

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

**DATE:** July 17, 2003 **TIME:** 7:30 a.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Art Jordan, Chair  
Christine Close  
Theresa Carmichael  
Jeff Jarvis  
Marshall Poe  
Mark Reeb  
Terry Smith

**STAFF PRESENT**

Shelly Allen  
Katrina Bradshaw  
Greg Marek  
Bryan Raines

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Wayne Pomeroy  
Chuck Riekema, Vice-Chair

**1. Call to Order**

The July 17, 2003 meeting of the Downtown Development Committee was called to order at 7:33 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 June 19, 2003 Study Session**

It was moved by Mark Reeb, seconded by Theresa Carmichael, to approve the minutes.

Vote: 7 in favor; 0 opposed

**Approval of Minutes of June 19, 2003 Regular Meeting**

It was moved by Mark Reeb, seconded by Marshall Poe to approve the minutes.

Vote: 7 in favor; 0 opposed

4. **Presentation of awards for departing Board members Dave Wier and Vince DiBella.**

Mr. Marek presented the awards to Dave Wier and Vince DiBella.

Due to scheduling issues, Chair Jordan announced that some agenda items would be taken out of order.

5. **Discuss and consider Rezoning Case No. CZ03-003TC from TCR-2 to TCB-2 for Assessor Parcel numbers: 138-48-008, 138-48-009, 138-48-010A, and 138-48-010B, generally located at the southeast corner of SIRRINE Street and 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue.**  
(Item number 7 on the agenda).

Ms. Allen explained that the applicant was able to acquire several residential properties on the southeast corner of SIRRINE and 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue which they plan to rehabilitate and lease.

Ms. Allen provided a site plan showing the location of the properties and specifically those four parcels which are proposed for rezoning. She explained that the applicant would like to use one of the homes for his business office and the remaining three vacant parcels will be sold to the adjacent property owner to use for storage. Ms. Allen explained that the office and storage uses will provide a buffer between the residential homes and the industrial uses to the south and east of these properties.

Ms. Allen stated that the proposed zone change is consistent with the surrounding properties. She explained that there is one lot directly east of this site that is still zoned TCR-2. The property is owned by Pearce and Sons Distributing Company and is used by Quality Vans and Accessories. The use is legal non-conforming and staff has made several attempts to reach the owner to see if he wants to include his parcel in this rezoning request in order to make the zoning compatible to the use. Unfortunately staff has been unsuccessful in trying to reach the owner but will continue to try and get a hold of him.

Ms. Allen stated that this rezoning request is compatible to the Town Center Concept Plan, is compatible to the surrounding area, and complies with the Historic Preservation Plan, which is to provide infill property and rehabilitation of existing structures. Ms. Allen said only one neighboring resident attended the public neighborhood meeting and he was in support of the project.

Mr. Reeb pointed out that the rezoning of these four parcels to TCB-2 will allow them to have outdoor storage and asked if parcel number 138-48-008, which is intended to be used for the business office of the applicant, will have outdoor storage on the lot. If not, Mr. Reeb asked if the applicant would be willing to agree to a stipulation that no outdoor storage be allowed on that lot.

Rob McCabe, applicant and property owner, stated that he does not intend to use that parcel for storage and agreed to the stipulation.

**It was moved by Theresa Carmichael, seconded by Marshall Poe, to approve Rezoning Case No. CZ03-003TC from TCR-2 to TCB-2 for Assessor Parcel numbers: 138-48-008, 138-48-009, 138-48-010A, and 138-48-010B, generally located at the southeast corner of Sirrine Street and 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue subject to the following stipulations:**

1. Compliance with the site plan submitted dated June 27, 2003.
2. The height of the storage materials shall not exceed the height of the fence.
3. Design Review approval by the Downtown Development Committee of future development plans.
4. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
5. No outdoor storage on parcel number 138-48-008 (including construction equipment).

**Vote: 7 in favor; 0 opposed**

6. **Discuss and consider Rezoning Case No. CZ03-005TC for Assessor Parcel numbers: 135-60-049, 135-60-048, 135-60-068, 135-60-069, 135-60-070, and 135-60-071 from R1-6 to TCB-1, and Parcel numbers: 135-60-114 and 135-60-118 from TCR-1 to TCB-1, as required by the approved Disposition and Development Agreement associated with Redevelopment Project Site 24, located at the northwest corner of Country Club and Main Street.**  
**(Item number 8 on the agenda).**

Ms. Allen explained that this rezoning request was initiated by the City of Mesa to rezone eight parcels from R-1-6 and TCR-1 to TCB-1. The rezoning is required as part of the Disposition and Development Agreement for Site 24 that was approved by City Council in 2001. Ms. Allen explained that the City is obligated to provide the adequate zoning for the construction of this project based on the Redevelopment Agreement.

Ms. Allen talked about the surrounding zoning and land uses and said the rezoning is consistent with the Town Center Concept Plan.

Ms. Allen explained that on June 2, 2003 the City Council approved an amended and restated Disposition and Development Agreement that would allow Mesa Discount to get started on the first phase of their project, which includes the warehouse/office/retail building adjacent to their existing building. Ms. Allen clarified that the building will overlap the existing residentially zoned properties, which are now being considered for rezoning.

Ms. Allen explained that Mesa Discount has agreed to build a screen wall and landscaping buffer along their portion of the property during phase one of their project to shield the neighborhood from the vacant lot and the construction process.

Ms. Allen said a neighborhood meeting was held in conjunction with this rezoning request and the three people who showed up to the meeting were in

support of the project and excited to see it move forward. Ms. Allen explained that some of the neighbors have previously voiced opposition to the design of the project which has already been approved by City Council in 2002. Staff is continuing to work with those neighbors on the wall, trash enclosure, etc. Mesa Discount has also made some concessions to help alleviate concerns from the neighbors by restricting the use of the dumpster to recyclables and by planting larger trees in front of the roll-up doors.

Ms. Allen stated that staff is in support of this rezoning, subject to the stipulations in the staff report, because it does not create a detrimental impact to the surrounding area and is consistent with the Redevelopment Plan and Town Center Concept Plan.

Ms. Smith asked how much of the wall is Mesa Discount willing to construct during phase one of the project.

