

**CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
MEETING**

DATE: March 18, 2004 **TIME:** 7:30 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Art Jordan, Chair
Theresa Carmichael
Jeff Jarvis
Marshall Poe
Wayne Pomeroy
Mark Reeb

STAFF PRESENT

Shelly Allen
Greg Marek
Amy Morales
Patrick Murphy

MEMBERS ABSENT

Chuck Riekana, Vice-Chair
Christine Close
Terry Smith

1. Call to Order

The March 18, 2004 meeting of the Downtown Development Committee was called to order at 7:30 a.m. in the City Council Chambers located at 57 E. First Street by Chair Jordan.

2. Items from Citizens Present

There were no items from citizens present.

3. Approval of Minutes of the February 19, 2004 meeting

It was moved by Marshall Poe, seconded by Wayne Pomeroy, to approve the minutes.

Vote: 6 in favor; 0 opposed

4. Discuss and consider Rezoning Case No. CZ03-002TC, from R-4 to C-1 and C-2 at 438 and 450 W. 5th Place. (This item was continued from the January 15, 2004 meeting.)

Applicant: Mark Miku, property owner

Staff Contact: Shelly Allen, Sr. Redevelopment Specialist, (480) 644-2773

Ms. Allen said the applicant has asked that the Board table this agenda item in order to allow him to continue to work with the neighborhood to resolve some of the outstanding issues in regards to this zoning case.

It was moved by Marshall Poe, seconded by Mark Reeb, to table this agenda item until further notice.

Vote: 6 in favor; 0 opposed

5. Discuss and Consider Design Review Case No. DR03-006TC, for the property located at 506 N. Center Street.

Applicant: William Barnhart, owner

Staff Contact: Shelly Allen, Sr. Redevelopment Specialist, (480) 644-2773

William Barnhart, property owner of 506 N. Center Street, introduced himself and said he has been trying to bring his artist studio to downtown Mesa for two years and he hopes to finally be successful in accomplishing that. He displayed renderings of the proposed artist studio and said he is intrigued by the arched roof system and has proposed it as part of the design of his building. He also indicated that the front of the building would mirror the exact same materials that are used on the Arizona Museum for Youth's building with the corrugated siding, CMU cinder block, and painted red steel beams. He also explained that he made some last minute changes to the design in order to incorporate a three-inch river rock into the design of the building and fencing.

Mr. Barnhart also clarified that the plans indicate that the upstairs balcony area on the front of the building will be painted, however; this was a miscommunication with his architect and a dark gray plate steel with aluminum casing around the windows is actually proposed in order to contrast the brightness of the galvanized siding.

Mr. Barnhart explained that the floor plan consists of a small exhibition area in the front and an office. The remaining area will be open space to be used for the production of sculptures. He anticipates that his work will get larger over the next 10 to 15 years as he produces big pieces for major corporations and cities, hence, the building is designed to provide the height that he needs for his work. Mr. Barnhart asked the Board members if they had any questions.

Mr. Poe asked how runoff will be handled since there is a zero lot line.

Mr. Barnhart said the gutter system will run in the crevice of the eye beam on the south side of the building.

Mr. Jordan said his concept is agreeable but he asked Mr. Barnhart to consider the quantity and speed that the water will be running off. He felt that the trough will need to be fairly wide and he suggested that it be studied a little further.

Mr. Reeb asked for clarification on the proposed mesh rock system that will be on the façade of the building and perimeter fencing and if river rock will be used in place of the granite as indicated on the plans.

Mr. Barnhart said the bottom will be masonry and steel posts will be anchored into the concrete to support the wire mesh and river rock.

Mr. Reeb asked if the rock will be inside from top to bottom beginning at grade level.

Mr. Barnhart said there will be about 40 inches of masonry that the rock will sit on.

Mr. Reeb asked if the 40-inch masonry fence will match the building.

Mr. Barnhart said it will be exactly like the building.

Mr. Poe asked how tall the fence will be.

Mr. Barnhart said it will be six feet. He further clarified that the façade will have the rock on the bottom with the CMU above and the fencing will be the opposite, with the CMU on the bottom and the rock above.

Chair Jordan asked how he plans to prevent the black iron steel from rusting.

Mr. Barnhart said it will be protected with a couple of coats of lacquer.

