

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
DECEMBER 1, 2004

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

MEMBERS PRESENT

Pete Berzins - Chair
Dave Richins- Vice Chair
Randy Carter
Rob Burgheimer
Tim Nielsen
Vince DiBella

MEMBERS ABSENT

Jillian Hagen (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

Laura Hyneman	Fred Woods
Lesley Davis	Bob Saemisch
Debbie Archuleta	Barry Booth
Charlie Scully	Travis Williams
John Wesley	Sarah Stewart
John Vitale	Paul Masse
Liz Gaston	Joe Isbell
Rick Cartell	Michael Quattrone
Les Partch	Bruce Heywood
Krista Herring	Brett Nattress
Erik Peterson	Rob White
Paul Devers	Dan Shreeve
Bob Fish	Ellery Brown
Brent Henderson	Others
Greg Hitchens	

1. Call to Order:

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

2. Approval of the Minutes of the November 3, 2004 Meeting:

On a motion by Dave Richins seconded by Tim Nielsen the Board unanimously approved the minutes as revised.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the November 17, 2004 Meeting:

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

4. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-95 **Superstition Springs Toyota**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 6136 E Auto Loop Ave.
REQUEST: Approval of a 96,769 sq. ft. new car sales facility
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Superstition Springs Toyota
APPLICANT: Rick Cartell
ARCHITECT: Barry Barcus

REQUEST: Approval of a 96,769 sq. ft. new car sales facility

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR04-95 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be approved by Design Review staff:
 - a. Provide a revised site plan incorporating landscaping shown on the colored elevations and conforming to the Superstition Springs Auto Park Design Guidelines.
 - b. Provide exhibit showing that the height of the proposed wall will screen vehicles on the roof deck from view.
 - c. Provide an exhibit showing the location of the roof deck lighting fixtures. Place fixtures as far from the edge of the structure as possible.
2. Compliance with Superstition Springs Auto Park development guidelines and compliance with the approval letter from Superstition Springs Auto Park Auto Retailers' Association.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
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.
6. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
8. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The modifications to the existing dealership and the new garage are an attractive addition to the Superstition Auto Mall.

Recorded on Tape No.: (side A)

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-96 **Greenfield South Lot 1**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: West of SWC Greenfield and Southern
REQUEST: Approval of a 9,147 sq. ft. retail shops building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Greenfield Southern SW Development Investors
APPLICANT: Mark Bowker, K&I Architects
ARCHITECT: Kristjan Sigurdsson, K&I Architects

REQUEST: Approval of a 9,147 sq. ft. retail shops building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR04-96 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications: (Details to be approved by Design Review Staff)
 - a. Revise the Site Plan to accommodate a 30' landscape setback along Southern Avenue.
 - b. Finish the backside of all parapets and roof elements that project above 22'.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: (side A)

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-97 **Greenfield South Lot 3**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: South of SWC Greenfield and Southern
REQUEST: Approval of a 9,800 sq. ft. retail shops building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Greenfield Southern SW Development Investors
APPLICANT: Mark Bowker
ARCHITECT: Kristjan Sigurdsson

REQUEST: Approval of a 9,800 sq. ft. retail shops building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR04-97 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications: (Details to be approved by Design Review Staff)
 - a. Finish the backside of all parapets and roof elements that project above 22'.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: (side A)

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-99 **AZG Corporate Center**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Florian and Oakland
REQUEST: Approval of a 7,260 sq. ft. office
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: AZG Homefield, LLC
APPLICANT: Partch & Assoc. Architecture
ARCHITECT: Lesley Partch

REQUEST: Approval of a 7,260 sq. ft. office building

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR04-99 be approved with the following conditions:

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

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: (side A)

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-102 **Superstition Gateway**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC Signal Butte & US 60
REQUEST: Approval of a 67 acre shopping center
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: Signal Butte/Bojer Land
APPLICANT: Diversified Partners
ARCHITECT: Silvo Popovsky, KDRA

REQUEST: Approval of a 67 acre shopping center

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda. Liz Gaston and Rick Froeb represented the case.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the elevations were very attractive, but difficult to review because of the rendering style. He wanted to ensure the building moved in and out. He thought the Board should see the hardline drawings.

Boardmember Vince DiBella preferred the proportions of Anchor A with the higher towers rather than the tower height presented to the Board.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen confirmed the distances from the major entrances would be 15 feet from column base to face of curb, and 15 feet from storefront to face of curb. He also confirmed the masonry would be integral color. He preferred the tower at the original height. He stated there were a lot of pads on this site, he was concerned that there be enough parking.

Boardmember Randy Carter confirmed that they have tenants or owners for everything except Anchor B. He preferred the higher towers shown for Anchor A. He was concerned with the center tower, he suggested raising the arch or lowering the stone. He liked the streetscape but would like hardline drawings with floor plans. He thought it would be helpful to review more comprehensive plans on a larger scale drawing.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed Shops A did not have 4-sided elevations, and that only employees would use the rear entrances.