Ms. Allen said staff is still negotiating with Mesa Discount to determine that. She said they will definitely build the wall along the entire length of their property which reaches about half way, just past the residential lots. There are still discussions taking place on whether or not the wall will be constructed beyond Mesa Discount's property line during phase one of the project. Ms. Allen explained that the other half of the site still belongs to the City of Mesa and will eventually be bought by Lenhart's Ace Hardware.

Chair Jordan asked for clarification if Mesa Discount intends to maintain any occupancy in their existing building after the new building is built.

Ms. Allen said they plan to continue to operate their current business in their existing building and move their offsite warehousing to the new building. They also plan to expand their retail business into the new building as well. The rest of the new construction will be leased to outside tenants.

Chair Jordan asked if they own the building that they currently occupy.

Ms. Allen said they own the entire retail center that they currently occupy.

Chair Jordan asked if they anticipate knocking a whole through the wall and connecting the two spaces.

Ms. Allen said they do not plan to adjoin the two buildings due to building code issues.

Ms. Close asked if the approval of this rezoning request will impact the construction on the lots that are currently zoned residential.

Ms. Allen said it would impact the construction because commercial zoning is required in order to build the project. Ms. Allen reiterated that the rezoning of this site was included in the Disposition and Development Agreement that was

approved by City Council which stated that the City would provide adequate zoning for them to build the project.

Ms. Close asked if the wall will be constructed in phases.

Ms. Allen said that it is still under discussions to determine who will fund the construction of the wall if it is to extend the entire length of the site during phase one of the project. Ms. Allen explained that everyone prefers to have it extend the entire length of the site but the issues revolve around the ownership of the land.

Ms. Close expressed her desire that it be constructed along the entire site as soon as construction begins.

Ms. Smith asked if the approval of the rezoning could be contingent upon the requirement that the wall be constructed along the entire length of the project during phase one. She pointed out that it is undetermined when phase two will be ready to commence and it is possible that the neighbors will be waiting a long time before the second half of that wall is finally built.

Ms. Carmichael said she didn't think the Board could require Mesa Discount to construct the wall on property that they do not own.

Mr. Marek said there are two separate Redevelopment Agreements for this project and the City cannot require that one property owner make improvements on another property owner's land. He explained that the second half of the wall is part of Lenhart's agreement, not Mesa Discount's. Mr. Marek added that the design of the project is not considered part of the rezoning case so it is difficult to enforce stipulations related to design.

Ms. Carmichael asked if the City owns all of the property.

Mr. Marek said Mesa Discount has purchased their portion of the land that is part of this rezoning request, but the eastern portion of the site is still owned by the City of Mesa and will be sold to Lenhart's Ace Hardware at some point in the future.

Ms. Carmichael asked how much room there is for discussion on this rezoning case if City Council has already promised the zone change in the Redevelopment Agreement.

Mr. Marek said if the City Council does not approve the rezoning, the City will be in breach of the Redevelopment Agreement.

Ms. Smith clarified that her comments did not indicate that the Committee not approve the rezoning, but that the wall be completed across the length of the project for the benefit of the neighborhood.

Chair Jordan suggested that maybe the City could fund the completion of the wall and be credited back the expense when Lenhart's purchases the land.

Ms. Allen said that option has already been considered and will continue to be looked at.

Ms. Carmichael said she could not support a stipulation which would require Mesa Discount to build the wall beyond their property line.

Mr. Jordan suggested that the stipulation merely be a recommendation that the City do what they can to work out a solution on the construction of the wall.

Mr. Poe agreed that a recommendation could be attached but expressed concern with the City's ability to provide funding for the wall considering the current budget conditions.

Mr. Jarvis pointed out that not only would the City need to find funding for the wall but also the landscaping as well.

Mr. Poe pointed out that some of the adjacent property owners have also asked that the height of the wall be increased.

Mr. Marek said that the approved site plan shows the wall to be eight feet in height. He pointed out that anything higher than that will look too overbearing.

Ms. Allen added that there will be 23 feet of landscaping on the neighbors' side of the wall and another three or four feet of landscaping on the interior of the wall adjacent to the parking lot.

The Board asked some questions about the phasing of the project. Mr. Marek reiterated that the first portion of the wall is scheduled to be completed before construction of phase one begins.

Ms. Carmichael said she did not think adding a stipulation about the wall was feasible due to the issues of property ownership and therefore encouraged staff to continue to work with the neighbors. She also said she was confident that Mr. Lenhart would do whatever he could to be a good neighbor.

**It was moved by Theresa Carmichael, seconded by Marshal Poe, to approve rezoning Case No. CZ03-005TC for Assessor Parcel numbers: 135-60-049, 135-60-048, 135-60-068, 135-60-069, 135-60-070, and 135-60-071 from R1-6 to TCB-1, and Parcel numbers: 135-60-114 and 135-60-118 from TCR-1 to TCB-1, as required by the approved Disposition and Development Agreement associated with Redevelopment Project Site 24, located at the northwest corner of Country Club and Main Street subject to the following stipulation:**

- 1. Compliance with the site plan submitted, dated September 24, 2001 and the design review approval stipulations, dated October 18, 2001.**

Mr. Reeb declared a conflict of interest and abstained from voting on this case.

**Vote: 6 in favor;  
0 opposed  
1 abstained (Mark Reeb)**

7. **Discuss and consider Rezoning Case No. CZ03-006TC from R-2 to C-2 for the property located at 506 N. Center Street.**  
(Item number 9 on the agenda).

Ms. Allen explained that this property was purchased by the City in February 1987 for a Habitat for Humanities project. The project never came to fruition. The property was identified in the Real Estate Services reports as excess property and staff was directed by City Council to sell the property. The property was purchased by William Barnhart, who originally submitted a proposal to rehabilitate the City-owned property at 146 W. Main Street.

Ms. Allen explained that the property owner intends to use the same design that he submitted with the proposal for 146 W. Main Street. She added that the design of the project will be brought back to the Downtown Development Committee at a later time for review.

Ms. Allen talked about the surrounding zoning and land uses adjacent to this site. She explained that the property owner intends to build an art studio. The front of the studio will have an office and the back of the building will be the workspace. A sculpture garden will be located on the side of the building, which will buffer the residential property from the commercial property. Ms. Allen reiterated that those items can be discussed and considered when the project is considered for design review approval.

Ms. Allen stated that the rezoning is compatible to the Town Center Concept Plan and implements the encouragement for arts related uses along Center Street and Main Street.

Ms. Allen stated that no one attended the neighborhood meeting that was held on July 9, 2003.