Chair Jordan asked if the building will have an overhead crane on the inside to move heavy materials, such as steel.

Mr. Barnhart explained that his process does not involve a lot of steel. The sculptures are mostly made from foam and plaster so he does not envision steel fabrication or an overhead crane within the building.

Chair Jordan suggested that Mr. Barnhart invest in a paint manufacturer called Tnemec which maintains better color retention and rust protection. He added that the landscape plan was very well done.

Chair Jordan asked how the vertical circulation from the upper level will be handled.

Mr. Barnhart said the upper level is mechanical space and storage. He added that a 24-foot ceiling fan will provide circulation.

Mr. Reeb asked if the material on the gate is the same corrugated material that is on the building.

Mr. Barnhart said he has not yet decided on the material. He indicated that he would like to incorporate an artistic or sculptural element to the gate as well as to the front door. He hopes to create something that will have a dramatic impact.

Mr. Reeb asked if the gate is intended to be a screening device or is it intended to allow people to look through to see the sculpture yard.

Mr. Barnhart said it will be a little bit of both. He would like it to partially screen but also allow people to walk up to it and see the sculptures in the back.

Chair Jordan suggested that if the design becomes real edgy or dramatic, that he include the Redevelopment Office so that it is not a surprise.

Mr. Barnhart agreed.

It was moved by Marshall Poe, seconded by Theresa Carmichael, to approve Design Review Case No. DR03-006TC, for the property located at 506 N. Center Street subject to the following stipulations:

- 1. Full compliance with approved plans and all current Code requirements, unless modified through the appropriate review and stipulations outlined below.**
- 2. Compliance with the basic development as shown on the site plan and elevations dated December of 2003.**
- 3. The lighting plan shall be developed according to the City's Outdoor Lighting and Control Ordinance (Night Sky Ordinance), and shall ensure that light does not spill over into the adjacent properties.**
- 4. Sign design requires the approval of the Redevelopment Office.**

Vote: 6 in favor; 0 opposed

- 6. Discuss and Consider Variance Case No. ZA04-016TC, a request for a reduction in the required building setbacks and required landscape area, for the property located at 506 N. Center Street.**

Applicant: William Barnhart, owner

Staff Contact: Shelly Allen, Sr. Redevelopment Specialist, (480) 644-2773

See agenda item number five for Board comments on this agenda item.

It was moved by Mark Reeb, seconded by Wayne Pomeroy, to recommend approval of Variance Case No. ZA04-016TC, a request for a reduction in the required building setbacks and required landscape area from ten feet (10') to zero feet (0') along the south property line, for the property located at 506 N. Center Street.

Vote: 6 in favor; 0 opposed

- 7. Discuss and Consider Design Review Case No. DR03-007TC for the Brickstone Center located at 351 North Country Club Drive.**

Applicant: Fred Stern, Architect

Staff Contact: Katrina Bradshaw, Redevelopment Associate, (480) 644-3966

Mr. Murphy said this case is to consider a new retail building on the corner of University and Country Club Drive. The building will contain four individual suites. The tenants have not yet been identified; however, the intended use is restaurant and retail.

Mr. Murphy explained there are a number of obstacles that had to be addressed when developing this site, including small parcel size, street frontage on three sides, and the request for the architect to create an urban design by orienting the

building towards the corner of the intersection. These impediments led to the need to obtain the variances that have been requested.

Mr. Murphy said staff is pleased with the design of the project. Parking is located at the back of the property. One of the variances needed is to allow the parking to be located within the front and side yard setbacks. The trash enclosure will also be located within the side yard setback off of Morris Street. Solid Waste has agreed to allow roll out trash barrels instead of a dumpster. Stipulation number 8 in the staff report requires that the sidewalk for the roll off containers match the colored concrete around the building to avoid the appearance of a driveway off Morris Street.

Mr. Murphy displayed a copy of the landscape plan and explained that, even though a variance is being sought to reduce the landscape setback on Country Club Drive and Morris Street, the applicant is still providing the total number of trees and shrubs that are required on the site. The landscaping that is proposed will help beautify the area and enhance the design of the building.