Chair Pete Berzins agreed that the higher tower on Anchor A looked better. On Anchor B, he wondered why there were some columns with tapers and others that were straight. He didn't think the columns were balanced. He preferred the straight columns.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR04-102 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications (**approved by Design Review staff prior to submittal of construction documents**):
 - a. Provide direct sidewalk links between the public sidewalks along Signal Butte and each pad site or group of pad buildings: Pad C, Pad D, Shops

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- B/Pad E, and Shop C/D.
 - b. Provide required foundation base hardscape and landscaping. Additional landscaping including trees, shrubs and vegetative ground cover material shall be added to the plaza between the entrance towers and around the base of the Garden Center.
 - c. Provide the required foundation base landscaping around Anchor B, Anchor C, Major A-D and Shops E including trees, landscape filled planters equal to 33% of the building frontage with entrances facing public parking or the public street and landscape filled planters equal to 10% of the building face without public entrances.
 - d. Provide a 5' wide planter and 5' wide sidewalk between Pad E and drive aisle between the signalized entrance and the decorative paving.
 - e. Screen non-building elements such as, but not limited to, vending machines, shopping cart storage and ice lockers from street and parking lot view. Design Review staff shall approve design of screening device.
 - f. Wall and gate colors, materials and forms of "outdoor palette storage" enclosure shall be consistent with the details of Anchor A.
 - g. The backsides of all towers and raised parapets shall be finished to match the adjacent surface or in an architecturally compatible manner. (As shown on the colored elevations.) Provide return for garden center parapet on Anchor B.
 - h. Mechanical units within 50' of the notched parapets shall be painted to match the field color of the building.
 - i. Provide concrete curb and 5' wide temporary landscaping around all undeveloped pads and portions of the site.
 - j. The line drawings of the elevations for the Construction Documents are to be reviewed by Design Review staff for compliance with the elevations presented to the Design Review Board to verify the architectural detailing. Specific detailing to include: The face of the wall with the parapet should be in the same plane as the masonry window wall. Steps in the EFIS trim should each be at least 8" unless shown otherwise on the sections submitted with this case.
2. Future Design Review Board approval of Anchor C, Pad A, and Pad B.
 3. The Design Review Board approves the building heights as shown based on a finding that:
 - a. Increased setbacks, enhanced landscaping, or other screening measures effectively mitigate the impact of the building height; or
 - b. The exception is necessary to accommodate the proposed uses or activities within the building or structure; or
 - c. The architectural style of the building or structure places the exception at a central point or in a limited area such as a dome, sphere, or other geometric solid; and
 - d. The proposed development does not exceed the maximum number of stories, or residential densities permitted in the zoning district in which it is located.
 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.
 7. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
9. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.
10. **Tower element on Anchor A to remain 45' tall as originally proposed.**
11. **Review by the Design Review Board of all hardline drawings. Hardlines to include light fixtures and details of downspouts. To be reviewed as information only not an actual new case.**
12. **Revise the center tower to break in plane.**

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: (side A)

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-104 **Mesa Family Medical Center**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1345 E McKellips
REQUEST: Approval of a 16,141 sq. ft. medical office
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: Nupetco Associates
APPLICANT: Cawley Architects
ARCHITECT: Cawley Architects

REQUEST: Approval of a 16,141 sq. ft. medical office

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda. Paul Devers represented the case. Mr. Devers stated the building would be a medical office suite with three tenants. The pop-out portions have gable and hip roofs. Gables are above the entrances.

Boardmember Vince DiBella liked the richness of the building; but suggested the windows have more variety of size.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen agreed the windows need more interest. He was concerned the parking was not convenient for medical offices and there would be a long walk from the parking to the entrance. He understood the pie shaped lot was challenging.

Boardmember Randy Carter was concerned with the windows, especially on the west elevation. He confirmed the applicant was proposing butt joined glass. He suggested adding mullions for interest. He thought using mullions would help with the design of the exam rooms. Mr. Devers stated the exam rooms would have spandrel glass. Boardmember Carter stated spandrel glass was not an attractive material.

Boardmember Dave Richins liked the east elevation; but he thought since the north elevation faced McKellips it was too plain. He suggested using stone on the north elevation. He was also concerned with what will happen with the left over parcel between this project and the well site.

Chair Pete Berzins agreed the windows needed more thought. He was also concerned with the parking because the smallest area of the parking lot was next to the entrances. He suggested they shift the building south and provide parking along McKellips. Mr. Devers stated the site is hidden by the shopping center to the west and they need visibility from McKellips.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer liked the stone accent pieces but suggested variation in the heights of the stone. He liked the color board much more than the elevations. He thought the entrances should be enhanced. He thought there should be mullions that could actually be seen, not black or bronze mullions in bronze windows. He thought the height of the windows to vary. He suggested using fewer windows and some other detail to break up rear elevation.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR04-104 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications: (Details to be approved by Design Review Staff)

- a. Revise the landscape plan to comply with all Zoning Ordinance requirements for the number of trees and shrubs required.
- b. Relocate the two employee areas out of the required landscape setbacks and provide at least one employee area with shade and seating in an appropriate location.
- c. Revise the site plan and the landscape plan to either revise the sidewalk or provide a minimum of an 18' deep parking stall adjacent to the building to prevent the vehicle to overhang the sidewalk.
- d. Provide a revised drawing, which does not show the property line designation in the middle of the lot, show temporary landscaping along the undeveloped edge per code, provide shared drive and cross access agreements with Construction Documents.
- e. **Introduce mullions and/or variation in the size of windows.**

Differentiate the secondary entrances.