Ms. Allen said staff feels this rezoning will create a buffer between the residential properties to the north and the auto repair shop to the south. Staff recommends approval of the rezoning subject to the stipulations listed in the staff report.

Mr. Poe asked what is currently on this piece of property.

Ms. Allen said it is a vacant lot. There may have been a residential home on the site at some point but the City probably demolished the home after it was purchased.

Mr. Reeb asked if the City is the owner of the property.

Ms. Allen said the City sold the property to Mr. Barnhart which was finalized last week.

Mr. Reeb asked where the Redevelopment Area boundaries fall and why this rezoning is not a Town Center zoning district.

Ms. Allen said the Town Center zoning districts only extend about 300 feet outside of the original Town Center square mile. The Redevelopment Area has been expanded beyond the square mile and includes the City standard commercial and residential zoning districts.

Mr. Marek added that the Town Center zoning districts were specifically designed for the downtown area and the Redevelopment Area goes beyond downtown; therefore citywide zoning districts are more appropriate for this area.

**It was moved by Terry Smith, seconded by Marshall Poe, to recommend approval of rezoning Case No. CZ03-006TC from R-2 to C-2 for the property located at 506 N. Center Street subject to the following stipulations:**

- 1. Compliance with the site plan submitted dated June 27, 2003.**
- 2. Design Review approval by the Downtown Development Committee of future development plans.**
- 3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.**

**Vote: 7 in favor;  
0 opposed**

- 8. Discuss and consider Rezoning Case No. CZ03-004TC from C-2 to TCB-1 for Assessor Parcel number 137-26-043G, located at 450 N. Center Street.**  
(Item number 5 on the agenda).

Ms. Bradshaw explained that the property owner has merged two smaller parcels into one in order to make it easier to develop into a commercial property. The original two parcels were zoned C-2 and TCB-1 so the result of the merging has created dual zoning for the new parcel.

Ms. Bradshaw said the property owner has not provided development plans in conjunction with this rezoning request because they intend to sell the property to a commercial developer. She added that even though dual zoning is permissible, the property owner wishes to establish a single zoning at this property for the following reasons:

1. It will be easier to sell the property to a potential buyer with only one zoning district listed.
2. It will alleviate time constraints to the buyer if the rezoning is already complete.
3. It will provide obvious consistency and uniformity for the lot.

4. It's easier to process development plans.

Ms. Bradshaw explained that the property will be required to comply with the Zoning Ordinance when it is planned for development and that will include approval of the development plans by the Downtown Development Committee.

Ms. Bradshaw said the Town Center Concept Plan calls for single-family residential with an office overlay for this property. It is for this reason that the TCB-1 zoning district is preferred for this site because it allows single-family housing and limits commercial uses, whereas the C-2 zoning district does not.

Ms. Bradshaw said a public meeting was held on July 9, 2003 but no one showed up to the meeting. Neither staff nor the applicant have received any phone calls in support or opposition to the project.

Ms. Bradshaw said staff is in support of this rezoning because it is compatible to the Town Center Concept Plan and to the surrounding area.

Ms. Carmichael asked if the Downtown Development Committee has reviewed any projects at this property in the past.

Mr. Murphy stated there was another applicant proposing a studio apartment complex at this site but the project never came to fruition.

Ms. Smith asked what the City's vision is for Center Street north of University Drive.

Mr. Marek said the Town Center Concept Plan calls for a mix of residential and commercial uses. Development should be along a residential scale but will allow for some commercial uses such as office and artist studios. Mr. Marek added that the developer of this property will be required to come to the Downtown Development Committee for Design Review approval and the Committee will be able to ensure that the project is consistent with the Town Center Concept Plan.

**It was moved by Terry Smith, seconded by Marshall Poe, to recommend approval of Rezoning Case No. CZ03-004TC from C-2 to TCB-1 for Assessor Parcel number 137-26-043G, located at 450 N. Center Street.**

**Vote: 7 in favor;  
0 opposed**

9. **Discuss and consider Special Use Permit and Variance Case No. ZA03-052TC to allow general auto repair in the TCB-2 zoning district, to reduce the parking requirements from 26 to 16 spaces, and to modify the Design Guidelines in Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance for the property located at 134 E. Broadway Road.**

(Item number 6 on the agenda).

Ms. Bradshaw stated that the applicant is requesting approval of a special use permit to allow general auto repair in the TCB-2 zoning district and a variance to reduce the required number of parking spaces from 26 to 16 spaces. The Downtown Development Committee is also being asked to modify the Site Development Standards in the Zoning Ordinance to reduce interior parking and building foundation landscaping at this commercial property.

Ms. Bradshaw said that staff is working on new design guidelines specific to the downtown area but, in the meantime, the Downtown Development Committee has the ability to modify Site Development Standards in the Redevelopment Area on a case-by-case basis.

Ms. Bradshaw said this project is the adaptive reuse of an existing building previously used as a carpet warehouse facility. The building is very conducive to an auto repair business with a front office and customer waiting area as well as five service bay doors.

Ms. Bradshaw explained that the change of use from warehouse to general auto repair requires that the applicant bring the property into zoning conformity and this includes compliance with the Design Standards in Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Bradshaw stated that Chapter 15 requires the applicant to provide one parking lot landscape island and a 15-foot wide landscaping strip around the foundation of the building. Staff feels that it is more important to retain the existing parking spaces rather than eliminate parking for additional landscaping. In addition, Ms. Bradshaw said the existing layout and small lot size does not make additional landscaping feasible. As a result, staff recommends that the Downtown Development Committee approve the request to eliminate the landscaping requirements by modifying the Site Development Standards in Chapter 15 for this project.

Ms. Bradshaw said staff also recommends approval of the variance to reduce the parking spaces from 26 to 16 for the following reasons:

1. There are at least 6 additional spaces on the north side of the building, in the City of Mesa right-of-way, which can be used for employee parking.
2. The service bays can accommodate at least 10 vehicles, which will free up space in the parking lot.
3. The existing site does not allow for expansion of additional parking, nor can the parking be re-stripped for more efficient use.

Ms. Bradshaw said the property owners and tenants within 300 feet of the site were notified by mail of the project, and to date, staff has not received any feedback from the neighbors. Staff recommends that the Downtown Development Committee approve Case No. ZA03-052TC subject to the following stipulation:

1. Pave the parking area on the north side of the property in the City of Mesa right-of-way as per City of Mesa standards in order for it to be used for overflow parking.

