

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

DATE: May 17, 2001 **TIME:** 7:00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Dave Wier, Chair
Vince DiBella, Vice-Chair
Theresa Carmichael
Debra Duvall
Art Jordan, AIA
Shanlyn Newman
Lori Osiecki

STAFF PRESENT

Robert Bagley
Katrina Bradshaw
Craig Crocker
Tony Felice
Gerry Gerber
Greg Marek
Amy Morales
Patrick Murphy

OTHERS PRESENT

Reverend Fred Baum
John Gentry
Chris Miller
Rick Pfannenstiel
Ernest Porter
Dwight Todd
Tom Verploegen

MEMBERS ABSENT

Wayne Pomeroy
Terry Smith

1. Call to Order

The May 17, 2001 meeting of the Downtown Development Committee was called to order at 7:00 a.m. in the City Council Chambers located at 57 E. First Street by Chair Wier.

2. Items from Citizens Present

There were no items from citizens present.

3. Approval of Minutes of April 19, 2001 Regular Meeting

It was moved by Deb Duvall, seconded by Shanlyn Newman to approve the minutes.

Vote: 7 in favor; 0 opposed

4. Discuss and consider Historic Landmark Overlay Case No. HL01-001TC, for the Ramon Mendoza House, located at 126 N. Pomeroy St.

**Applicant: Jon Gentry
Staff Contact: Tony Felice, (480) 644-3965
e-mail address: tony_felice@ci.mesa.az.us
Recommendation: Approval**

Mr. Felice explained that the Ramon Mendoza House, located adjacent to the Wilbur Historic District, is being considered as a Historic Landmark Overlay. The purpose of a Historic Landmark is to recognize and preserve Mesa's cultural, historical, and architectural heritage. Mr. Felice explained that the significance of this house is associated with the person who lived there more than for its architectural style. He explained that Ramon Mendoza was the first Hispanic Police Chief for the city of Mesa and further discussed his contributions to the community, his family history, and his accomplishments.

Mr. Felice stated that in order to evaluate the significance of a person, the City uses the guidelines that are set forth for evaluating a property associated with a person in the National Register of Historic Places, specifically the Secretary of Interior Standards for identifying historic properties.

The analysis was based on the following criteria:

1. Individuals must have made a contribution or played a role that can be justified as significant within a defined area of history.

Chief Mendoza was the first Hispanic Chief of Police and he made innovative approaches in Police Administration.

2. Individual must be directly associated with the subject property.

The house was purchased by Ramon Mendoza with his wife in 1946 and he lived there until he died in 1999.

3. Properties must be associated with individuals during the productive part of the history of significance.

He was an important figure in the community and active as a community volunteer during the time that he lived in the house.

Mr. Felice stated that this proposed historic landmark is compatible with the Downtown Concept Plan and the Historic Preservation Plan. He also stated that the Fire Department will continue to work with the owner, Jon Gentry, to make sure that Fire Station 201 does not interfere with this historic landmark. The Redevelopment Office will continue to facilitate and mediate that process.

Mr. Felice stated that staff recommends that the DDC recommend approval of this Historic Landmark Overlay to the City Council.

Mr. DiBella asked if the homes along Pomeroy Street are still planning to become a part of the Wilbur Historic District.

Mr. Felice stated that the neighborhood is still interested in expanding their boundaries to include those homes and are currently working to obtain the signatures required for that expansion.

Mr. Gentry, owner of the Ramon Mendoza House, stated that he was totally supportive of the Historic Landmark Overlay and shared some of his memories of the Mendoza family. Mr. Gentry said he was very pleased that the house would not be demolished as a result of the Fire Station and added that he was not opposed to Fire Station 201 being located adjacent to his home.

It was moved by Lori Osiecki, seconded by Deb Duvall, to approve the Historic Landmark Overlay Case No. HL01-001TC for the Ramon Mendoza house, located at 126 N. Pomeroy Street.