- f. **Embellish the north elevation with a tower element.**
 - g. **Revise the west elevation to minimize or eliminate the spandrel glass. In place of the glass add arch element, stone or color.**
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. This site will be required to receive a Land Split.
 5. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
 6. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
 7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
 8. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: If revised per conditions, the project is reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: (side A)

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-106 **M & I Bank**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2740 N Power
REQUEST: Approval of a 6,000 sq. ft. bank
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Superstition Promenade LLC
APPLICANT: Misael Gana, Bollinger + Cardenas Architects
ARCHITECT: Kevin Bollinger

REQUEST: Approval of a 6,000 sq. ft. bank

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

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Randy Carter that DR04-106 be approved with the following conditions:

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

VOTE: Passed 6 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: (side A)

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-108 **Retail Shops**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC Brown & Recker
REQUEST: Approval of a 3,300 sq. ft. retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Greenstreet Properties
APPLICANT: Saemisch DiBella Architects
ARCHITECT: Robert Saemisch

REQUEST: Approval of a 3,300 sq. ft. retail building

SUMMARY: This case was not discussed by the Board; however, it was removed from the consent agenda because Boardmember DiBella abstained.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Dave Richins that DR04-108 be approved with the following conditions:

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

VOTE: Passed 5 - 0 - 1 (Boardmember Vince DiBella abstained)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: (side A)

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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

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

SUMMARY: Erik Peterson, Brad Logan and Philip Logan represented the case. The applicants stated that staff had requested the cross access, and on the previously approved site plan there were two drive aisle connections between this property and the property to the west.

John Vitale who lives near the site spoke regarding the case. Mr. Vitale stated the site is connected to Walgreen's and the property to the west, currently approved for a bakery. He had traffic concerns regarding the school. Mr. Vitale stated people could get from Power Road to Raffriver through these three sites. He wanted the cross access to the west removed.

The applicants then spoke and stated that the project would be heavily landscaped. They also felt the proposed colors do relate to one another. They were willing to use one type of stone on all buildings. The tower elevations are for the SES and will have 5' walls in front of them. The tower elements were designed to bring light into the buildings. They thought the buildings would not be as rigid when built as they appear due to the layout of the site. The groupings were at different levels. They did not think the buildings would appear flat.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen liked some of the enhancements. He stated the color elevation drawings were shocking, but the color board was more subdued. He would prefer the use of one roof tile type, either flat tile or mission tile with a simple color change. He did not think barrel tile was appropriate. He thought there should be reveals on the tower elements and more fenestration of the windows. He thought the site plan was still too static.

Boardmember Randy Carter was concerned with the color shift. He stated he preferred similar hues rather than two different schemes with oranges and olive greens. He suggested more dramatic colors with similar roof or stone. He thought there should be more change to the window styles. He also thought the west elevations of the buildings at the west end of the project needed more articulation because they would be so visible. Additionally, the rear elevations needed to be enhanced. The site plan and buildings were too rigid. He also thought there should be additional trees along the north.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed the applicant would be adding a view fence to the existing school wall.

Chair Pete Berzins thought the colors as shown on the materials board were all right; however, he did not like the way the colors were grouped.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer did not think the changes had made the project better, or addressed the Board's concerns. He thought the color changes needed to be more subtle, not warm and cool colors together. He also thought there should be one common color or element that carried through the entire project. He did think the elevations of building plan A were attractive. He agreed the site plan was too rigid, he thought the buildings should be angled. He thought there should be no access to Raft River.

Boardmember Vince DiBella was concerned with the drive aisle from the bakery to Thomas. He thought there should be cross access between the bakery site and the office project. He thought buildings C, D, E, and F should be different.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Rob Burgheimer that DR04-91 be continued to the January 5, 2005 meeting, so that the applicant can redesign the site plan and building elevations.

During discussion, Chair Pete Berzins stated he thought the Board could condition the case so the applicant can move forward. Boardmember Randy Carter stated he thought they needed to mix the colors up and change the building "plan A". He thought the buildings were too square, he suggested using awnings. Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought the towers should all be different.