Mr. Marek added that the front of the property is currently landscaped so, even though the Committee is being asked to eliminate some of the landscape requirements, there is a nicely landscaped frontage to the property.

Chair Jordan asked if the building on the adjacent property to the west is connected to the building on this site.

Ms. Bradshaw said the walls are connected but have separate ownerships and are located on two separate parcels.

Mr. Nick Miner, representative of the seller at 134 E. Broadway, said the adjacent building to the west is owned by Don Wisdom who operates a Canon Copier Center. The property was constructed with a zero lot line and the buildings on each parcel share a common wall.

Chair Jordan asked what the quality of the landscaping is on the adjacent parcel.

Mr. Miner said the adjacent parcel has similar landscaping and each parcel has its own irrigation system.

Chair Jordan asked if the gate closes to the parking lot at night and if it has any screening material in it or if it was an open picket.

Mr. Miner said the gate is a rolling rod iron gate and is kept closed at night. He added that it does not contain any screening material and therefore passersby will be able to see into the property.

Ms. Smith asked for clarification of what the picture shows on screen.

Ms. Bradshaw pointed out the portion of the site that is adjacent to this property, which does not contain any landscaping. She added that the east side, which contains the lush landscaping, is the property that is being reviewed for the variance and special use permit.

Ms. Smith asked if the applicant would be willing to provide some landscaping by the front door (on the east façade).

Mr. Miner said the area by the front door is completely concrete.

Chair Jordan explained that it is possible to saw-cut a 5x5 foot diamond and plant a tree that could thrive under the appropriate soil preparation. Chair Jordan also suggested that planters could be provided as long as there was appropriate irrigation.

Gene Neal, applicant for 134 E. Broadway, said he was not opposed to doing planters but would prefer not to block the natural sunlight from coming into the windows of the waiting area and office.

Mr. Reeb said landscaping is always important and softens the building, however, he suggested screening the gate with some kind of opaque backing to hide anything unsightly, such as vehicles and storage, from the street. He added that since the gates are only closed at night, then the planters would be good to help beautify the entrance during daytime business hours.

Mr. Poe asked what kind of landscaping exists in the surrounding area and also asked if the neighbor has landscaping at his front door.

Ms. Bradshaw said the surrounding properties do not have the degree of landscaping that this property has.

Mr. Miner added that the neighbor on the adjacent property does not have any landscaping at his front door.

Ms. Smith commended the applicant and property owner for the attractiveness of their property and said she was only interested in finding out how the applicant would feel about adding a little greenery around the front door for additional beautification of the property. She said, as she understood it, the applicant has agreed to that.

Mr. Jarvis asked if there is a landscape requirement on 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue.

Ms. Bradshaw said it is not required in the TCB-2 zoning district.

Mr. Jarvis said he would be more interested in seeing landscaping along the street frontage. He added that he would like to see the back gate be more solid for security purposes.

Mr. Marek clarified that 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave. is City of Mesa right-of-way but is not frequently utilized by vehicular traffic because of the railroad spur.

Chair Jordan asked what criteria is used to require 26 spaces when the business only feels they need 16.

Ms. Bradshaw said the Zoning Ordinance requires one parking space for every 375 square feet of gross floor area and, based on the size of the building, requires a total of 26 spaces. Ms. Bradshaw stated that there is not enough room on the property to provide for the required parking, however, there is overflow parking available along 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, and it is the opinion of the applicant that it will be sufficient to provide for the needs of the business.

Chair Jordan asked if the applicant ever foresees a situation where they may max their parking lot and need additional space.

Mr. Neal said he could only hope the business would be that busy, but did not foresee the need for 26 spaces.

Mr. Marek said staff is supportive of the variance because the cumulative total of spaces in the service bays, overflow parking in the back, and the existing parking lot actually exceeds the number of spaces required.

Chair Jordan asked who owns the property where the overflow parking is located.

Ms. Bradshaw said it is owned by the City of Mesa and the applicant has agreed to replace the gravel with pavement for the purpose of using it for overflow parking.

Mr. Marek explained that using City of Mesa right-of-way for parking is common in the downtown area. Mr. Marek said the applicant does not have a problem complying with the stipulation.

Mr. Poe pointed out that the parking spaces at the back of the property will likely only be utilized during business hours. He asked how much of the entire 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue right-of-way is currently graveled.

Mr. Miner said, as far as he knows, the only portion that is gravel is the two properties at this site and about 20 feet by the lumberyard.

Mr. Poe said his concern with requiring the applicant to pave the right-of-way behind his property is that other businesses may decide to utilize that space for their parking and the applicant will have no way to enforce the parking.

**It was moved by Art Jordan, seconded by Marshall Poe, to approve Special Use Permit and Variance Case No. ZA03-052TC to allow general auto repair in the TCB-2 zoning district, to reduce the parking requirements from 26 to 16 spaces, and to modify the Design Guidelines in Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance for the property located at 134 E. Broadway Road subject to the following stipulations:**

- 1. Pave the parking area on the north side of the property in the City of Mesa right-of-way as per City of Mesa standards in order for it to be used for overflow parking.**
- 2. Provide some decorative planters near the front door in an attempt to beautify the area.**
- 3. Provide some sort of decorative material on the front gate to partially screen visibility from Broadway Road.**

Rick Coggins, adjacent property owner, said he was involved early on in the development of the subject property and is familiar with the background of the site. Mr. Coggins said he is concerned about the stipulation in relation to the screening of the rolling doors. He said there are security issues with homeless people coming into the properties after hours for shelter, water, etc. Mr. Coggins said he has considered removing some of the screening from his property to detract the homeless from seeking shelter and privacy on his property. Mr. Coggins said he could understand the Committee's desires to

beautify the area but in this case he felt it was more important to secure the property by allowing the police the ability to shine lights into the property at night to detract the amount of homelessness and theft going on in the area.

As a neighbor, Mr. Coggins said he was in favor of the project and felt it was a good use of the property. Furthermore, he said the site was originally intended to become an auto repair shop and was designed for that purpose. Mr. Coggins added that 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue is really tantamount to an alley, exists for the purpose of a railroad/City right-of-way, and is not a through street. He further explained that there is a great deal of unpaved area along 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue which other businesses use daily for parking.