Mr. Murphy explained that the building will be visible from three street frontages: Country Club, University, and Morris Street. The architect has proposed a variety of materials and colors to enhance the design of the building. The colored elevations are incorrectly labeled in a couple of areas and therefore, staff has placed stipulation number nine upon the approval of the design review case that the archways and insets will be painted Harvest Brown as the color rendering portrays.

Mr. Murphy said another stipulation mentioned in the staff report indicates that signage will not be approved at today's meeting but will have to come back for approval through a Comprehensive Sign Plan.

Mr. Murphy reviewed the variances that are being requested which are to reduce the landscaping/building setbacks on Country Club Drive and Morris Street, allow the trash enclosure to be located within the side yard setback along Morris Street, and to allow parking within the front and side yard setbacks.

Mr. Murphy said the developer sent out a letter to surrounding property owners and tenants. Staff received comments from two neighbors who expressed support for the project.

Mr. Murphy said staff recommends approval of this project subject to the stipulations outlined in the staff report.

Mr. Marek added that, even though the signage will be approved through a separate permit, the architect did provide a detail of the monument sign on the elevations in the development plans in order to illustrate that the materials and design of the monument sign will be compatible to the design and materials of the building.

Fred Stearn, architect for this project, introduced himself and said neither he nor the owner of the property have any problems with the recommendations made by staff. He offered to answer questions from the Board.

Mr. Reeb asked what color is Harvest Brown.

Mr. Stearn said it is an integrated light brown color with a pink hue. He said the color scheme was chosen to have an urban, cityscape look. He offered to provide staff with an actual sample. He further explained that the color scheme is the Harvest Brown, Superlite Gray, white concrete cap, and patina copper for the canopies and above the windows. Mr. Stearn explained that the owner hopes to obtain a restaurant tenant on the northwest corner and be able to incorporate outdoor dining.

Chair Jordan asked where the proposed outdoor dining would be located.

Mr. Stearn said they still have not obtained a restaurant tenant yet but if the outdoor dining is being sought, then they may have come back to the Board for modification to the Design Review and obtain a tenant improvement.

Chair Jordan said he is in favor of outdoor dining but reminded Mr. Stearn that it would require a Special Use Permit and would have to come back to this Board for a recommendation.

Mr. Stearn said they are aware they would have to follow the process, but they did not want to pursue it at this time in case they are unable to obtain a restaurant tenant.

Chair Jordan said he would like to see an outdoor dining area that has the same quality as the building.

Mr. Marek added that the details of the location, size, amount, and design of the outdoor dining will be considered as part of the Special Use Permit.

Mr. Stearn explained that the 8-foot, stamped concrete sidewalk was placed around the building to create an urban feel and a pedestrian atmosphere where people could walk around and look into the shops. If the outdoor dining is incorporated, they would expand the triangular sidewalk area on the northwest corner and provide additional shading. He hoped they will be able to eliminate the SRP pump station which is right on the corner of University Drive and Country Club.

Chair Jordan asked if he has talked to SRP about that yet.

Mr. Stearn said he was told by staff that there is a future right-hand turn lane proposed for that corner and at which point the SRP box would have to be relocated. He added that the building is set back far enough for the future right-hand turn lane.

Chair Jordan asked who will be required to pay for the relocation of the equipment.

Mr. Marek said it will be paid for by the City as part of the street widening project. Mr. Marek added that the City has not yet determined if the corner will be widened.

Chair Jordan said this project has all of the elements to be an exciting project for both the City as well as the developer, but the execution is the most important part.

He explained that high-end retail tenants can have a dramatic effect. He explained that the Board is looking for a four-sided building that maintains high standards of landscaping maintenance, signage, etc. so that it presents itself as a feature building on a prominent corner in Mesa.

Mr. Stearn said the difficulty of this building is that it is a gateway feature on the outskirts of downtown Mesa and, although they would like to attract pedestrian traffic, the reality is that they probably will not. It is likely the tenants will be destination points for shoppers. He added that they hope to attract a high-end tenant that will bring people to the site for shopping, eating, etc.