Vote: 7 in favor; 0 opposed

5. **Discuss and consider the Design Review Case No. DR01-003TC for the surface parking lot located at 15 E. 1st Ave. (First United Methodist Church).**

Applicant: Rev. Fred Baum
Staff Contact: Patrick Murphy, (480) 644-3964
e-mail address: patrick_murphy@ci.mesa.az.us

Recommendation: Approval with conditions

Mr. DiBella declared a conflict of interest and abstained from voting and comments on this agenda item.

Mr. Murphy explained that the Downtown Development Committee is reviewing the development plans for the surface parking lot in order to fulfill one of the stipulations of the Redevelopment Agreement for Site 22. Staff recommends approval of the design review subject to the following stipulations:

1. Full compliance with the approved plans and all current Building Code requirements, unless modified through the appropriate review.
2. Compliance with the basic development as shown on the site plan and landscape plan dated April 23, 2001.

Mr. Murphy gave some background information on Site 22 and reviewed the phases involved in the development of this site. The project will be constructed in four phases:

- Phase I Memorial Chapel
- Phase II Improvements to the surface parking lot
- Phase III Family Life Center
- Phase IV Completion of the surface parking lot improvements

He said staff is pleased with the improvements that the applicant has proposed for the parking lot. He added that the parking lot meets all the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance regarding isle widths, parking stall locations, maneuvering areas, etc.

Mr. Murphy went over the improvements to the parking lot including the lighting, landscaping, signage, and talked about the temporary location of the trash bin (which will be moved during construction of Phase III). Mr. Murphy explained that the trash bin will be placed at its temporary location so that it won't have to be moved during the construction of Phase III.

Mr. Murphy said that the surrounding residents have been notified of these improvements and staff has not received any comments from the public.

Mr. Murphy reiterated that staff believes these improvements are in compliance with the Downtown Concept Plan and recommends approval subject to the stipulations noted earlier.

Chair Wier said he was impressed with the improvements to the Memorial Chapel that was recently completed.

It was moved by Shanlyn Newman, seconded by Art Jordan, to approve Design Review Case No. DR01-003TC for the surface parking lot located at 15 E. 1st Ave. (First United Methodist Church) subject to the following stipulations:

1. Full compliance with the approved plans and all current Building Code requirements, unless modified through the appropriate review.
2. Compliance with the basic development as shown on the site plan and landscape plan dated April 23, 2001.

Vote: 6 in favor; 0 opposed (Vince DiBella abstaining)

6. Discuss and consider Main Street Streetscape Phase IV improvements (Center Street between Main and First Avenue; and Main Street between Center and Surrine).

Staff Contact: Patrick Murphy, (480) 644-3964
e-mail address: patrick_murphy@ci.mesa.az.us
Recommendation: Approval of design concept for Phase IV including parallel parking on Center St. and reduce travel from four lanes to two lanes.

Mr. Murphy stated the intent of streetscape is to create a more pedestrian friendly environment in downtown Mesa. The City has been implementing the streetscape project since 1998. Phases include:

Phase I	Main Street, Country Club to Center Street Center Street, Main St. to Pepper Place Macdonald, Main St. to First Ave.
Phase II	Robson Street, First Ave. to First Street
Phase III	Main Street, Lewis Street to Mesa Drive
Phase IV	Center Street, Main St. to First Ave. Main Street, Center St. to Surrine
Phase V	Macdonald Street, Main St. to First St.

Mr. Murphy went over the conceptual site plans of the streetscape improvements for Phase IV. Mr. Murphy talked about lighting, landscaping, bike racks, bus pullouts, bus shelters, street furniture, etc. Mr. Murphy also explained that electrical outlets are being provided for all the trees adjacent to the street frontages to provide power supply for holiday lighting. Plans for Main Street include four through lanes for traffic, a four-foot wide bike lane, nine-foot wide parallel parking spaces, and widened sidewalks. Center Street will have two through lanes, a center turn lane, a four-foot wide bike lane, and parallel parking spaces on both sides of the street.

Chair Wier asked if the parallel parking will be on both sides of Center Street.

Mr. Murphy said the parallel parking was chosen instead of the back-in diagonal parking because the project team and the consultants were concerned about safety and also felt that the parking should be consistent throughout downtown to eliminate confusion.