Mr. Poe asked Mr. Coggins to point out the paved area on the aerial map for the Committee.

Mr. Coggins pointed to the paved areas on the aerial map and where parking typically occurs during the day.

Chair Jordan asked if there is a vision for this area, if the City wants to continue to treat this area as an alley, or if there are other long-term goals for this area.

Mr. Marek said the Town Center Concept Plan shows this area for business park, industrial, and heavier commercial uses. He added that, until the railroad spur is abandoned, which the City has no idea when that would take place, it will be difficult to plan anything along the 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue alignment. As a result, there are no long term plans to make 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue a through street as long as the railroad spur exists. Mr. Marek said once the railroad spur is abandoned, the hope is that a developer would assemble those properties and do some kind of redevelopment project that would incorporate some type of business park or employment center.

Chair Jordan amended his motion as follows:

**It was moved by Art Jordan, seconded by Marshall Poe, to approve Special Use Permit and Variance Case No. ZA03-052TC to allow general auto repair in the TCB-2 zoning district, to reduce the parking requirements from 26 to 16 spaces, and to modify the Design Guidelines in Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance for the property located at 134 E. Broadway Road subject to the following stipulations:**

- 1. Pave the parking are on the north side of the property in the City of Mesa right-of-way as per City of Mesa standards in order for it to be used for overflow parking.**
- 2. Provide some decorative planters near the front door in an attempt to beautify the area.**
- 3. Work with staff on solution for the front rolling gates, balancing the aesthetics with security, to partially screen visibility from Broadway Road while still maintaining security at the site.**

Mr. Marek said staff will work with CPTED who will consider the design issues and make a recommendation on the best way to provide security while considering the aesthetics.

Mr. Reeb said he would support the motion but added that since the City of Mesa is requiring the applicant to pave the right-of-way for parking, that the applicant be allowed to post signage which dedicates the parking to his business so that neighboring businesses do not try to use it for their parking.

Mr. Marek said staff has already spoken to the City Attorney's office concerning other public right-of-way areas in the City and have been told that the public right-of-way cannot be dedicated or reserved for a particular property owner.

Mr. Poe said he has the same concerns about requiring the right-of-way to be paved as Mr. Reeb has suggested. He felt that since there was already a large portion of 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue unpaved, that there was no value added by requiring the property owner to comply with that unless they have a real desire to do so.

Chair Jordan asked if the applicant needs that area for overflow parking.

Mr. Neal said they intend to use it for employee parking when needed. Mr. Neal said the 16 spaces that are already provided will probably be adequate for the business.

Chair Jordan asked if the stipulation was placed in order to address dust control.

Mr. Marek said that was staff's primary reason for placing the stipulation. Mr. Marek said the Committee can remove the stipulation if they do not agree with it.

Mr. Poe suggested that the Committee exchange the requirement to pave the back of the building, with asking them to use that money to beautify the front of the property along Broadway Road.

Chair Jordan agreed with Mr. Poe's comment. He added that the landscaping is nicely done but suggested that the applicant work with staff to ensure that it is meeting current City landscape guidelines which might mean adding some additional trees, shrubs, etc.

Chair Jordan again amended his motion to include the following:

**It was moved by Art Jordan, seconded by Marshall Poe, to approve Special Use Permit and Variance Case No. ZA03-052TC to allow general auto repair in the TCB-2 zoning district, to reduce the parking requirements from 26 to 16 spaces, and to modify the Design Guidelines in Chapter 15 of the Zoning Ordinance for the property located at 134 E. Broadway Road subject to the following stipulations:**

- 1. Provide some decorative planters near the front door and make attempts to beautify the front area.**

**2. Work with staff on solution for the front rolling gates, balancing the aesthetics with security, to partially screen visibility from Broadway Road while still maintaining security at the site.**

Mr. Jarvis asked if the Committee needs to vote on the first motion before considering this one.

Mr. Marek said Chair Jordan can amend the motion as long as the person who seconded agrees to the amendment.

Mr. Poe agreed with the amendment.

**Vote: 7 in favor;  
0 opposed**

Ms. Carmichael asked why the adjacent property owner does not have any landscaping and asked if the City can require that it be landscaped through some kind of code enforcement.

Mr. Marek said its possible the original landscaping died and was never replaced but staff will see if there were any approved plans and see if any code enforcement action is necessary.

**10. Discuss and consider Case No. DR00-011TC regarding the cornice detail for the One Macdonald Center Building (Site 21), located at 1 N. Macdonald Street.**

Mr. Murphy said on May 15, 2003 the Downtown Development Committee approved the development plans for the building subject to eight stipulations. One of the stipulations was that the cornice detail be brought back to the Downtown Development Committee for review and approval.

Mr. Murphy displayed a rendering of the One Macdonald Center and the detail of the cornice. Mr. Murphy talked about the materials and color of the cornice and circulated the sample color and materials board. Mr. Murphy stated that Gene Valentine, architect with BPLW, is in attendance at the meeting to answer questions from the Board.

Mr. Murphy said staff is requesting approval of the final detail of the cornice, after which BPLW will be able to finalize their construction plans. Mr. Murphy added that, according to the Disposition and Development Agreement, the construction plans are due on August 13, 2003.

Chair Jordan asked about the details of the parapet.

Mr. Valentine said that information was provided in an earlier packet and was already approved by the Downtown Development Committee. He said it was his understanding that the only thing left to consider by the Committee was the detail of the cornice. Mr. Valentine explained that he had not pinpointed the exact

materials that would be used for the cornice at the last meeting and the Committee placed a stipulation upon the approval of the design review that the cornice material would be brought back to the Committee for consideration. Mr. Valentine went ahead and discussed the materials and details of the cornice.

Chair Jordan asked about the dimensions of the cornice.

Mr. Valentine displayed drawings and answered questions about the measurements.

Mr. Reeb asked Mr. Valentine to comment on the texture of the synthetic stucco. He asked if it was a smooth surface.

Mr. Valentine said the texture will be a little heavier than a sand finish in order to help mask some of the imperfections.

Mr. Reeb asked if the color will match the panel color below the window.

Mr. Valentine said it would and explained that they want to keep the color palette simple so that it does not look too busy.

Mr. Reeb asked how the detail of the twisted rope pattern will be accentuated.

Mr. Valentine said it will be rounded.

