

APPROVED



**SCOTTSDALE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
KIVA - CITY HALL
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
FEBRUARY 24, 2005
MINUTES**

PRESENT: Betty Drake, Council Member
E.L. Cortez, Vice Chairman
Steve Steinberg, Commission Member
Michael D'Andrea, Design Member
Jeremy Jones, Design Member
Kevin O'Neill, Design Member
Michael Schmitt, Design Member

STAFF: Mac Cummins
Suzanne Colver
Lusia Galav
Randy Grant
Al Ward
Bill Verschuren
Greg Williams

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was called to order by Councilwoman Drake at 1:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

A formal roll call confirmed members present as stated above.

OPENING STATEMENT

COUNCILWOMAN DRAKE read the opening statement that describes the role of the Development Review Board and the procedures used in conducting this meeting.

MINUTES APPROVAL

February 10, 2005 DRB Minutes

MR. JONES MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 10, 2005, MEETING MINUTES AS PRESENTED. SECOND BY MR. SCHMITT.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

COUNCILWOMAN DRAKE stated cases 110-DR-2004 and 111-DR-2004 has been moved from the consent to the regular agenda.

CONSENT AGENDA

5-DR-2003#4	Danny's Family Carwash Site plan and elevations 14651 N. Northsight Bl Deutsch Associates, Architect/Designer
24-PP-2004	Offices @ Pinnacle Peak & Miller Preliminary Plat 7655 E. Pinnacle Peak & Miller DFD Cornoyer Hedrick, Architect/Designer
97-DR-2004	Scottsdale Bead Supply Site plan and elevations 3625 N. Marshall Way Sixty First Place Architects, Architect/Designer
100-DR-2004	Well Site 86 Water Quality Improvements Site plan and elevations 37400 N. Cave Creek Rd Swaback Partners PLLC, Architect/Designer
108-DR-2004	Mark-Taylor Office Site plan and elevations 6623 N. Scottsdale Rd Mark-Taylor Development, Architect/Designer

APPROVED 3-10-05 - bdf

110-DR-2004 The Z Group Office Building
Site plan and elevations
7800 E. Greenway Rd
Archi-cad Architects PLLC,
Architect/Designer

(PULLED TO REGULAR AGENDA)

111-DR-2004 Carmello Apartments Remodel
Site plan & elevations
6915 E. 3rd St.
Design Coalition, Architect/Designer

(PULLED TO REGULAR AGENDA)

116-DR-2004 Pima School WCF
Installation of 2 additional dish antennas on
an existing light pole (WCF)
8330 E. Osborn Rd
FM Group, Architect/Designer

117-DR-2004 Saguaro High School
Installation of one additional antenna on
an existing light pole (WCF)
6250 N. 82nd St
FM Group, Architect/Designer

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE 5-DR-2003#4, 24-PP-2004 WITH THE REVISED STIPULATIONS, 97-DR-2004, 100-DR-2004, 108-DR-2004, 116-DR-2004, AND 117-DR-2004. SECOND BY MR. JONES.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

MS. COLVER read into the record the amendment to Stipulation No. 14 for Case 97-DR-2004 requested the following sentence be added after the first sentence:

The Developer shall widen the existing sidewalk located along Goldwater Boulevard at locations abutting the existing tree grates located within the sidewalk area to a minimum total sidewalk width of six feet.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO RECONSIDER CASE 97-DR-2004. SECOND BY MR. D'ANDREA.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

APPROVED 3-10-05 - bdf

RUSS ROWLANDS, 737 W. Why Worry Lane, Phoenix, AZ, presented information on the color palette and materials. He responded to questions and comments from the Board regarding the materials.

MR. SCHMITT expressed his concern regarding the dark roof noting that it would not reflect much heat.

MR. O'NEILL asked a series of questions regarding the project. Mr. Rowlands provided a brief overview of the project.

MR. O'NEILL MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 111-DR-2004 WITH THE ATTACHED STIPULATIONS AND THE CLARIFICATION THAT IT IS TWO-STORIES ALL THE WAY OUT TO THE STREET. SECOND BY MR. D'ANDREA.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ stated that he would not support the motion based on the existing character of the project. He further stated that he did not believe the way it has been handled is sensitive to the existing context. He added that he was hesitant the existing roof line will be maintained which is not consistent with what we have in the elevations.