VOTE: Failed 2 – 4

MOTION: It was moved by Randy Carter and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR04-91 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications (**approved by Design Review staff prior to submittal of construction documents**):
 - a. Provide 25 additional trees along north property line for a total of 48 trees.
 - b. Provide 2 additional trees along Power Road for a total of 13 trees within the street landscape yard; and, Provide 5 additional trees along Thomas Road for a total of 30 trees within the street landscape yard.
 - c. Ensure lighting fixtures are in compliance with City Lighting Code and provide darker or earth tone finish for wall sconces.
 - d. Provide revised plans for the retaining walls with stepped wall design and minimum five (5) feet wide landscaped sections, including at ground level. Include elevations, sections and typical details for the retaining walls along the west side of the development.
 - e. **A portion of the trees along the north to be 36" box.**
 - f. **Move the buildings along the north and west so they are staggered a minimum of 5'.**
 - g. **Revise Plan A and redesign the building to add four-sided architecture, perhaps a wainscot, and the tower element to give differentiation of plan A.**

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- h. **Provide some differentiation between the four Plan B buildings.**
 - i. **Revise color palettes to be more homogenous, and provide one unifying element throughout the entire complex, through stone, base color, or roof color.**
 - j. **Work with staff to provide architectural awnings and shade around the perimeters of the buildings.**
 - k. **Ask Traffic Engineering if it is possible to reconsider the cross access to the west to either remove it or relocate it to a different area.**
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
 3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
 4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
 5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
 6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
 7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 1 (Boardmember Burgheimer voting nay)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: 2 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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

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

SUMMARY: Paul Gilbert and Todd Trainer represented the case and explained the changes that had been made. The roof slope was a 3 – 12 pitch, the fascia was the metal roof material, the ridge vent was shown, the horizontal reveal banding was added, the windows had a recessed lintel, the light fixtures were shown; the bollards, the storefronts, and any steel detailing were bronze; the drive through was no longer a hipped roof, they had changed it back to the prototype. They were not willing to change the windows because the windows related to the interior spaces and ceiling height.

Paul Gilbert stated this building was very similar to a previously approved bank. Staffmember Laura Hyneman then explained the differences were: the other bank had a tile roof, it had heavy timber eaves along the front, it had incorporated steel I-beams and steel columns, it had a special stone that was used within the surrounding shopping center, the drive through canopy picked up on the rustic detailing, and the coloring matched the surrounding shopping center.

Boardmember Dave Richins liked some of the changes to the bank including the ridge vent. He preferred the drive through canopy with the hipped roof.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer did not think the colors had changed because there was no revised color board only revised elevations. He did not think the building looked well put together. He liked the roof change and the reveals in the masonry. He was not comfortable with the connection between the EIFS portion and the brick portion of the building. He was uncomfortable with the 14' soffit line. He thought the roof would be better with a 10'-8" soffit line. He thought the drive through canopy needed coffering or revealing. He liked the brick material. He was concerned the reveals did not align with the window mullions. He suggested dropping the soffit line down so the detailing on the wall might engage the roofline better. He preferred the drive through with the hipped roof.

Boardmember Vince DiBella appreciated the change in the reveals. He thought the hipped roof on the drive through helped balance the building and added character to the drive through. He was concerned that a metal coping on the curved feature would not look good. He had seen an example of one built and the coping was not done well. He thought that the arch should better engage the roof, he suggested it could be more severe.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen appreciated the enhancements. He liked the thickness of the metal fascia. He liked the richness of the shadows from the stone reveals. He suggested they be carried across to go together with the mullions to soften the windows. He thought the entry was too foreign with the rest of the building. He suggested using brick at the entry to make the entry richer, warmer and more inviting. He thought it would also tie the entry feature to the rest of the building. He agreed the proportion of the arch to the roof was not handled well. He

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

suggested a trellis piece.

Chair Pete Berzins preferred the blue hipped roof on the drive through, but he was concerned with how fascia of the drive through would be matched to the fascia on the building. Would it all be blue or would a portion of it be white? He thought the north elevation entry needed to be tied into the building better. He suggested extending the roof to tie into the entry.

Boardmember Burgheimer agreed with the suggestion to use brick on the entry piece to bring the two elements together. He was still concerned with the floor to ceiling glass, he thought the building would look nicer if the window sizes were varied. He thought the idea of the mullions and the reveals being connected was a good suggestion. He thought the light fixtures were not enhancing the building. He thought the fixtures should enhance the building and be an element.

Mr. Trainer then spoke and stated the changes to the drive through roof could be done; however they were not willing to add the metal roof on the back of the building because he thought it would not work on the front. He stated he would rather stay with the two appendages; they were willing to add the metal roof on the back of the building. The coping detail did not need to be on the building. He thought the first window mullion did align with the third band of brick reveals; they did not want to add a mullion below. The brick wainscoted entry was not a problem. They were open to a better specification light fixture with more architectural detail. The 14' soffit was something they were not willing to change. He stated if they pulled it down they would have to change the trusses.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR04-85 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations. If revisions are required to the drawings presented, provide revised drawings to Design Review Board staff for approval prior to submitting construction drawings.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. **Provide a sloped metal roof over the drive through. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
8. **Addition of brick wainscot at window level at front/ east elevation. To be approved by Design Review staff.**
9. **Lower the roof line, 12". To be approved by Design Review staff.**
10. **Revise the light fixtures to a fixture that better suits the building architecture.**
11. **Revise placement of window mullions to better relate to the reveal lines and**

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

insets.

12. **Revise the white color to a warmer color like the elevation, not the color board.**
13. **Provide metal work below the Bank One sign as a lintel or trellis.**
14. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

Mr. Gilbert then confirmed that the white color needed to be as shown on the revised elevation not on the color board.