**It was moved by Marshall Poe, seconded by Mark Reeb, to approve Case No. DR00-011TC regarding the cornice detail for the One Macdonald Center Building (Site 21), located at 1 N. Macdonald Street.**

**Vote: 7 in favor;  
0 opposed**

**11. Discuss and consider Special Use Permit Case No. ZA02-007TC for a Comprehensive Sign Plan to allow the permanent use of the forty-five foot (45') high freestanding sign currently located at Brown & Brown Chevrolet, 145 East Main Street.**

Mr. Murphy explained that this case was originally brought before the Committee in 2002 to consider a revised Comprehensive Sign Plan for Brown and Brown Chevrolet to allow some new wall-mounted signs on the parking structure, eliminate some existing signs, and to retain the existing 45-foot-high freestanding sign.

Chair Jordan asked if staff has reviewed the staff report with the applicant and discussed the recommendation.

Mr. Murphy explained that staff has worked closely with Brown and Brown over the past year and has had many discussions with them on this issue. Mr. Murphy also explained that staff has provided several different alternatives for

Brown and Brown to consider for their sign package and the City has even provided drawings of these alternatives to them. Mr. Murphy said Brown and Brown was not in favor of the alternatives and felt that the freestanding sign should remain because it provides visibility to their customers, has been part of the property for many years, and because Henry Brown did not know about the streetscape improvements when he agreed to remove the freestanding sign.

Chair Jordan asked the applicant to come forward to provide a presentation before the Committee once the staff report is complete.

Mr. Murphy provided some additional history behind the Comprehensive Sign Plan. He said staff feels that the 45-foot-high sign should be replaced with monument signs that are more compatible with the pedestrian environment and recommends denial of this case. Mr. Murphy also said staff recommends that, if the Committee decides to approve this case, that there be a 5 year time limit when the sign should come back to the Committee after the trees have had more time to mature.

Mr. Marek explained that it was the Downtown Development Committee's stipulation, placed upon the approval of the Comprehensive Sign Plan one year ago, that required Brown and Brown Chevrolet to come back for reconsideration of the 45-foot-high sign after the trees had time to mature.

Chair Jordan felt there should be some sort of vision for signage of auto dealerships in the downtown area and didn't see the benefit to repeatedly reviewing this signage issue every year or so.

Mr. Marek pointed out that if Brown and Brown were a brand new auto dealership coming to downtown Mesa, there would be no question that a 45-foot-high sign would be prohibited; however, the issue with this sign was created because of the letter written by Henry Brown promising to remove it, and because the sign has existed at the property for many years. Mr. Marek explained that Brown and Brown received an extension to keep the sign until the streetscape improvements were complete, but Brown and Brown is now requesting to keep the sign. Mr. Marek said staff's perspective is that Brown and Brown Chevrolet will still have the visibility that they desire if the 45-foot-high sign were replaced with freestanding monument signs.

Chair Jordan asked if staff supports these kinds of signs in the downtown area, generally speaking.

Mr. Marek said staff would not support these kinds of signs for new businesses because they are not appropriate for the downtown area.

Mr. Murphy pointed out that staff did not support the freestanding sign at Four Wheel Parts, located at 420 S. Country Club Drive, even though ultimately it was approved by City Council.

Chair Jordan felt that, no matter what the Code requires, there are always opportunities to be creative about signage, to the point that it could look like

public art, yet it is signage. Chair Jordan said he had a hard time integrating the concept that bigger, taller signs are better, and felt that the City should be mindful of that when promoting downtown redevelopment.

Mr. Marek said the Comprehensive Sign Plan provides flexibility for staff to consider signage that has unique and creative design that would otherwise be prohibited. Mr. Marek pointed out that the Committee previously considered a Comprehensive Sign Plan for the new Mesa Arts Center for signage that was outside the boundaries of the Sign Ordinance, but incorporated design and style that enhanced the facility.

Chair Jordan said he felt everyone agrees that they want Brown and Brown downtown and want them to thrive as a business, but they also want them to be an urban community citizen.

Mr. Murphy displayed some drawings that the City came up with for Brown and Brown as alternative signage and indicated that the applicant has seen these drawings but have declined to incorporate them for their signage.

Chair Jordan asked if the applicant would come forward and speak, after which any other persons who wished to speak on this agenda item could come forward.

Matt Brown, Brown and Brown Chevrolet, said he appreciated the Committee considering this signage issue. Mr. Brown said auto dealerships are moving out of downtown areas and are migrating to freeway locations. This is because it is more convenient for customers and is better for advertising. Mr. Brown explained that they have heavily marketed their business in Scottsdale, Tempe, and Chandler and, without this sign, it is difficult to direct customers to his location. Mr. Brown explained that most people are not familiar with the cross streets of Hibbert and Main so the sign has become a landmark to direct customers to his business from Mesa Drive. Mr. Brown said the sign is easily recognizable and has been invaluable in directing customers to his site.

Mr. Brown said Brown and Brown Chevrolet has been successful in downtown Mesa. He said the business would probably not suffer tremendously without the sign, but it does help them direct their customers and they would like to request permission to retain the sign. Mr. Brown said if this issue were delayed another year, their position would not change. He hoped that this issue could be resolved now and that the Committee would support the sign.

Mr. Brown pointed out that his business is working to expand a small portion of their site where they have been asked to make several concessions to comply with requests from the new Mesa Arts Center (MAC). Mr. Brown did not feel that there has been much consideration given to them in return during the construction of the MAC. He said no one has spoken to them regarding the construction parking and blockage of roads and parking spaces around his business. Mr. Brown pointed out that Brown and Brown Chevrolet has been located in downtown Mesa much longer than the MAC and has been a great

asset. He said that these types of small considerations definitely help their business and he hoped that the Committee would consider allowing them to retain their sign.

Dick Stanko, an employee of Brown and Brown Chevrolet, said the competitiveness between the dealerships with Phoenix is tremendous. He said with the booming Internet trade, they are pulling customers in to their business from all over the area who are not familiar with their location. He pointed out that there has only been one lane of traffic open on Main Street due to the construction of the MAC and they need an identifier to help customers find their business. Mr. Stanko said they do not feel that a monument sign can serve as that identifier because they need something higher that can be seen from a distance. Mr. Stanko said that the reason this issue was delayed for one year was to allow the trees time to mature so that placement of signage could better be identified. He said that the reports have indicated that the trees will not fully mature for five years. He suggested that this issue be delayed for five more years until the trees have had time to finish maturing. Mr. Stanko pointed out that Brown and Brown Chevrolet employs 500 people and generates a lot of revenue for the state of Arizona and the City of Mesa.