MR. JONES stated the new version does not seem to be of the same quality as the older version and it lacks clarity. It does not seem like a good design solution so he would be opposed.

COUNCILWOMAN DRAKE stated she would not support the motion. The existing building has a strong horizontal emphasis and she likes the colors, which are consistent with that neighborhood. She further stated that she would have liked to see more of the stronger horizontal character and light colors continued. She added it could be remodeled with adding second-story units with keeping some of the roof overhangs and detailing that really gives that area distinctive character.

Councilwoman Drake called for the vote.

THE MOTION FAILED BY A VOTE OF THREE (3) TO FOUR (4) WITH COUNCILWOMAN DRAKE, VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ, MR. SCHMITT AND MR. JONES DISSENTING.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO CONTINUE CASE 111-DR-2004 IN ORDER TO ALLOW THE ARCHITECT AND DEVELOPER TO CONTINUE TO WORK ON THE AESTHETIC CONTEXT AS DELINEATED IN OUR DISCUSSION TODAY.

SPECIFICALLY IN REGARD TO HORIZONTAL EMPHASIS ON THE EXISTING PROJECT. THE DESIGNER TAKE INTO ACCOUNT EXISTING ROOF LINE AND TRY TO MAINTAIN THE EXISTING ROOF LINE WITH THE LARGE OVERHANGS. LOOK AT THE MASONRY THAT EXISTS. TRY TO KEEP SOME OF THE EXISTING ELEMENTS. CONSIDER THE EXISTING ROOF COLOR. SECOND BY MR. JONES.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF FOUR (4) TO THREE (3) WITH MR. O'NEILL, MR. D'ANDREA AND MR. STEINBERG DISSENTING.

69-DR-2004

Mark Kia Auto Showroom & Service Center
Site Plan and Elevations
1000 N. Scottsdale Road
Marc Architecture, Architect/Designer

MR. WARD presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval, subject to the attached stipulations.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ requested clarification on the colors.

MARK LYMER, Marc Architecture, reviewed the colors.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 69-DR-2004 WITH THE CLARIFICATION THAT THE CORPORATE COLORS WILL BE UTILIZED IN THE RENOVATION AND NOT SPECIFICALLY THE SAMPLES THAT WERE SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD FOR REVIEW. SECOND BY MR. D'ANDREA.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

(MR. STEINBERG LEFT AT 1:55 PM.)

99-DR-2004

Spec Home For Landmark Partners
Site plan and elevation
13358 E. Mountain View Rd

MR. WILLIAMS presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval subject to the attached stipulations.

JASON ALLEN, Skyline Consultants, stated that he is here representing Landmark Partners the owner and developer of the site. He discussed the neighborhood issues and how they have been addressed. He further stated we felt we have addressed all of the issues with the exception of the location of the home. He discussed why the home is in the existing location. He reported after meeting with the neighborhood we have moved the home down 15 feet closer.

APPROVED 3-10-05 - bdf

He requested the Board keep in mind that we are within conformance of the ordinance.

TOM WEBER, Clouse Engineering, provided information on the engineering issues related to this site. He responded to questions and comments from the Board regarding engineering issues.

MR. SCHMITT inquired about the material used on the wall. Ron Darling the Architect for the project explained why they chose to use the clone stone as opposed to the boulders on the site.

(COUNCILWOMAN DRAKE OPENED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

Councilwoman Drake noted there is a speaker comment card from Dennis Rodrigues of NESPOA who does not wish to speak but supports Carino Canyon HOA's position.

JOHN COYNE, 13331 E. Del Timbre Dr., representing Carino Canyon HOA, stated he appreciates the efforts by the Developer to meet with the neighborhood. He further stated there are two issues that were of significance to the neighborhood: The minor issue was to have the developer place some vegetation between the home owner's property and the road that is going to be built to accommodate the driveway of the home. The Developer has indicated they would accommodate us on that.

The second issue that has not been resolved is the extent to which this project is going to affect the side of the mountain as high up on the mountain that it is. At the height of where the home is going to go it will require significant scarring with cut and fill of this beautiful mountain. We would like to have the home moved down the slope. He expressed the concern that this project will set precedence. He added we believe that moving the home down the slope would not significantly change the view from the home.