Mr. Trainer then stated they could change the color of the wall as long as it is white. He stated they were not willing to add metal work, and they were not willing to say they would lower the roof line 2'. He stated they would work on that but he could not say what the dimension would be. Boardmember Burgheimer stated his concern was the proportioning. Mr. Trainer stated you would perceive very little of the roof from the parking lot. Boardmember Burgheimer stated they could increase the overhang and have the eave come down below the roofline. Mr. Trainer stated they probably could not lower the roofline to the header or height of the window. Boardmember Burgheimer stated one foot might be enough. Boardmember Nielsen stated the Board was uncomfortable with the proportion and he thought they needed to change it higher or lower so it would harmonize a little more. Mr. Gilbert asked if they could bring it down somewhere between 0" – 12". He stated they could not get approval above 12". It was agreed the amount would be 12". Chair Pete Berzins confirmed the applicants could change the roofline 12". Mr. Trainer stated he thought the brick wainscot tied the entry feature to the building and he was unwilling to provide the metal lintel or trellis below the Bank One sign. Boardmember Nielsen thought the metal piece would bring a nice people scale to the building; he stated it could be very simple and crisp and contemporary with the curve. Chair Berzins confirmed that the motion would amend the roof change to 12", change the color of the white, allow the applicant to look at the window mullions, provide the brick, and the gable roof on the drive-through. Boardmember Burgheimer thought the metal piece below the Bank One sign tied the entry to the roof; an exposed metal lintel that's blue adds something. Chair Berzins confirmed that that condition would stay a part of the motion. Mr. Gilbert stated Bank One had been given them parameters. Boardmember Nielsen stated the applicants would probably want to build more Bank One buildings in Mesa and he thought they should be looking at a number of options that they have done in Tucson and Prescott. Mr. Gilbert stated Bank One had done something similar to this before and the bank was unhappy with it. Mr. Nielsen stated the Board doesn't want each Bank One to look like the others. There was certainly a theme and the Board was not discarding the theme, they were trying to change the architecture a little and trying to tie it together. Chair Berzins stated the motion stays with something metal below the sign.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project with conditions is reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: 2 (side B)

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

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

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

SUMMARY: Ellery Brown and Brent Henderson represented the case. Mr. Brown stated the previous technical issues had been resolved. Mr. Brown also stated they had revised the buildings to address the Board's concerns from the November meeting.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought there had been a great turn around. The applicants had really addressed the Board's concerns. He thought the project was much improved.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed that the color that appeared "salmon" on the elevations would actually be the "gold mustard" color shown on the color board. He liked the changes.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought the project was very nice and thanked the applicants for the changes.

Boardmember Dave Richins thought the revisions were very nice.

Chair Pete Berzins thought the applicants had really addressed the Board's suggestions. He confirmed that building 13 only occurs once in the project.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Dave Richins that DR04-92 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the revised site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications:
 - a. Provide play equipment in at least one location adjacent areas identified on the site plan as "Play Areas". Add at least one ramada near a BBQ.
 - b. Evaluate the use of additional plant types within the final landscape plan.
 - c. Provide trees with mature canopies that are large and non deciduous (or leafless for a very short period time) along the perimeter.
 - d. Reconfigure the retention basin so that it complies with Design Standards for retention basins.
 - e. Provide elevations of site walls and refuse enclosure walls that incorporate colors, materials, forms and textures of the proposed screen walls. Provide an elevation of proposed enclosure gate that incorporates design theme of the project.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

- f. All revisions and additional exhibits to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: 4 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-98 **Greenfield Court Lot 10**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: 4320 E. Florian Ave.
MAJOR CROSS STREETS: NWC Southern and Greenfield
SUMMARY OF REQUEST: Design Review for Office Development Lot 10
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 2
OWNER: The REEB Group, LTD.
APPLICANT: Fred Woods
ARCHITECT: Fred Woods

REQUEST: Approval of two 3,600 sq. ft. office buildings

SUMMARY: Fred Woods represented the case.

Boardmember Vince DiBella thought this buildings fit in with this eclectic subdivision.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought the buildings were well proportioned and well designed.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer suggested using a wainscot to ground the building and providing mullions or mutttons on the windows to tie into the banding.

Chair Pete Berzins thought that in this development it was OK that this building is different from what is around it. He liked the project.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Vince DiBella that DR04-98 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be approved by Design Review Planning Staff prior to submitting construction documents:
 - a. Provide revised site plan with single parking canopy along the east side of Lot 10 where the canopy structure has been pulled back at least one space on the south end abutting the landscape island so as to allow adequate room for tree growth.
 - b. Provide elevations for any freestanding monuments signs, including project identification proposed for the screen wall; and, provide building elevations with general location for any proposed attached signs, if any.
 - c. Provide a letter of approval from the Greenfield Court Architectural Review Committee at the time construction documents are submitted for plan review.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.