Mr. Murphy also talked about the mid-block crossing on Main Street and Lewis Street and the reduction of the through lanes on Center Street. The project team understands that the flow of traffic will become more limited, however, they felt that this would help to create a more pedestrian friendly downtown.

Mr. Murphy said staff plans to have the construction plans for Phase IV completed by August of 2001 and will bid those documents in tandem with the Mesa Arts Center construction documents. The Mesa Arts Center is scheduled to be under construction from January 2002 to September 2004. The streetscape Phase IV will be constructed once the Mesa Arts Center is completed and therefore is scheduled to be completed in 2004. The proposed budget for the streetscape Phase IV is \$1.92 million dollars. The streetscape project team, the MAC consultants, and the MAC user groups recommend that the DDC approve the concept plans for Streetscape Phase IV. Mr. Murphy added that the Downtown Development Committee's recommendation will be forwarded to the General Development Committee and to the City Council.

Ms. Newman asked if there is enough room for parallel parking on Center Street.

Mr. Murphy stated that there is maneuvering area for the parallel parking spaces as well as a four-foot wide bike lane that separates the parallel parking from the through lane. Mr. Murphy stated that there is adequate space for all of that as well as for a center turn lane.

Mr. Jordan said he is in favor of the consistency of the design of the streetscape improvements throughout downtown, but was concerned how its design would interact with the colors and unique features of the Mesa Arts Center. He wanted to know if the MAC consultants were comfortable with the integration of our standard features with their distinct design.

Mr. Murphy stated that the MAC consultants were included on the streetscape project team and have met regularly to ensure that the designs are compatible and that everyone is comfortable with how the MAC building will integrate with the streetscape project. Mr. Murphy also pointed out that the MAC consultants are planning to design the bus shelter on Center Street so that it ties in with the unique design of the Mesa Arts Center.

Mr. Marek also added that the design review of the Mesa Arts Center included discussions of how the pedestrian connections and the Streetscape Phase IV would relate to the Mesa Arts Center. Those considerations have been incorporated with the landscape plans of the Mesa Arts Center.

Mr. Jordan said the plans that he received in his packet do not show the details of the street furniture, etc. for the Streetscape Phase IV, however, he felt reassured that the MAC consultants and architect have been involved in the streetscape project and would trust that they are comfortable with the plans.

Mr. Marek said that many of the unique features of the Mesa Arts Center (i.e. arroyo, etc) are located in the internal portions of the project and the streetscape will be interacting mostly with the building architecture and the entry points of the Pedestrian Pathways. The Sherman Group and the architects of the Mesa Arts Center have been working together to make sure that the projects integrate in a complementary fashion.

It was moved by Deb Duvall, seconded by Vince DiBella, to approve Main Street Streetscape Phase IV improvements (Center Street between Main and First Avenue and Main Street between Center and Surrine).

Vote: 7 in favor; 0 opposed

7. Discuss and consider design plans for the arroyo, sails, and color palette for the Mesa Arts Center.

Staff Contact: Shelly Allen, (480) 644-2773
e-mail address: shelly_allen@ci.mesa.az.us

Ms. Allen explained that the Downtown Development Committee approved the design review of the Mesa Arts Center subject to the following nine 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.
3. Before making a final decision on the colors proposed for the various buildings, prepare an intricately colored, masonry plaster sample of the finished product in an 8'x8' format of the exact

colors and place on the site. This will allow the decision-makers to view the colors during different hours of the day before making a decision.

4. Review and approval of a complete comprehensive sign plan by the DDC before the issuance of a sign permit. The sign plan shall include a directional sign plan and special signage at the major entranceways.
5. 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.
6. Mirrored window glazing and glass reflective in quality shall not be used on the buildings.
7. Since the final decision regarding the development of the surrounding streets has not been determined, Redevelopment, Engineering, Transportation, Traffic, and Streets will coordinate efforts and recommend a design to develop the surrounding streets for approval by City Council.
8. The wall for the Mesa Contemporary Arts at Center and Main Streets should be constructed using a cast-in-place masonry concrete with an intricately colored, cement plaster finish demonstrating a high quality finish.
9. Final design plans on the shade sails and the arroyo cloud will be presented to the Downtown Development Committee after it is reviewed by the Design Committee for approval.