It was moved by Marshall Poe, seconded by Mark Reeb, to approve Design Review Case No. DR03-007TC for the Brickstone Center located at 351 North Country Club Drive subject to the following stipulations:

- 1. Full Compliance with approved plans and all current code requirements, unless modified through the appropriate review and stipulations outlined below.**
- 2. Compliance with the basic development as shown on the site plan and elevations dated February 25, 2004, and the deletion of the sign envelopes.**
- 3. The lighting plans shall be developed according to the City's Outdoor Lighting and Control Ordinance (Night Sky Ordinance), and shall ensure that light does not spill over into the adjacent properties.**
- 4. Mirrored window glazing and glass reflective in quality shall not be used on the building.**
- 5. Final placement, quantity, and design of all signage (wall, monument, window, etc.) shall be subject to the approval of a Comprehensive Sign Plan.**
- 6. Obtain necessary right-of-way permits from the Development Services Department prior to performing any work located within the right-of-way.**
- 7. Final placement of plant/landscape materials shall be subject to the approval of a City of Mesa Landscape Inspector.**
- 8. Use stamped colored concrete for the roll-off barrel walkway on the east side of the building instead of a concrete sidewalk.**
- 9. Stucco insets on east elevation and stucco arches, typical of all four elevations, shall be painted Superlite Harvest Brown, as the color rendering portrays.**
- 10. Eliminate the requirement for parking lot and foundation base landscaping as described in Chapter 15 of the City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance.**
- 11. A color and materials board, with actual samples, shall be produced and turned in to the Redevelopment Office.**
- 12. Approval of Variance Case No. ZA04-001TC by the Zoning Administrator.**

Vote: 6 in favor; 0 opposed

- 8. Discuss and Consider Variance Case No. ZA04-001TC to reduce the building and landscaping setbacks and to allow parking, mechanical equipment, and trash enclosure to encroach within the required front and side yard setbacks for the Brickstone Center located at 351 North Country Club Drive.**

Applicant: Fred Stern, Architect
Staff Contact: Katrina Bradshaw, Redevelopment Associate, (480) 644-3966

See agenda item number seven for staff report and Board comments.

It was moved by Marshall Poe, seconded by Mark Reeb, to approve Variance Case No. ZA04-001TC for the Brickstone Center located at 351 North Country Club Drive for the following:

- 1. Reduce the required front yard building and landscaping setback (Country Club Drive) from 10 feet to 8 feet and reduce the required side yard building and landscaping setback (Morris Street) from 15 feet to 7 feet.**
- 2. Allow the trash enclosure and mechanical equipment to be located within the required side yard setback.**
- 3. Allow parking to be located within the front yard (future right-of-way area) and side yard setbacks.**

Vote: 6 in favor; 0 opposed

- 9. Discuss the submittals to the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for Site 17 and consider a Request For Proposals (approximately 25-acre parcel located at the southwest corner of Mesa Drive and University Drive). (Continued from the February 19, 2004 meeting.)**

Mr. Murphy explained that as a result of the DDC study session held on March 8th, and the comments that were received from the Board members, staff has revised Section 5 of the Request for Proposals (RFP). Mr. Murphy added that the Board members had expressed interest in holding a joint meeting with the City Council, which staff is working on setting up.

Mr. Murphy went over the added text that has been proposed for Section 5 of the RFP. He explained that the additions that have been proposed are to help clarify the type of project that is being sought and the submittal requirements that are expected of the developers including phasing, joint ventures, timelines, experience, etc.

Mr. Poe pointed out that number two in the RFP requires that a residential, office, and commercial component be integrated into each phase of development but number nine states that there must be either a retail or commercial component within each phase.

Mr. Reeb felt that the discussions at the study session indicate that the Board would like to see some component of commercial or office integrated with the

residential component in the beginning, however he did not feel that there needs to be a commercial or retail component in every phase of development.

Mr. Marek clarified that number nine states that the developer must incorporate either a retail or commercial component with each residential phase that is built. He asked if the Board is comfortable with that.

Mr. Reeb said he does not feel comfortable requiring a commercial component every time they build a residential component. He clarified that, in his opinion, the retail, office, or commercial component should be developed in the first phase in conjunction with the residential component.

Mr. Marek suggested that the wording be changed to require that the first phase of development must include a retail, office, or commercial component and remove the requirement to provide it in each phase.

Mr. Reeb said he would be comfortable with that language but couldn't speak for the rest of the Board.

Mr. Murphy said one concern with that suggestion is to consider that the commercial component in the first phase might be really small. He suggested that staff work on the language for this item a little further.