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

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project was reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: 4 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be approved by Design Review Planning Staff prior to submittal of construction documents:
 - a. Revise the street front elevations to include greater variation and design interest through the use of such design techniques as roofline changes, window variation, color or material changes, greater articulation of building massing elements, and greater articulation of wall planes in general.
 - b. Revise the front and side building elevations to provide an integration of the windows in a manner that responds to the scale, proportion and design elements in a coherent and well-designed composition.
 - c. Provide shade devices, such as canopies or awnings, over windows to address solar orientation.
 - d. Provide typical elevations for parking lot screen walls and provide a revised site plan indicating locations of screen walls. In addition, provide a cross section of the area with screen walls, basin and berms.
 - e. Provide revised site plan showing parking canopies in conformance with Chapter 15 requirements for location next to landscape islands, including pulling the canopy one space away from landscape islands to allow adequate room for tree growth.
 - f. Relocate attached building signs from the split face banding and show potential sign locations for all units in the multi-unit development.
 - g. Relocate landscaping from the front of the monument sign and provide revised plan if sign is proposed to be perpendicular to the street.
 - h. **Redesign at least two of the towers on each side: change the height, material, or design patterns so they are not all the same.**
 - i. **Provide a change in plane at the key intersection to recess or pop-out 8".**
 - j. **Provide metal window element to tie into the metalwork on the tower elements.**
 - k. **Redesign the steel connection piece so that it provides the same detailing as the tower elements.**
 - l. **Explore alternative coursing by using stacked bond or raking the joints differently.**
 - m. **Break the roof plane to provide variation of roof heights.**
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: With the conditions stated above, the project is reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: 4 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-101 **Southern & Country Club**
ADDRESS: 1215 S. Country Club
LOCATION: SEC Country Club & Southern
REQUEST: Develop 4,630 sq. ft. retail building
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4
OWNER: Mesa Sunrise LLC
APPLICANT: Mark Bowker, K & I Architects
ARCHITECT: Kristjan Sigurdsson

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,360 sq. ft. commercial building

SUMMARY: Kristjan Sigurdsson represented the case. Mr. Sigurdsson stated there was always an issue with storefronts at the street. He stated the bathrooms had been moved to the rear of the building to avoid spandrel glass along the street. He thought the yellow band complemented the building. He stated the Wireless' awnings had signage on them so the yellow band would go with the lighted awnings Wireless wanted to add as part of their sign package. Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated staff was concerned that the awnings were only 8" deep so they would not provide any real shade.

Boardmember Dave Richins did not think the yellow was appropriate but he did like the slate accent tiles. He was concerned these buildings are becoming a "prototype" because they have been recreated several times. He confirmed that they want tenant signage above the awnings, which would have signage as well. Boardmember Richins thought the project had an urban feel. He stated he would prefer metal awnings.

Chair Pete Berzins thought the building had very diverse materials and colors for its size. He was OK with the yellow.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer liked the shade of yellow chosen. He was concerned with how it would go with the slate, and thought the yellow should be introduced somewhere else on the building. Boardmember Burgheimer stated he was not a fan of spandrel glass because he thought it was confusing to customers. He suggested using metal panels. He stated the awnings are not awnings; they are signs, especially if they are multi-color or striped.

Boardmember Vince DiBella was OK with the use of yellow.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen liked the yellow as long as it is "maize" color not a bright yellow. He wanted a warm yellow/gold. He suggested using a massing form at the rear where the bathrooms were and make an actual form that the bathrooms back up to and then maybe have clerestory windows above that to provide light into the bathrooms.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR04-101 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

elevations with the following modifications to be approved by Design Review Planning Staff prior to submittal of construction documents:

- a. Indicate the location of opaque spandrel glass proposed for any locations and provide revised floor plans to ensure the location of the interior bathrooms will not be in conflict with the storefront elevations, especially on the west elevation.
 - b. **Work with staff on placement of the awnings.**
 - c. **Awnings to be increased in depth to be a functional shade.**
 - d. **If awning signs are used, then additional awnings, if he chooses to use them, cannot follow the same graphics; they must be of a solid color.**
 - e. **Introduce the yellow somewhere else on the building.**
 - f. **Provide an alternative to the spandrel glass.**
 - g. **Awnings to be stay fast and durable, Sunbrella fabric.**
 - h. **Cornice to wrap around tower so it does not look like a "set".**
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
 3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
 4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
 5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
 6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
 7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is reasonably well designed.

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

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-103 **AHC**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: SWC 58th Street & Main
REQUEST: Approval of a 29,329 sq. ft. skilled-nursing facility
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 6
OWNER: MWE East Mesa Medical Properties
APPLICANT: Heywood Enterprises
ARCHITECT: Gould Evans

REQUEST: Approval of a 29,329 sq. ft. medical rehabilitation facility

SUMMARY: Boardmember Vince DiBella abstained. Bruce Heywood, Brent Hapkins and Rob White represented the case.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated he thought the looked like row housing because it was too long and linear. He confirmed that the clearstory windows allowed light into the patient rooms. He was concerned because they were not attractive from the outside. He did not think the elements harmonized. He stated the fascia was too thin; the building was flat and planer. He thought the building should be redesigned. He confirmed they were no longer proposing shingles. He told the applicant that he should provide a sample of the concrete tile on a revised color board. Boardmember Burgheimer thought the windows were repetitive.

