



Architectural Review Committee Meeting

**Mesquite City Hall
10 E. Mesquite Blvd.
Tuesday, May 7, 2013 - 4:30 PM**

Minutes of a scheduled meeting of the Architectural Review Committee held on Monday May 7, 2013 at 4:30 P.M. at City Hall. In attendance were Colleen Glieden, Mark Haas, and Tom Henry. Also in attendance were **Ex-officio**, and Development Services Director, Richard Secrist, and 4 citizens, Rusty Hughes (Kokopelli), Judy Navarrete (Star Nursery), William Tim (Star Nursery), and Ken Cook.

Development Services Director, Richard Secrist called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m. (NOTE: This meeting has been tape-recorded and will remain on file in the office of the City Clerk for four years for public examination.)

Below is an agenda of all items scheduled to be considered. Unless otherwise stated, items may be taken out of the order presented on the agenda at the discretion of the Committee. Additionally, the Committee may combine two or more agenda items for consideration, and may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any time. Public comment is limited to three minutes per person and may only address items that are not on the meeting's agenda.

Consent Agenda

Items on the Consent Agenda may not require discussion. These items may be a single motion unless removed at the request of the a Committee member of City Staff.

Mr. Secrist introduced the committee as having jurisdiction or design review authority over what happens in the Central Business District downtown and out of the Mesquite Technology and Commerce Center in the Industrial Park and there are special design standards adopted for each area, so whenever there is a permit of any type, a sign permit or a building permit, some change or remodel, then it comes to the Architectural Review Committee.

1. Consideration of approval of the May 7, 2013 Regular Architectural Review Committee Meeting Agenda.

Mr. Haas moved to approve the agenda for April 22, 2013. Colleen Glieden seconded the motion.

Motion Passed For: 3; Against: 0; Abstain: 0

2. Consideration of approval of the Minutes of the April 22, 2013 Architectural Review Committee Meetings. - Possible Action

Mr. Secrist asked if everyone had reviewed the minutes, and if so, if there were any corrections.

Committee member Mark Haas noted that the minutes included a statement attributed to him that he didn't make. On Page 3, second paragraph it states, "Mr. Haas asked where the location was." He said that must have been someone else because he was the one that actually measured the sign.

Mr. Secrist stated that he would make sure it gets corrected.

Mr. Henry moved that the April 22, 2013 minutes be approved with this correction. Mr. Haas seconded the motion.

Motion Passed For: 3; Against: 0; Abstain: 0

Administrative Items

3. Consideration of Sign Permit No. CSS-13-0015 to erect one wall sign and one monument sign for Kokopelli Landscaping at 1485 W Pioneer Boulevard, in the Light Industrial (IR-1) Zone.

Mr. Secrist introduced the item stating that an application and a sign plan had been submitted. He noted that Rusty Hughes was present from Kokopelli. Mr. Secrist went on to say that the proposal calls for a new wall sign on the building and a new monument sign. "The sign standards for the MTCC allows multiple signs for tenants within a building, one text sign may be placed on the rear of the building, that is not the case here. The maximum letter height is 24 inches, maximum three lines of text on the building. Single tenant monument signs shall not exceed 6 feet in height and 30 square feet of copy area. It appears from the drawings that were submitted that it meets the area requirements on both counts on the wall sign and the monument. The height of the monument, the area of the copy and so forth, and so our recommendation is to approve."

Motion: Committee member Glieden made a motion to approve the sign permit as presented. Committee member Haas seconded the motion.

Passed For: 3; Against: 0; Abstain: 0

4. Consideration of a request by Star Nursery to place chain link fencing on top of the screening wall around the perimeter of the property at

549 Commerce Circle, in the Light Industrial (IR-1) Zone.

Mr. Secrist introduced the item saying, "Star Nursery is going to open business in the old Capital Building Materials site at 549 Commerce Circle. They intend to utilize both the building and the fenced in materials storage yard in the rear. There is an existing masonry screen wall around the materials yard in back. However, the applicant desires greater security than is afforded by the 5' to 6' wall, and therefore, seeks to put a 4' high chain link fence on top of the wall. They would also like to place several strands of barbed wire on top of the chain link (see attached drawings with and without)".

Down the road, it is the applicant's desire to place wrought iron fencing on the wall instead of the chain link, but given the quick opening at this location and the inability to get iron fencing in time, they seek approval of the chain link.

They are beginning to move in materials this week, so they hope to secure an approval as early as possible.

Judy Navarrete showed a picture of an existing store in Las Vegas (Boulder Highway location) with the chain link and three strands of barbed wire on top. She stated that it is hardly noticeable. The height of the top strand is about 8 feet at this location. She stated that in this case, if they go with the barbed wire, it will be 3 feet of chain link with the three strands of barbed wire on top.

Mr. Secrist asked if the wall varies in height about 5-6 feet. Ms. Navarrete said yes.

Mr. Haas asked, "Do any of your stores not have barbed wire?"

Ms. Navarrete replied, "In the newer locations that we have right now, we actually have like 10 feet of cinder block wall with the wrought iron. There are about four stores that do have the chain link, that's the fencing around the store".

Mr. Haas asked if there had been theft in any of the stores and Ms. Navarrete stated that 'yes, it is horrible'.

Mr. Henry felt it was reasonable to put the chain link instead of building the wall up.

Ms. Navarrete added that the chain link would be painted saddle to match the wall.

Mr. Secrist presented photos/examples of chain link and chain link with barbed wire.

Ms. Glieden asked if there was an alternative to the barbed wire on top of the fence.

Ms. Navarrete, "The reason why we're trying to get the chain link down is timing. We'd have to fabricate all the wrought iron to go around the fence and that's going to take a lot of money and a lot of time. In future, that's where we want to go because we take a lot of pride in our properties."

Mr. Secrist stated, "Are you viewing this, if approved, as temporary, eventually being replaced or you're not really sure?"

Ms. Navarrete said, "I know that the owner always goes that route because of what it looks like, it's kind of our theme now. So, the timeframe would be a year to two years depending on how well the store does." She added that this was the more cost effective way to go as well.

Mr. Secrist stated, "I don't think there is any question that the wrought iron would be better, would be much more attractive and provide a nicer type of security, but on the other hand, I understand the timing and trying to get open and get moving and so forth." He said that if they were to allow it, he would prefer the chain link to the barbed wire.

Motion: Committee member Haas made a motion to approve this item with the chain link fencing on the wall with barbed wire on top, with the condition that the chain link be removed in 3 years and replaced with wrought iron. Committee member Henry seconded the motion.

Passed For: 3; Against: 0; Abstain: 0

Additional discussion followed wherein Judy Navarrete asked if they could have an approval without setting a time for replacement of the fencing, if they removed the barbed wire. Several committee members sought clarification. Mr. Secrist advised the committee that if they wanted to consider a different decision, then a new motion would have to be made. Previous motion was withdrawn.

MOTION: Committee member Haas made a motion to approve the chain link only fence with no time limit stipulation on changing to wrought iron, to the height of maximum 10 feet, block wall included. Committee member Henry seconded the motion.

Passed For: 3; Against: 0; Abstain: 0

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00P.M.

Ex Officio/Development Services Director, Richard Secrist