Ms. Allen introduced Dwight Todd, DWL Architects, and Rick Pfannenstiel, Kitchell, to give the Committee a presentation and update on the stipulations listed above.

Mr. Todd said the conceptual plans have generally remained the same since the last update to the Downtown Development Committee, however, the biggest change was that the cloud and water feature have been eliminated and will be replaced with some other redesigned water source feature. He explained that they are still working on that issue, otherwise the plans are developing along the original concept as has been presented before.

Mr. Todd said the color samples for the Mesa Arts Center have been displayed on the site and have been universally accepted up to this point. He explained that the issue of colors is always a controversial one, however they feel that the colors have been very well supported. He said there will be permanent mock-ups of the color samples on the construction site and opportunities will exist to adjust the colors up through the construction phase since it is one of the last things that is completed on the construction project.

Mr. Todd talked briefly about signage and passed around some conceptual plans of the sign package. He was pleased with the sign package and felt that the contemporary design and durable, modern materials were very much in character with the design of the building.

Mr. Marek pointed out that the sign package will be brought back to the Downtown Development Committee as a separate action to obtain a comprehensive sign permit at a future meeting.

Mr. Todd talked about lighting and said they will be incorporating an automated lighting control that will shut off any non-conforming lighting no later than 10:00 p.m. in order to comply with the Night Sky Ordinance.

Mr. Todd said there will not be any mirrored glazing or reflective glass used on the project. He also said they have been working with the streetscape project team and have worked to successfully

merge the streetscape designs with the Mesa Arts Center and are pleased with the results of those efforts.

Mr. Todd talked about the wall finish on the Mesa Contemporary Arts building and the shade sails. He concluded by stating that the work on the shade sails and canopies have not progressed to a point where the design team is ready to make a presentation but added that they will present something for final approval at a later date.

Chair Wier was concerned that the colors will fade on the buildings and felt that the blue color would not look good on such a massive building.

Mr. Todd said the life span of the colors is expected to fade no more than 10% in ten years. He indicated that the colors can be refreshed. Again he expressed that the colors are subject to opinion and was surprised that the color scheme was accepted as well as it was considering how dramatic they are.

Mr. Pfannenstiel explained that the integral colored plaster was the best long-term value for this project in terms of long-term maintenance and cost.

Ms. Carmichael echoed Chair Wier's opinion of the colors and was not in favor of the chosen color scheme. She also expressed her disappointment that the color samples for the building were not displayed at a more prominent location where more of the public would be able to view them. She felt that the purpose of stipulation #3 was to allow the public to view the colors and have a chance to provide their feedback.

Mr. Pfannenstiel explained that the color samples were placed on the south side of the cinema building because it received full sun exposure and could provide a better idea of what the colors would look like in the sun. He also explained that that the City Council has been presented with this color scheme and have all endorsed it.

Ms. Duvall thought that the color scheme was being brought back to the Downtown Development Committee for consideration at this meeting but based on the comments that have been made, it seems that City Council has already made the decision to go ahead with the proposed color scheme. She asked what was the role of the Downtown Development Committee at this meeting today and will their opinions even be considered on this issue.

Mr. Marek said the Downtown Development Committee asked to receive an update on the status of the stipulations at their last meeting, hence staff asked DWL to provide an update and presentation at today's meeting. Mr. Marek stated that members of the City Council have been attending the public meetings with the Mesa Arts Center design team and have been expressing their opinions as to what they support. He said the City Council will receive the Downtown Development Committee's comments and concerns when they read the minutes of this meeting and will consider those along with everything else when making their final decisions. Mr. Marek said that the Downtown Development Committee approved the color scheme when the design review plans were approved. The remaining stipulations requiring action relate to the arroyo cloud, shade sails, and comprehensive sign plan.

Ms. Gerber indicated that stipulation #3 requests that the color samples for the building be displayed on the site so that the final decision makers (which is City Council) will have a chance to view the colors during different hours of the day before making a final decision. The design team has complied with the request and placed the color samples on the site allowing for south exposure for the reasons that Rick Pfannenstiel explained. She said they came to the Downtown Development Committee this morning because they understood that the Committee wanted to receive an update on the status of the project and the stipulations that were requested at the time of design review approval.

