

**CITY OF MESA  
MINUTES OF THE DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE  
STUDY SESSION**

**DATE:** June 20, 2002 **TIME:** 7:00 a.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Dave Wier, Chair  
Art Jordan, Vice Chair  
Theresa Carmichael  
Vince DiBella  
Deb Duvall  
Shanlyn Newman  
Wayne Pomeroy

**STAFF PRESENT**

Shelly Allen  
Katrina Bradshaw  
Tony Felice  
Greg Marek  
Amy Morales  
Patrick Murphy  
Bryan Raines

**OTHERS PRESENT**

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Lori Osiecki  
Terry Smith

**1. Call to Order**

The June 20, 2002 study session of the Downtown Development Committee was called to order at 7:03 a.m. in the Gold Room of the lower level City Council Chambers located at 57 E. First Street by Chair Wier.

**2. Discuss items on the agenda for the Regular Meeting.**

**Infill Development**

Mr. Marek said the City Council recently approved new design guidelines for the City. The Downtown Redevelopment Area was exempt from these guidelines because the suburban character of the guidelines would not be conducive to an urban environment. As a result of these new guidelines, the Planning Office has come up with a set of procedures called the SCIP (Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit) and DIP (Development Incentive Permits) to address those infill properties which would become legal non-conforming. The Planning Department agreed that the Downtown Redevelopment Area should be exempt from these new procedures since the Redevelopment Office already has their own process to address legal nonconforming properties. In addition, since the Redevelopment Area was excluded from the new design guidelines, it makes sense to exclude them from these new procedures. Consequently, the "Infill Property" Ordinance was written to exclude the Redevelopment Area.

Mr. Marek explained that the reason this issue is being brought to the Downtown Development Committee is because a few of the Planning and Zoning Board members disagree that the Redevelopment Area should be exempt from the SCIP and DIP process. The Redevelopment Office has been working on its own set of design guidelines for the Redevelopment Area and feels that the SCIP and DIP process will become very cumbersome for the

applicants. In addition, it would exclude the Downtown Development Committee from reviewing projects that require variances in the downtown area. Mr. Marek said the Mesa Town Center Corporation supports the Ordinance as it is written which exempts the Redevelopment Area from the SCIP and DIP. Mr. Marek said he plans to attend the Planning and Zoning Board meeting later that afternoon to voice the opinions of the Mesa Town Center Board and the Downtown Development Committee.

Mr. Pomeroy agreed that if the Redevelopment Area was included in the Ordinance that it would hinder the goals and purposes of the Downtown Development Committee.

Mr. DiBella felt that the Planning and Zoning Board may have a lack of understanding of the current process followed in the Redevelopment Area. He pointed out that many of the variance cases reviewed by the Downtown Development Committee are also part of a design review case and should be handled one in the same rather than split up and reviewed by two different boards.

Mr. Jordan asked who makes the final decision if there continues to be opposition on this issue.

Mr. Marek said the City Council will make the final decision; therefore it is important they understand the current process and hear the recommendations made by the Downtown Development Committee and Mesa Town Center Corporation.

### **RFQ Submittals for Site 21**

Mr. Marek said the Redevelopment Office received seven submittals for the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for the former Bank One building (Site 21). He explained that the purpose of the RFQ is to determine if there are qualified developers who can undertake the project. This includes reviewing their experience and financial capability to fund the project. An internal team has reviewed the submittals and has deemed four of the submittals to be worthy of more serious consideration for the project. On July 25<sup>th</sup> City Council will consider the RFP for Site 21 and provide direction to staff to issue the Request for Proposals. Mr. Marek said the RFP has not changed from the previous one except to eliminate the requirement for retail on the ground floor. Instead, it will only be strongly encouraged.

Mr. Marek asked if the Board would like to hold a special meeting within the next couple of weeks to discuss the RFQ submittals that were received or wait until the RFP is issued to discuss the more detailed proposals, which would include more information about the proposed projects. Mr. Marek briefly discussed each RFQ submittal.

Mr. DiBella asked if the purpose of the RFQ was to determine what kind of interest the development community had in this building or if it was to determine who should be issued an RFP.

Mr. Marek explained that once the City publicly issues an RFP anyone can submit a proposal, even if they did not provide a submittal to the RFQ. However, the RFQ did help to determine if there would be enough interest from developers and if they would have the experience and financial capability to do their project. He added that the advertisement of the RFP will not be as widespread as it was in the past and will be more specific about the conditions of the building.

Chair Wier asked if the City is still planning to make the parking lot improvements behind the Bank One building.

Mr. Marek said the project is still in the five-year Capital Improvement Program but got pushed back a few years due to budget cuts.

Mr. Jordan asked if the RFP will require the submitter to provide more information about their financing.

Mr. Marek said it would require the submitter to provide more proof of their ability to finance the project. He added that Hunter Interests, Inc. will be presenting their final report to the City Council on July 25<sup>th</sup>, the same meeting as the RFP for Site 21, which will allow the Council members to ask them questions about the RFP and hear their recommendations regarding Site 21.

Mr. Jordan said he would be interested in seeing a master schedule for this project starting from the issuance of the RFP until the time that the building is complete. He added that he would be interested in seeing the milestones that must be undertaken to accomplish this project and work towards a time frame that is the least time-consuming.

Mr. Marked pointed out that the quickest way to accomplish this project is for the developer to use the approved design review plans. He said some of the submitters to the RFQ indicated that they would use them and some wanted to create their own. This may become one of the deciding factors when ranking the submittals to the Request for Proposals.

Mr. Jordan said he would be interested in holding a special meeting before July 25<sup>th</sup> when the RFP is reviewed by City Council. He felt it was important to take an active role at the beginning of the project rather than wait to discuss and consider items as they happen.

The DDC discussed possible dates for the special meeting.

### **3. Update on applications and projects**

**Four Wheel Parts** – The City Council reviewed the appeal to the Zoning Administrator's decision regarding the Comprehensive Sign Plan on May 20, 2002. They approved the retention of the freestanding sign for two years after which time it will need to be removed.

**Brown and Brown Comprehensive Sign Plan** – The City Council will consider the appeal to the Comprehensive Sign Plan on July 18<sup>th</sup>.

**4. Director's Report, Greg Marek**

None

**5. Board Member Comments**

None

**6. Adjournment**

With there being no further business, this meeting of the DDC was adjourned at 7:29 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

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