Mr. Reeb asked when construction of the Mesa Arts Center is anticipated to be complete.

Mr. Marek said Fall of 2005.

Mr. Reeb asked for a summary of what was included in the Comprehensive Sign Plan that was approved for Brown and Brown Chevrolet in 1993.

Mr. Murphy said they had new signage installed but couldn't remember the details.

Ms. Carmichael said that if she were considering a new 45-foot high sign she would be opposed, but because it is an existing sign, and is in scale with the taller buildings and trees in the surrounding area and with the size of Brown and Brown's site, she did not have a problem with the aesthetics of the sign. Furthermore, she did not think Henry Brown would have agreed to remove the sign if he had known about the streetscape improvements. Ms. Carmichael pointed out that the business is under different ownership now and the new owner probably was never aware of the agreement to remove the sign. Ms. Carmichael felt that new businesses need to comply with the current standards but existing businesses are grandfathered and she was in favor of allowing them to continue to use the sign.

Mr. Poe said he has never really noticed the sign but agreed with Ms. Carmichael that the business is existing and it is unfair to require them to comply with the new standards. Mr. Poe added that the sign was delayed for a year to see how much the trees have matured and now staff is saying that the trees won't fully mature for another 5 years. He said he could not support the removal of the sign when the City seems to keep changing the rules.

Ms. Smith asked why Brown and Brown Chevrolet has not considered the alternatives that would satisfy visibility while taking into account aesthetics. Ms. Smith agreed that Brown and Brown has been an asset to the community and a long-standing resident of downtown, but she felt there was room for compromise.

Mr. Brown said they have considered the drawings that were provided by the City proposing two monument signs at each end of the property; however, some of the concerns with the monument signs was that they would cause traffic problems and that they would not meet the needs that the existing sign was serving. Mr. Brown said have they considered new signage on the parking garage, additional window signage, balloons, etc. but all are prohibited by the City. He added that they have already replaced three or four signs, as requested by the City, to bring them into compliance with today's standards. He said they are not opposed to alternatives, but they have not yet come up with anything would fit their needs.

Ms. Smith suggested that Brown and Brown consider another type of 45-foot-high sign that is more aesthetically appealing.

Chair Jordan said he is aware of the sensitivity behind the cost of a new sign, but if the real issue is visibility, then he suggested artistic signage alternatives. He explained that the Committee is not unwilling to consider creative alternatives, but there is nothing creative about the existing 45-foot-high sign.

Mr. Brown said that if replacing the 45-foot-high sign is an option, then they have no problem doing that. He explained that the height of the sign is the issue and they are willing to spend the funds to replace it with a better one.

Chair Jordan suggested that quality graphic designers work with staff in bringing alternative proposals to the Committee. Without speaking for the Committee, Chair Jordan said he would be very receptive to reviewing those proposals.

Mr. Stanko explained that Chevrolet restricts the sizes, colors, and combinations for their signage. Mr. Stanko said they cannot create their own design. He explained that all signs have to be approved by Chevrolet and options have to be selected from their catalog.

Mr. Brown said he would be willing to approach Chevrolet with an exception to the guidelines. He felt they would consider their request, being one of the largest dealers for Chevrolet. On the other hand, there is no guarantee that they will be granted their request.

Mr. Reeb said there have been some mitigating circumstances that have occurred since 1993. He said the City has a much different vision of what they want in downtown. Mr. Reeb agreed that there should be some distinguishing feature for Brown and Brown and agreed with the other Committee members who said they would be willing to consider other alternatives that are creative

and integrate the current vision of downtown. Mr. Reeb said he did not feel it was important to wait until the trees mature. He said a Landscape Architect can let the Committee and staff know how big the trees will get. Mr. Reeb suggested that the Committee extend the deadline for the existing sign until the completion of the Mesa Arts Center in Fall 2005. He suggested that Brown and Brown Chevrolet work on some alternatives to the sign during the interim and bring their proposals to the Committee prior to the deadline to allow time for review, approval, and construction of the sign.

Mr. Jarvis suggested that as Brown and Brown Chevrolet considers alternatives for their identifier or signature piece, he encouraged them to look beyond a 45-foot-high sign and suggested that their identifier could be the show room, or their customer experience, which could do a whole lot more for the business than just a vertical sign.

Mr. Brown said he will look at all the options and would be willing to consider any input or suggestions from the Committee.

Ms. Close said she felt the sign was very noticeable and certainly could be considered a landmark. However she felt that there has been a migration of dealerships out of downtowns and probably Henry Brown was aware of that when he wrote his letter. Ms. Close agreed with the other Committee members and encouraged Brown and Brown to consider other alternatives and bring them to the Committee.

Ms. Carmichael said she still holds the position that Brown and Brown is entitled to keep their sign; however, she was not opposed to seeing other alternative signs that could serve as an identifier for the business.

Mr. Poe said he understood the restrictions that Brown and Brown must face with Chevrolet on the sign but said he supports the idea of bringing creative designs to downtown. He said he has seen some creative Chevrolet signs in Southern California.

Chair Jordan said that, in summary, the Committee is in favor of allowing Brown and Brown Chevrolet to extend the deadline to retain the existing sign and work on alternative signage options during the construction of the Mesa Arts Center. Chair Jordan hoped that, when this is reviewed by the Committee again, that there has not been a half-hearted attempt to come up with a new design and, ultimately, a request to retain the existing sign.

Mr. Poe asked if Brown and Brown Chevrolet is willing to explore alternative designs for the sign.

Mr. Brown said they are absolutely willing to look at other designs but reminded the Committee that they are under the direction of General Motors. He explained that there will be no half-hearted attempt and that they will pursue different options for the sign as much as possible, however General Motors

could deny their request from the beginning and they could know that right away.

Chair Jordan said he understood their concerns but he found it hard to believe that a company that advertises during the Super Bowl and spends so much money on marketing, would deny the request to allow alternative signage, especially if it is coming at the request of the City.

Mr. Brown asked the Committee members and staff to let him know if they see any Chevrolet signage that meets the criteria they are looking for in this sign. Mr. Brown added that he appreciates the comments that have been made in consideration for the spirit of the Ordinance and not the letter of it.