Mr. Jordan felt that the primary customer of the Mesa Arts Center was not the design team, the advisory boards, or the City Council, but the citizens of Mesa. He expressed his concern that regardless of whether the City Council is in favor of the color scheme, it will not affect the opinion of the citizens of Mesa. He thought that the citizens should have the opportunity to give their opinion on the color scheme for the Mesa Arts Center and have more influence on the final decision.

Ms. Gerber said the project team has consistently invited over 250 citizens to every meeting for the Mesa Arts Center. She said even though 250 people don't always show up, they have encouraged and included public participation on this project more than any other project that she knows of in Mesa. She also mentioned that the project has been focused on the City Beat program on Channel 11 for several months and citizens have expressed their opinions on the colors to different City Council members. Ms. Gerber explained that when the design committee was formed, the feedback from the citizens of Mesa was that they wanted to see a building that would make an architectural statement in downtown Mesa. They wanted something that was unique and had never been built here before. For the most part, the feedback that the design team has received is that people have embraced the colors. They are an accent and they make a statement. Not everyone is going to embrace the colors, and not everyone likes every building, especially if it's a building worthy of so much focus and discussion.

Mr. Jordan still felt that the chosen color scheme would not hold up under the long-term scrutiny of architectural review. Mr. Jordan thanked the project team for following through with stipulation #3 and putting the color samples on display as requested, however he thought the decision makers needed to understand the significance of the decision they were making.

Ms. Duvall said her preference for any building for downtown (including this one) was that it be stately, conservative, and have a substantial look to it. She was concerned about what kind of statement that the design and colors of this building would make over time. She felt that the colors and other aspects of the building would not stand the test of time. She felt people would see it as an artsy building rather than a building that presents a cultural and stately image. She said if she had the decision making power she would not vote for the colors that have been proposed.

Chair Wier asked if the colors can be changed in the future.

Mr. Pfannenstiel explained that the selection of the material was an integral color and in order to change those they would have to be applied in some sort of surface application. That would mean they would have to either resurface the building or paint over it.

Mr. Jordan asked if the Committee is still going to see the final design plans for the shade sails and arroyo cloud as indicated in stipulations #9.

Mr. Marek said that Mr. Todd announced earlier today that the cloud has been removed from the project to be replaced with some other form of water feature. Mr. Todd also mentioned earlier today that there have been no changes in the sail design as of yet and will be brought back to the Committee for review once they have finished working on it.

Mr. Todd asked if the Committee had intended to make a final approval at today's meeting.

Mr. Marek explained that the Downtown Development Committee asked about the status of the stipulations that were placed on the design review for this project at their last meeting. Staff intended for Jeremy Jones, DWL Architects, to bring any new design changes and present them to the Board today for approval or to just update the Board if no changes had been completed up to this point.

Ms. Osiecki said she was in favor of the color scheme for the Mesa Arts Center and felt that the design committee has diligently encouraged public comment and review. They have gone to great lengths to encourage participation from user groups, the public, and the architects and have responded very quickly to the Committees concerns. She felt that the whole process has been handled very well and felt that all public input has been taken into consideration.

Ms. Newman asked if the color samples could be displayed in a more public place closer to Main Street and Center Street so that more of the public could see them. She didn't feel that the general public was aware that the color samples were on display at the back of the old movie theater. She also felt it would be beneficial to see the colors at a different location in order to see what they would look like, not only in direct sunlight, but also with different shadows being cast on them. She indicated that she wasn't fond of the blue color but liked the other colors and would like to see them displayed from the direction of Main Street. At the very least she felt that this would expose the colors to the general public so they don't come as a shock when the building is built.

Mr. Todd said they plan to display a permanent mock up on the site at the beginning of construction.

Mr. DiBella said he wasn't opposed to the colors however they would not be his first choice either. He felt that the important thing to remember was that the experience of the space and the architecture was to be enjoyed more between the buildings and the lobby spaces on the interior of the facility. He felt there were a lot of positive features within the facility and the controversy of the colors seem to be overshadowing all of the positive things about the building. He felt that the colors are subjective and no matter what is picked, there will always be those who do not agree with the choice.