STEVE KISTLER, 13326 E. Sorrel Lane, representing Carino Canyon HOA, stated that he believed that the project as presented is environmentally insensitive due to its placement on the hillside. He discussed the benefits of moving the home down further on the hillside. He noted that we do not have representation at the meeting today from the La Colina community which is located north but we do have on file from the President of La Colina community their concerns regarding the placement of the home on the hillside. He further noted that we do have the support of NESPOA.

(COUNCILWOMAN DRAKE CLOSED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

MR. ALLEN discussed some of the impacts that would occur by moving the home further down the slope. He stated we have come to an impasse in this regard.

MR. JONES stated this is suppose to be a discussion about walls but there is an inherent relationship between the house and the walls and we can't consider the two separately. As hard as we try to make improvements to the wall the fact of the matter this design is anti-environmental and anti-community. He further stated if the home were to come down lower on the mountain it would provide a good view and flatten out the view of the roof. He noted that it is possible to design a driveway that gets into the garage from the side rather than going all the way around the house. It is possible to develop a pleasant pathway up to the house without taking so much of the mountain. He added it is clear that there are better design solutions for the mountain and the community.

MR. D'ANDREA stated that he is in complete disagreement with his fellow Board Member. He further stated that the purview of the Board is to review cuts and fills. He noted that if the applicant is within the purview of the limits ESLO then they should be able to site the house anywhere where within that jurisdiction. He concluded he would support the project with the clarification that the retaining walls do step back and that there are four of them.

COUNCILWOMAN DRAKE stated that she thought the reason the DRB was asked to review cuts and fills goes beyond are they engineered correctly. She further stated that she would not support the proposal as presented but would support this if it were moved father down the hill.

MR. O'NEILL stated it is a very difficult decision for him but he will support the house as it currently prepared.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO CONTINUE CASE 99-DR-2004 IN ORDER TO ALLOW THE ARCHITECT AND DEVELOPER TO FURTHER STUDY THE SENSITIVITY OF THE IMPACT OF THE CUT AND FILLS ON THE MOUNTAIN. SECOND BY MR. JONES.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF FOUR (4) TO TWO (2) WITH MR. D'ANDREA AND MR. O'NEILL DISSENTING.

105-DR-2004

Scottsdale Air Center
Site plan and elevations
7676 E. McClain
Dickinson Architects, Architects/Designer

APPROVED 3-10-05 - bdf

MR. WARD presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval, subject to the attached stipulations.

LOREN DICKINSON, Dickinson Architects, provided information on the colors noting they are to be identical to the existing facility. He responded to questions and comments from the Board regarding this project.

COUNCILWOMAN DRAKE inquired if FAA guidelines would preclude having a fence or masonry wall on the north and south areas behind the building line where it would not impact the access. Mr. Mascaro replied the FAA guidelines would not preclude that, however, as described in the property itself the north and south sides is not technically air side they are land side. Those taxi lanes are private property. The Airport concern was the facility itself to ensure there is a physical boundary between the airpark and the airport.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 105-DR-2004 WITH THE ADDED STIPULATIONS THAT THE CHAIN LINK FENCE THAT HAS BEEN DELINEATED ON THE SITE PLAN BE IMPROVED WITH AN ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENT CONSIDERATION. THAT THE COLORS RETURN AT A STUDY SESSION FOR BOARD REVIEW AND INPUT. THE CONTEXT PHOTOS BE PROVIDED AT THAT SAME TIME.

COUNCILWOMAN DRAKE stated that it is her understanding that there is a requirement that the airport boundary be treated differently. Mr. Mascaro replied for clarity on the north and south side there is no requirement for the airport to have fencing there only need to be some type of architectural barrier between that property line and the airport property, which is private property. The southeast corner, which connects between the air side, is a fence line that would conform to the fencing requirements as outlined throughout the airport of the six foot with barbed wire.

SECOND BY MR. JONES.

MR. O'NEILL stated it is difficult to determine the scale of the building with the drawings we have received. A color elevation was passed around.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the regular meeting of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

APPROVED 3-10-05 - bdf

Scottsdale Development Review Board
February 24, 2005
Page 10

Respectfully Submitted

"For the Record" Court Reporters

APPROVED 3-10-05 - bdf