Mr. Marek said the conundrum is that the Request for Proposals cannot specify in too much detail the number of square footage or percentage that must be commercial. He suggested that this would be considered in the evaluation of the proposals that are received.

Mr. Poe said he agrees that the first phase should include both residential and commercial components. He did not feel, however, that the City should try to control design by specifying a minimum square footage for each component. He felt it was important to try to steer the developers who will respond to the RFP that this is a master development with the first phase including retail/commercial. He explained that he believes that the Board wants to avoid the possibility of a delayed commercial component.

Mr. Jarvis asked for clarification for the meaning of the term "urban area" in the RFP.

Mr. Murphy said the term is used to distinguish this project from a suburban development.

Mr. Jarvis said he felt that the term "higher density" was more appropriate. He suggested that the RFP focus on density and pedestrian oriented design with an emphasis on the pedestrian experience and street life.

Mr. Marek also felt that the RFP should emphasize urban elements and the new urbanism design concepts. Mr. Marek suggested that there be more descriptive terms in the RFP in order to portray that.

Mr. Poe suggested that the RFP define the term "urban areas" instead of repeating the same description numerous times in the RFP.

Mr. Reeb suggested referring back to the Town Center Concept Plan's design concepts described in that document rather than recreating the language in the RFP.

Mr. Marek agreed and added that the Town Center Concept Plan is the General Plan for downtown. He added that if a submittal was made that is contrary to the Town Center Concept Plan design elements, then staff would not recommend proceeding with that submittal.

Mr. Poe added that the design should be of high quality and asked how the City plans to control that.

Mr. Marek explained that the quality will be reviewed during the design review process, and if it does not meet the standards that are desired, then the design review case would not be approved.

Mr. Poe felt that the RFP should describe the quality that the City is looking for so that the developers are aware of the standards that they are expected to meet before they respond to the RFP.

Mr. Reeb said it is difficult to craft language to communicate that to a potential applicant. He felt that the current language in the RFP is pretty good. He suggested that the Board members provide staff with their comments and expectations so that staff can communicate them to the developers who may be curious as to the predisposition of this Board.

Mr. Marek said another way to address that is by asking the developers to provide examples of projects that they have developed in order to get a sense of their reputation for quality.

Chair Jordan said the challenge is to create an RFP document in a timely manner that clearly depicts all of the aspects that staff, Board members, and City Council envision for the site. He said he was unsure on how to accomplish that but suggested that Jeff Jarvis list bullet points for all of the elements of an urban pedestrian design. He hoped that within the next 30 days that the Downtown Development Committee and City Council will feel comfortable with issuing the Request for Proposals under the guidelines that have been discussed at this meeting. He asked staff for suggestions on how to accomplish that.

Mr. Murphy suggested that staff revise the RFP document, incorporating the suggestions made by the Board, and discuss them at another study session prior to the joint meeting with City Council.

Mr. Pomeroy asked the status of the proposals that were received in response to the Request for Qualifications.

Mr. Murphy said the Board members are not being asked to make a decision on the proposals, only to determine if there is enough interest in the project by qualified developers. He felt that the City has already established that based on the responses that were received and the interest shown as recorded in the Northeast Quadrant Analysis prepare by Hunter Interests.

Mr. Marek suggested that, in order to refine the process a little further, the Board members can provide their written comments to staff, including Mr. Jarvis's comments as discussed earlier, so that they can be distributed to all of the Board members before the next study session for discussion and comments. He suggested that Board members be prepared to discuss their major issues, focusing on the concerns with section 5, when they meet with City Council at the joint meeting. Once the Board has had a chance to discuss the major issues, and obtain feedback from City Council, they can bring this agenda item back again at the May DDC meeting for further refinement and a recommendation to City Council. He added that the joint meeting with City Council is a chance for the Board members to discuss other issues, not just Site 17.

Chair Jordan asked how formal the draft versions of the RFP have to be. He didn't feel it necessary to use strikethrough and bold versions to keep track of previous documents.

Mr. Murphy said there is no formal requirement for this process.

Mr. Marek added that staff has used that technique in the past to help the Board members see where changes have been made and to distinguish changed text from text that has already been approved.

Chair Jordan asked Mr. Poe what he suggests in trying to bring together several people to contribute text to a document.