Mr. Pfannenstiel wanted to reiterate that the colors and design have been displayed to the public on Channel 11 through Citybeat. He felt that one of the most important aspects of the color was understanding its context and that the percentage of color is much smaller than the overall building itself. He pointed out that most of the building is finished in a more neutral palette whether it's the gray of the concrete, the integral color of the masonry (which is more like a buff color), or the metal shingles. He also pointed out that the color is above the parapet of the lobby space therefore, from the pedestrian level a lot of the color will not be visible.

Chair Weir wanted to point out that the Committee is very much in favor of the project and only wants to be sure that the project is appreciated just as much 10 years from now as it is when it's first built.

Mr. Marek wanted to clarify to the Board that they are not required to take any action at today's meeting on any of the items that have been discussed. He said the comprehensive sign plan and the shade sails will be brought back to the Downtown Development Committee for consideration at a future meeting when the design team is more prepared to present them. Since the arroyo cloud has been deleted from the project there is nothing to consider with that. He also mentioned that stipulation #3 was complied with by the project team since the color samples were displayed on the site as requested.

Ms. Carmichael felt that it is not possible to explain the context of the colors to the citizens of Mesa when they are driving by the facility. She also felt that the color samples seem to have been placed in a location where they would be hidden from the general public's view. She pointed out that many citizens do not watch Channel 11 on a regular basis, nor do they generally attend public meetings, and therefore the amount of citizens that have been exposed to the colors is probably very limited. She was under the impression that the color samples were to be placed on the site where they would be visible to the public and not hung behind a building where they are not readily seen.

8. Director's Report -- Greg Marek

Joint DDC & MTCC Meeting – There will be a meeting with representatives from the MTCC Executive Board and representatives from the Downtown Development Committee next Tuesday, May 22nd to talk about different issues and discuss ways to improve communication and interaction between the boards.

Tempe Community Inc. Annual Meeting – The annual meeting will be held on June 5, 2001 at 8:00 a.m. Mr. Marek asked that anyone who wants to attend should notify him in the next couple of days.

Site 21 – Mike Hutchinson held a meeting with various developers to discuss downtown and specifically the Site 21 building. The feedback received from the developers at that meeting was that the building was difficult to develop due to the small floor plates and the low ceiling heights. They also felt that if the City really wants retail on the ground floor, then the City will probably have to subsidize the lease rates on the ground floor in order to obtain financing. The City is still working with BPLW to try and develop the building with the approved design review plans.

Aquatics Center – The General Development Committee will be meeting on May 23rd to discuss a conceptual land use plan for site 17. It is believed that the Aquatics Center will take up about 12 to 13 acres for the facility and for parking. They will also be discussing cost estimates for moving the Aquatics Center to Site 17. If the General Development Committee decides to go forward from that point then the City will start the public process to get comments from the Wilbur Historic District, the Downtown Development Committee, the Parks and Recreation Board, MTCC, and the Visitor Convention Bureau. If this happens then staff will schedule a special Downtown Development Committee meeting in order to comply with City Council's request to make a decision within a 30-day period.

Day Labor Center – The City is moving forward to create a Day Labor Center. The City will be purchasing property on the Broadway corridor between Mesa Drive and Country Club for the location of the Day Labor Center. Since this is within the Redevelopment Area, the Downtown Development Committee will be considering the Council Use Permit for this project sometime around August.

Historic District Signs – The unveiling of the new historic signs, which will be installed in all the residential historic districts, is scheduled to take place on May 22, 2001 at 9:00 a.m. The mayor will be there to do the unveiling and members of the DDC are welcome to attend that event.

Historic Preservation Plan – The City has hired a consultant to work on a citywide Historic Preservation Plan. Staff has conducted several focus group meetings on this topic and the consultant is putting together an action plan and a series of recommendations in order to create a more defined historic preservation program. This plan will be incorporated into the General Plan update and staff will bring this to the Downtown Development Committee for a chance to review and provide comments.