Mr. Heywood stated that this building was designed to suit project. Mr. Hapkins stated they had regulatory requirements that the nurses be able to see down the corridors. Boardmember Burgheimer stated it was possible to add interest to the building without changing the interior. He suggested that the gabled ends could be changed to a hip and gable. He also was concerned with the limited variety of plants proposed and suggested that the landscape plan should be more cohesive. He suggested that there were areas of the building, which could have larger windows and suggested using larger windows in the lobby.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen understood the reason for residential detailing on the project, but thought the building should more have richness and change in wall planes. He thought the clerestory windows should be better designed, so they didn't look plunked on. He thought the detailing made the building look too horizontal. He stated that the building should have four-sided architecture with richer colors and more foundation base landscaping.

Boardmember Dave Richins understood the function of the building but was concerned about the quality of the building. He agreed the exterior could be revised without changing the use inside.

Chair Pete Berzins thought the repetitive elements add to the horizontality. He wanted the rear elevation broken up. He stated that this could be done with color changes. He was concerned the two-story condos to the rear of the project will be able to see this side of the building.

MOTION: It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Dave Richins that DR04-103 be continued.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

VOTE: Passed 4 – 0

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

Recorded on Tape No.: 4 (side B) and 5 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-105 **Olive Garden**
LOCATION: W of SWC of Southern and Alma School
ADDRESS: 1261 W. Southern Ave.
REQUEST: Remove existing restaurant and build new Olive Garden restaurant
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
OWNER: GMRI, Inc.
APPLICANT: Robert Burgheimer
ARCHITECT: Robert Burgheimer

REQUEST: Approval of a 7,685 sq. ft. restaurant rebuild

SUMMARY: Boardmember Rob Burgheimer abstained. John King and Michelle Wattanabee represented the case. Ms Wattanabee stated the downspouts would be copper.

Boardmember Vince DiBella thought the fascia boards should be articulated: thicker and heavier so it would help with the downspouts and gutters.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen suggested moving the entrance to the northeast to face the corner. The applicants responded that they wanted the entrance closest to the most parking. He thought the wainscot should be varied in height. He agreed the eave line needed to be heavier.

Boardmember Dave Richins thought the stone should come up on the rear elevation below the gable. He liked the stone.

Chair Pete Berzins was concerned that there would not be a covered waiting area outside. He confirmed the bar area could accommodate about 30 people and the waiting area about 15 people, and there was also a vestibule. He suggested landscaping be used to screen the trash enclosure.

MOTION: It was moved by Tim Nielsen and seconded by Dave Richins that DR04-105 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be approved by Design Review Planning Staff prior to submitting construction documents:
 - a. Revise the rear elevation to provide a more attractive presentation towards the interior of the mall and the main entrance to the subject site.
 - b. Provide manufacturer's color paint samples with full specifications for the development, including for the proposed color of the main stucco walls.
 - c. **Provide additional stone massing on the south elevation.**
 - d. **Provide thicker fascias.**
 - e. **Provide additional trees to buffer the trash enclosures.**
2. Compliance with all City development codes, ordinances and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

(Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)

4. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
5. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
6. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 4 – 0 – 1 (Boardmember Burgheimer abstained)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project was reasonably well designed.

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

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR04-107 **Commerce Place – The Commons**
LOCATION/ADDRESS: Lot 1, Unit 3 Commons Industrial Park
MAJOR CROSS STREETS: NEC McDowell and Norwalk
SUMMARY OF REQUEST: Design Review for four building industrial/commercial development.
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Fred T. Ash & Sons, L.C.
APPLICANT: Greg Hitchens
ARCHITECT: Greg Hitchens

REQUEST: Approval of a four industrial totaling 77,280 sq. ft.

SUMMARY: Greg Hitchens represented the case. Mr. Hitchens stated the two southern buildings were planned for retail, office and restaurant. The building furthest north was planned for warehouse industrial with open storage areas. The driveway onto McDowell was very important for retail and restaurant users.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen liked the building massing and stepping up and down. He confirmed there would be more parking than required. He confirmed the dark columns step out 4'. He suggested the buttresses be higher. He liked the rich materials of the building.

Boardmember Dave Richins confirmed there would not be a roll up door for the truck well because the truck well would be for use by everyone. The wall around the storage yard would be 8' high and would be capped with the trendstone block.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed the placement of the colors. He thought the green colors were too strong; he suggested olive green. He thought the buildings were interesting. He thought the changes in plane and a slight inset would help add shadow lines.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed the building would have a pre-cast concrete cornice. He was pleased the parapet walls would be finished. He suggested the column colors be reversed at the center and the brown block come down so it read as going all the way through, however, not on every building. He agreed the green was very strong.