Mr. Poe said typically the statement of work goes through a dynamic process when several people are involved. He said that he personally prefers to see the changes in bold so that he doesn't have to take the time to make careful comparisons to the previous document.

Mr. Murphy said in the future he could provide two versions of the document--the bold version to show changes, and the clean version.

Chair Jordan suggested that staff email the Board members the draft document and the Board members can review it and provide written comments back to staff for review at the next study session.

Mr. Reeb said he didn't feel that the document needs that much more work other than to incorporate the comments regarding the phasing requirements. Mr. Reeb said he would like to get feedback from City Council regarding their disposition for the future of this property to ensure that this Board is headed in the right direction.

Chair Jordan agreed but stated that he presumed that the Board wanted to present a prepared draft of section 5 of the RFP to draw in a discussion with City Council. He predicted that some of the City Council members may be interested in incorporating the Mesa Community College (MCC) campus into Site 17 but hoped that it wouldn't require waiting until November for the results of the ballot regarding MCC's funding.

Mr. Marek said the Northeast Quadrant Analysis contains over 20 pages specifically regarding MCC who has made it clear that they are not interested in

building a campus on Site 17. As a result, the issue in regards to MCC's involvement in Site 17 has already been addressed. Mr. Marek said he believes City Council will be interested in discussing the macro issues of the project, and therefore, the Board members can present an RFP that is reflective of the comments received today, but it does not need to be rushed for completion in time for the joint meeting with City Council.

Mr. Poe said he agreed with Mr. Marek that the City Council will be looking at it from a broader perspective. He felt that the purpose of the joint meeting is to obtain direction from City Council. He felt that the Board members should present an RFP to City Council that reflects the thoughts and opinions of the Board, and compare it to the views of the City Council.

Mr. Jarvis said he could provide some suggestions on what a pedestrian oriented project might contain without being too specific about the design of the project so that developers can present their own creative ideas.

Chair Jordan suggested that all written comments from Board members be provided to staff by Wednesday, March 24th.

Mr. Poe said he is cognizant of the fact that staff is short staffed and expressed appreciation for the changes that staff was able to present in the short amount of time that was given.

10. Report From Mesa Town Center, Tom Verploegen – Executive Director

Mr. Verploegen was not in attendance to give a report from Mesa Town Center.

11. Director's Report, Greg Marek

Redevelopment Ad Hoc Committee – Next Monday night at 6:30 p.m. is the first meeting of the Redevelopment Ad Hoc Committee formed by City Council to discuss the Redevelopment Area. Chuck Riekena and Art Jordan were asked to serve on the 13-member committee chaired by Rex Griswold. The ad hoc committee has been created to discuss whether the Redevelopment Area boundaries should be reduced and if the City should continue to have a Redevelopment Program. The first meeting will be to discuss housekeeping items and to outline the topics of discussion for future meetings. The second meeting will include presentations from Mesa Town Center Corporation and the Redevelopment Office on what it is that they do. The meeting is open to the public and will be held in the lower level Council Chambers.

Site 21 – The building plans have already been approved and the building permit is ready to be picked up; however, the developer, Outsource International, is in default of the agreement in regards to securing their financing. The City Council is scheduled to determine what action they want to take at their April 5th meeting. The developer says they will have a financing partner before the April 5th meeting.

Chair Jordan asked if there is a possibility that City Council will terminate the agreement with Outsource International.

Mr. Marek said City Council has several options. They can terminate the agreement and wait until the election in November to see if Mesa Community College is interested in the building as part of their downtown campus. Other options are to sell the building or grant the developer additional time to secure the financing.

Pomeroy House – Escrow will be complete next week and the Violin Studios will take ownership of the house.

Mitten House – The bond election was approved to move the City Courts building to 1st Avenue and Mesa Drive. The City is waiting to find out if John Giles still plans to proceed with the purchase of the Mitten House for his law office. If not, the City will probably issue another Request for Proposal.

Mera Bank Building (29 W. Main) – The building has been sold to Cardon Investments who plan to do some major renovations to the building. Those renovations will be brought to the Committee in a Design Review application at a future meeting.

12. **Board Member Comments**

None

13. **Adjournment**

With there being no further business, this meeting of the Downtown Development Committee adjourned at 8:50 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mr. Gregory J. Marek, Director of Redevelopment
Minutes prepared by Katrina Bradshaw