Chair Wier indicated that the Downtown Development Committee requested that the Fire Station 201 was to have a historic design and wanted to know if that is what is being planned by the Fire Department.

Mr. Marek explained that the City Council Fire Committee asked to see the conceptual plans for the Fire Station before it came to the Downtown Development Committee for design review approval. The Redevelopment Office has sent a memo, photographs, and design sketches to the architect and the Fire Department to illustrate what type of building would be representative of the time period of the Wilbur neighborhood. Staff is still waiting to see the revised plans. The

Downtown Development Committee will consider the design review of that building at a future meeting.

Mr. Marek also wanted to mention that the City Council has reappointed Terry Smith, Art Jordan, and Wayne Pomeroy to serve another term on the Downtown Development Committee.

9. Report from Mesa Town Center Cooperation, Tom Verploegen, Executive Director

Mr. Verploegen gave an update on MTCC and touched on the Building Rehabilitation Code, the MTCC website, marketing, and fundraising for permanent sculptures.

10. Board Member Comments

Mr. Jordan felt that some of the comments made in today's meeting may have left some people with an unsettled feeling and felt that the Downtown Development Committee may want to ponder what their role is and how they are to interact with the City Council. He suggested that maybe they have been too casual in their relationship as an advisory body to the City Council and suggested that they come up with ways to increase their role in advising the City Council. He felt if the Board is not comfortable with the role that they play in projects (like the Mesa Arts Center) then he suggested they take a proactive approach in determining what they can do to be a more influential body to the City Council.

Ms. Osiecki pointed out that the Mesa Arts Center project has been unique in the aspect that the City Council appointed a full committee to work on this and the process has also been a unique one. She felt that since this project has been eagerly anticipated it has sparked a higher level of interest and involvement from the City Council. This has resulted in the City Council expressing their opinions before the Downtown Development Committee has had a chance to make a recommendation to City Council. She felt that this was a result of the nature of the project and not because the design committee has tried to exclude the DDC. Ms. Osiecki felt that it might be a good idea to establish the role of the Downtown Development Committee when a project like the Mesa Arts Center first begins.

Mr. Jordan initiated a discussion on the participating role of the Downtown Development Committee versus a decision making role on these kinds of projects and how the Committee feels about those two different roles. The Committee also felt they needed to decide if the Board members should represent their own personal opinion when attending user group meetings or if they should represent the body of the Committee.

Mr. Jordan felt there was a lack of clarification as to the differences in the roles of the Downtown Development Committee versus the roles of the subcommittees of City Council, user groups, and design committees.

Mr. Marek wanted to clarify that the City Council is the property owner on these kinds of projects and typically the architects will meet with the client or property owner (City Council in this case) to determine what they should submit for design review.

Ms. Duvall felt that the Downtown Development Committee was the Planning and Zoning Board for the Redevelopment Area and should determine whether or not the overall appearance and placement of the design of a facility would fit into the surrounding neighborhood. She felt that the issues of parking, landscaping, coloring, orientation, etc. should be considered by the Downtown Development Committee and leave the intricate details of the design to people who have an architectural background. She felt her contribution to this Committee was to give her opinion on how new development will affect the downtown area and how will it be received by the citizens of Mesa. She felt a little taken back by how the process has played out in the decision making for the Mesa Arts Center and was not pleased to find out that many of the Council members had already

expressed their opinions on the colors for the Mesa Arts Center before the DDC had a chance to review them and forward a recommendation to City Council. She agreed that the Downtown Development Committee needed some clarification on its role on these types of projects.

Mr. Marek explained that as part of the design review process, if the Downtown Development Committee had denied approval of Mesa Arts Center plans then the design committee would've had to go through an appeal process to City Council for design approval. As it was, the Downtown Development Committee did approve design review for the building subject to the nine stipulations in which the design committee has followed through with. Mr. Marek explained that because of this process, the Downtown Development Committee's opinions do make a difference and they do have decision making power.

Chair Wier also felt that it was important for the Committee members to visit with City Council members to express their concerns.

11. Adjournment

With there being no further business, this meeting of the DDC was adjourned at 8:42 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

K:\Redev\Ddc\DDC2001\01maymin.doc