Ms. Smith said she feels uncomfortable with the vagueness of the time frame for the extension. She suggested that the Committee set up some specific timeframes that would allow the Committee to receive updates on how Brown and Brown Chevrolet is progressing rather than waiting to see the end result.

Chair Jordan suggested that the Committee continue this item and review it again in 90 days and see what ideas Brown and Brown has been able to come up with after talking to Chevrolet regarding their options on signage.

Mr. Marek agreed with Chair Jordan's suggestion because the next step is to take this to City Council who will probably have similar concerns. He said it would be a good idea to allow 90 days for Brown and Brown to come up with other creative alternatives and bring it back to the Downtown Development Committee. That way staff will have something tangible to present to City Council as an alternative. Mr. Marek said it would be nice to bring closure to this issue and this would be a good way to accomplish that.

Mr. Poe said he liked the idea of developing some goals and milestones for the Committee to discuss. He also said that, by forming a partnership, it is setting a good precedence and will help come up with reasonable solutions that are a win-win for both sides. Mr. Poe suggested that, rather than the Committee stipulating what the milestones should be, that staff work with Brown and Brown on some goals and milestones and bring those back to the Committee at a later meeting for discussion.

Mr. Marek said that, in order to bring closure to this issue, he recommended that the Committee continue this item for 90 days so that Brown and Brown can come back to the Committee to propose their alternatives.

Mr. Poe said he felt that everyone could agree that there will be some change to the sign. He hoped that the City and Brown and Brown could work towards their goals together, rather than having Brown and Brown work on it by themselves and come back with a final product.

Mr. Brown said Mr. Stanko has worked for General Motors for 35 years and knows the inner workings of General Motors. He said that if the sign is within

the guidelines of General Motors, then the 90 days will probably be enough time to come up with alternatives; however, if the Board is asking for something artistic that is outside of the guidelines of General Motors, then they will probably need more time.

Mr. Stanko said there will be many bridges to cross with franchise laws etc. and felt he would need at least 6 months to come up with alternatives. He added that there is no way to know if Chevrolet will allow them to make an exception to their guidelines or if they decide to deny the request from the very beginning.

Mr. Reeb asked about the legalities of bringing this case to the City Council if the Downtown Development Committee wishes to continue this agenda item.

Mr. Marek said the stipulation was to bring this issue back to the City Council in one year. He said he would confirm with the City Attorney's Office on how to proceed, but he supposed that if the Downtown Development Committee wishes to continue this item for six months, then this case would still be brought before the City Council to see if they support the recommendation from the Downtown Development Committee.

Mr. Poe said that it seems the Downtown Development Committee has one of three options to pursue. One is that the Committee recommend that the sign be retained as it exists and two, recommend that the sign be removed. Mr. Poe said he would find it hard to believe that City Council would not support pursuing the third option which allows staff and Brown and Brown Chevrolet to work together to sort out their differences and come up with a solution that both sides can be happy with. He felt it was important to make it clear to City Council that this is a situation that the City and the business owner are trying to deal with together.

Mr. Marek said staff has no problem working with Brown and Brown to come up with alternatives.

**It was moved by Mark Reeb, seconded by Jeff Jarvis, to give an extension to Special Use Permit Case No. ZA02-007TC until November 2005 for a Comprehensive Sign Plan to allow the temporary use of the forty-five foot (45') high freestanding sign currently located at Brown & Brown Chevrolet, 145 East Main Street subject to the following stipulation:**

- 1. Brown and Brown Chevrolet will submit some conceptual designs for a replacement sign or identifier by January 2004 for approval and implementation of the identifier to occur by November 2005.**

Ms. Carmichael asked if that means the existing sign must come down by 2005 no matter what.

Mr. Reeb said it is just an extension of the sign for a specific period of time. In the mean time, Brown and Brown will have time to come up with other signage options that the Committee is willing to consider.

Ms. Carmichael said she could not support a motion that flat out requires the sign to come down.

Mr. Poe said he sees the motion to be binary because the City has no stake in this situation. He explained that all of the effort will be on the part of Brown and Brown Chevrolet. He said if the City does not approve of any of the signs that Brown and Brown came up with, then the sign will be required to be removed. As a result he felt that there was no agreement or cooperation in the motion.

Ms. Carmichael asked if Brown and Brown is legally bound to take down the sign based on what happened in 1993.

Mr. Murphy said that Brown and Brown submitted a request for the City to consider a revised Comprehensive Sign Plan, which included the request to retain the existing 45-foot-high freestanding sign. Mr. Murphy explained that the Zoning Administrator denied the request for the 45-foot-high sign to remain, which was appealed to City Council. The City Council decided to review this issue again in a year after the trees had a chance to mature.

Mr. Poe asked if the City Council has the authority to allow Brown and Brown to retain the freestanding sign.

Mr. Marek said they did. He added that if this property were outside of the Redevelopment Area, the sign is prohibited and would be required to be removed. However, the City has the power to approve otherwise prohibited signs through the Comprehensive Sign Plan process in the Redevelopment Area.

Ms. Carmichael asked if the Downtown Development Committee were not to take any action of this item, what would be the status of the sign.

Mr. Marek said the City Council would have to make that decision.

Ms. Carmichael asked what will happen if Brown and Brown Chevrolet explores all of their options and is unable to come up with a new sign that everyone can agree on.

Chair Jordan said then they would be allowed to keep the sign until November 2005.

**Vote: 6 in favor;  
1 opposed (Theresa Carmichael)**

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

**Request for Qualifications (RFQ) Site 7 and Site 17** – The City Council approved the request to issue the RFQs for Site 7 and Site 17. Mr. Marek said they will mail over 500 RFQs to developers throughout the country on Monday.

**Hunter Interests, Inc.** – The City Council has hired Hunter Interests to work on the Northeast Quadrant plan which would include the area around the hotel, Centennial Center, MAC, post office, South Center Campus, Aquatics Center, etc. A big component of the study includes the downtown campus for Mesa Community College. He said the study should be completed by the end of September. Staff will keep the Committee abreast of this study.

**Council Use Permit for Brown and Brown Chevrolet** – The City Council approved the Council Use Permit for the auto repair facility at Brown and Brown Chevrolet, which was considered by the Downtown Development Committee at their last meeting.

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

There was no report from MTCC.

**11. Board Member Comments**

None

**12. Adjournment**

With there being no further business, this meeting of the Downtown Development Committee adjourned at 10:16 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

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