Chair Pete Berzins agreed the green was strong. He confirmed Mr. Hitchens was willing to provide additional lighting for pedestrians. Mr. Hitchens did not want to lose any lighting on the building. Mr. Hitchens stated there were panels shown for signage. He stated he did not want every bay to have signage. If someone leased more than one bay he would want them to have one sign. He did not want more signage than allowed by Code. Staff was concerned that in the future there could be smaller tenants and the signs could interfere with the design of the building. Chair Berzins confirmed Mr. Hitchens wanted to eliminate staff conditions 1C and 1J.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tim Nielsen that DR04-107 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be approved by Design Review Planning Staff prior to submittal of construction documents:

- a. Provide minimum foundation base landscaping for all sides of each building, including the minimum 10% required for the rear and sides that are not visible from the public right-of-way or parking areas for Buildings A & B.
 - b. Provide minimum number of trees around each building, as per Chapter 15 Foundation base requirements, including at least 16 trees for Building A and 11 trees for Building B.
 - c. Confirm removal of a portion of Norwalk Road raised median with City Transportation Division to allow traffic exiting the south driveway to be able to safely turn left on Norwalk.
 - d. Provide more effective lighting of pedestrian areas around buildings.
 - e. Relocate the trash enclosure at the northeast corner of the site so it is not within required landscape yards and relocate the trash enclosures closest to Building C adjacent to Norwalk Road so as to eliminate the direct conflict with the adjacent parking space.
 - f. Revise site plan and related plans to ensure minimum landscape area dimensions for landscape islands combined with pedestrian routes.
 - g. Provide typical elevations for all screen walls, including the parking lot screen walls required along Norwalk, the screen walls for the outdoor storage yards behind Building A and for trash enclosure screen walls.
 - h. Provide revised site plan with parking canopies pulled back at least one space from abutting landscape islands to ensure adequate area for tree growth and provide typical elevations and cross section to ensure compatibility with the building architecture.
 - i. Provide a letter of approval from the Commons Industrial Park at Falconview Architectural Review Board with construction documents.
 - j. **Consider an alternative green color to complement the building.**
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
 3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department (Engineering, Traffic, Solid Waste and Facilities, etc.)
 4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
 5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket and painted to match the primary building color.
 6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
 7. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 - 0

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: The project is reasonably well designed.

Recorded on Tape No.: 4 (side B) and 5 (side A)

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Other Business:

Jesse Macias spoke to the Board regarding changes to the Shell re-brand applications that were previously reviewed by the Board at a special meeting held November 17, 2004. Mr. Macias stated they had three options, which they were proposing to use on all eight sites. He stated they had raised the height of the wainscot, changed the canopy columns, introduced some red elements, and were now proposing three options for the field color of the building, including option 3 which was a tan instead of white. Mr. Macias stated Shell was willing to do all four-sides of the buildings.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer looked at the three options and stated he thought the tan was an improvement, although he was not totally against white for some of the locations. He thought the stark white would be a maintenance problem and would look dirty in just a few months. He preferred an off-white color, or the tan. He thought the canopies were clean and simple. He thought the tiles on the edges in a pyramid type form seemed hokey.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed the applicants were still proposing to repaint only, not reclad the buildings, except where there was a back lit ACM cap.

Boardmember Burgheimer liked the diamonds on the front elevation but did not think there should be too many of them on the sides and rear. He thought the applicants were on the right track.

Chair Pete Berzins agreed there should not be too many tiles. He suggested three at the end maybe one in the middle and three at the other end. He did not think they should be symmetrical. He preferred the tan color.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated he had visited some of the sites again and agreed that the changes would be an improvement.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that there were some sites that used attractive building materials that should be preserved.

Mr. Macias agreed. He stated that they had taken the Higley and Brown site out of consideration and had agreed to only change the signage for that site. He stated that on the Brown & Power site, which was already an off-white, they would leave the brick as is and the stucco as is. Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that staff would need to research the original approval for the Brown & Power site, she was not sure the white was the approved color; the building may have already been repainted to a color not approved by the Board. She suggested that when the applicant's come back with the individual renderings they would need to show the original color. Mr. Macias thought they would be getting a decision at this meeting. Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that the applicants had been told the Board would look at each individual site. She asked if they had brought renderings of each site. Mr. Macias stated they were proposing to use the same scheme on every site.

Chair Pete Berzins stated the Board would have to see renderings of each individual site. What was presented at this meeting was too general. Not all of the sites were similar enough to approve just one plan for all of them.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

It was determined the cases would come back to the special Design Review meeting to be held December 14, 2004.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen stated he wanted to see harmony and compatibility for each of the sites with their surrounding area. Mr. Macias stated that basically each of the existing buildings was a box and they would be willing to paint them all tan. Boardmember Nielsen stated they needed to study each individual site, because there may be something next door that may have a relationship to make this project harmonious with the neighborhood. He wanted them to study each site and make each building harmonious to the surrounding uses.

Boardmember Burgheimer stated there were enough differences on the various sites that they needed to be different.

Boardmember Dave Richins stated the applicants needed to go to each individual site and look at what is next door and across the street and make each station fit its environment. He suggested bringing a picture of what the stations look like, what is next to them, and then what they were proposing for each station.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da