Commercial Center Development Policy":

Staffmember Charlie Scully explained that the document is now available on-line. The Boardmembers will review the document and make comments at the next meeting.

Discussion of Design Review Board review of churches.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman explained that John Gendron, Zoning Administrator had drafted three options to take to the City Council. She explained that the City Council had discussed this issue at a study session, and had requested that John Gendron, research why the Ordinance was written the way it was and come up with some suggestions for further discussion.

Basically three options were identified: First "Option 1" was that the Design Review Board review free-standing churches if they met the requirements for review of commercial and industrial projects. This would mean churches along arterial streets and those exceeding 20,000 sq. ft. There was some discussion at the Council meeting that churches become a problem when they are large. A 20,000 sq. ft. church would mean a lot of parking and site improvements. The second alternative "Option 2" was to review all free-standing churches regardless of where they are located or how big they are. Basically the language in the options presented meant there was an agreement that this Board would not ask a church to change any feature that was customary or a traditional style of that particular religion. For instance if a church wanted a particular steeple or an onion dome this Board would not say that onion dome was not appropriate. The Board was concerned that a church could argue that any feature of their building was traditional. The Board was concerned that every detail of the design could be exempt from discussion. The Board understood that there are features that are traditional, such as steeples, or mosques, but what if someone wants an element that is 200' tall. How do you determine what is traditional on an individual church. They were concerned that the ordinance comment could cause serious problems down the road. They felt that if a design element was an integral part of the religion they should be able to justify it, therefore the statement should be removed from the ordinance. The Board understood that most churches would have a steeple but if they wanted it to be 200' tall the Board should be able to say it is incongruent with the rest of the building. The Board needs to have some latitude to ensure that the building elements are compatible and well designed. The Board felt that it could be a loophole and the Board needs to ensure that the project is reasonable.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer, who had attended the Council study session, felt that the Council would be more likely to approve the first option rather than the second.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen confirmed that if a church was proposed in a residential neighborhood but was 20,000 sq. ft. or larger it would be reviewed.

Staffmember Hyneman the stated that the third option was to specifically exempt all churches except as an appeal to comments of the zoning plans reviewers.

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

The Board discussed the differences between options one and two.

Boardmember John Poulsen confirmed that you could not build a commercial use on property not zoned commercial; however a church could be built in any zoning district including residential. He was concerned that if option 1 was approved a church could be built on residential lots, in the middle of a subdivision, and if the church was 19,999 sq. ft. it would not be reviewed by the Design Review Board.

Boardmember Randy Carter felt that the threshold needs to be lower. He stated that for example, smaller LDS churches are 15,000 to 16,000 sq. ft., their larger ones are 24,000 sq. ft. So the smaller churches, which are more likely to be built within a residential subdivision would not be reviewed.

Boardmember Burgheimer was concerned that a church could build a small building and later add buildings that would then take it over the 20,000, sq. ft. and it would not be reviewed. Staffmember Hyneman stated that as soon as the entire project reached 20,000 sq. ft. any additions would be subject to review by the Design Review Board with Option 1.

Boardmember Poulsen stated that he felt certain that no one on the Board wanted to do anything that went against any ones religious belief; however, with no controls the building or site plan could be detrimental to surrounding properties. He suggested a 5,000 s. ft. threshold.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman felt that 5,000 sq. ft. was probably too small.

Boardmember Burgheimer agreed that 5,000 sq. ft. was too small, 15,000 sq. ft. might be acceptable. He felt that the Board needed to keep their eye on the ball. Why were they requesting to review churches? One reason is that churches can be huge impacts to neighborhoods and streets, so they need to look at how they impact the neighborhood with cars and circulation, etc. He felt that the size issue makes a difference because a 5,000 sq. ft. church won't have that many cars. He felt that at 20,000 sq. ft. it was big enough to have a lot of cars and a real impact. He confirmed that the smaller LDS churches are 15,000 sq. ft. and typically has 220 cars. A 20,000 sq. ft. church could have 1,000 people. If you figure 3 to 4 people to a car, you would have 300 to 400 cars.

Boardmember Randy Carter stated that he had recently completed a Catholic church, and you usually have approximately 175 to 180 parking stalls and you are usually limited to 750 to 800 people, in a 15,000 to 16,000 sq. ft. church in the main sanctuary area, not included other rooms, or outdoor masses.

Boardmember Hagen wondered if the Board should be concerned with special events that occur once or twice a year.

Boardmember Plese was concerned that some churches have had serious parking problems that have caused a lot of dissention with the surrounding neighbors. She felt that the Board needs to look at how the church will impact the neighborhood.

Boardmember Burgheimer felt that the reason the Board should review churches was to look at site planning issues and how they interface with the neighborhood, the setbacks, the height requirements, etc. He felt it was important to look at the site planning issues.

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Carter agreed that they need to look at how the site plan is developed: will it work.

Boardmember Burgheimer felt that it might be best to start with option 1 and see how that works. Then, if their problems in the future with smaller churches the Council could always revise the Ordinance at a later date.

Boardmember Hagen felt that 5,000 was too small, however she felt that 15,000 was a reasonable number.

Chair Carie Allen wondered if the Board sent a recommendation for reviewing all churches of 15,000 sq. ft. or larger would the City Council say no to any review or would they simply vote to review any churches larger than 20,000 sq. ft. if they felt that was a better cutoff. Would the choice be all or nothing or could the Council simply make any changes they felt were appropriate?

Staffmember Laura Hyneman felt that 20,000 would be easier to get approved because it was more in line with the existing Zoning Ordinance requirement.

Boardmember Burgheimer agreed that any amount other than 20,000 sq. ft. would mean that churches are being treated differently than commercial. He felt that if the Board wanted to recommend 15,000 sq. ft. they would need to have sound reasons: occupancy, and people.

Chair Allen wondered if there are many churches larger than 20,000 sq. ft. The 15,000 sq. ft. churches are more likely to be in residential areas where they would have an impact on the neighborhoods.

Boardmember Carter confirmed with staff that Option 1 required any church less than 20,000 sq. ft., that is built on an arterial street be reviewed by the Design Review Board.

The Board agreed that they would recommend reviewing churches 15,000 sq. ft. or larger with the understanding that if they Council was unwilling to approve 15,000 sq. ft. the Board would accept 20,000 sq. ft.

Boardmember Carter felt that there were also prototype issues.

Chair Allen stated that the LDS churches at Stapley and McKellips and Lindsay north of McKellips they look totally different. They can be made to look different.

Boardmember Carter stated that the two LDS churches in Alta Mesa each of which are 27,000 sq. ft. are completely different buildings. His firm designed both of those buildings and the Homeowners Association in Alta Mesa wanted changes. He felt that it was important to design the church to fit the neighborhood. He said you can use the same footprint but still change the building.

Boardmember Burgheimer was concerned that the Board needed stronger justification for recommending 15,000 sq. ft., such as the amount of traffic and vehicles that would be generated by 15,000 sq. ft. churches. The percentage of churches between 15,000 and 20,000 sq. ft. as compared to those 20,000 sq. ft. or larger.

## MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 4, 2002 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Hagen felt that the fact that commercial buildings can only be built on property that has been determined to be appropriate for commercial use and churches can be built in any zoning district, therefore they can be built in the middle of a neighborhood on residentially zoned property, should be a factor. She felt that the main reason for wanting to review smaller sized churches is that they are the ones most likely to be built in residential neighborhoods.

The Board agreed that they do not want to review churches so that they can try to prevent them from being built, they simply want them to be an attractive building that is functional for the community.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta  
Planning Assistant

da