

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

**DATE:** May 15, 2003 **TIME:** 7:30 a.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Dave Wier, Chair  
Art Jordan, Vice Chair  
Theresa Carmichael  
Robert Fletcher  
Wayne Pomeroy  
Mark Reeb  
Chuck Riekema  
Terry Smith

**STAFF PRESENT**

Shelly Allen  
Katrina Bradshaw  
Tony Felice  
John Gendron  
Greg Marek  
Amy Morales  
Patrick Murphy

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Patricia Cosand  
Paul Moran  
Ron Peters  
Kathy Worcester  
Gene Valentine

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Vince DiBella

**1. Call to Order**

The May 15, 2003 meeting of the Downtown Development Committee was called to order at 7:30 a.m. in the City Council Chambers located at 57 E. First Street by Chair Wier.

**2. Items from Citizens Present**

There were no items from citizens present.

**3. Approval of Minutes of April 16, 2003 Retreat**

It was moved by Wayne Pomeroy, seconded by Art Jordan to approve the minutes.

Vote: 7 in favor; 0 opposed

**Approval of Minutes of April 17, 2003 Study Session**

It was moved by Art Jordan, seconded by Wayne Pomeroy to approve the minutes.

Vote: 7 in favor; 0 opposed

**Approval of Minutes of April 17, 2003 Regular Meeting**

It was moved by Art Jordan, seconded by Wayne Pomeroy to approve the minutes.

Vote: 7 in favor; 0 opposed

(Chuck Riekena arrived at the meeting after the voting of the minutes.)

4. **Discuss and consider Case No. DR00-011TC for the One Macdonald Center Building (Site 21), located at 1 N. Macdonald St. (Continued from the April 17, 2003 meeting).**

Mr. Murphy explained that the Board is being asked to review the final elevations for the former Bank One building. The Downtown Development Committee approved the Design Review application in January 2001. One of the stipulations placed upon the approval was that the upper elevations and an exhibit of the entire length of the building would be submitted for further review by the Downtown Development Committee. Mr. Murphy introduced Gene Valentine, the architect for the project, to give a presentation on the design.

Mr. Valentine gave a PowerPoint presentation showing the designs of the penthouse and western side of the building, materials and colors, as well as examples of architecture that inspired the design of the former Bank One building.

Chair Wier asked the Board members if they had any questions.

Mr. Reeb said he was still unclear where the materials were going on the building. He asked for more details on the materials and the cornice.

Mr. Valentine explained that they intend to use stone on the base of the building (meaning the first level of the building) and EIFS primarily in the penthouse area. Mr. Valentine continued to clarify where colors and materials would be located on the building.

Mr. Reeb asked for more information on the material of the cornice.

Mr. Valentine said they have not finalized a decision on the material of the cornice. He said they may use EIFS with foam and hard-shell stucco, plaster, or fiberglass.

Mr. Jordan asked that the design team be sure to inform the Board members if any changes will be made to the design or materials so that the dialogue remains open.

Mr. Valentine said the team feels very optimistic that they have remained within the budget that was established and does not feel that there will be pressure to value engineer the building.

**It was moved by Mark Reeb, seconded by Chuck Riekena, to approve Case No. DR00-011TC for the One Macdonald Center Building (Site 21), located at 1 N. Macdonald St subject to the following stipulations:**

1. Full compliance with approved plans and all current Code requirements as unless modified through the appropriate review and stipulations outlined below.
2. Compliance with the basic development as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, and elevations dated May 12, 2003.
3. Review and approval of a complete comprehensive sign plan by the Redevelopment Staff before the issuance of a sign permit.
4. 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.
5. Obtain an encroachment permit from the City for the second floor deck above the Main Street sidewalk.
6. Obtain approval from the City Council for the proposed new right-of-way line. All necessary easements shall be granted to the City.
7. The storm water drainage plan shall ensure that the current storm water capacity is maintained.
8. Final materials for the cornice need to be submitted to the Redevelopment Division for further review by the Downtown Development Committee.

Mr. Reeb clarified that he feels that the architects have done a good job with the design of the cornice however he wanted the final material detail of the cornice to come back to the Downtown Development Committee for approval because he felt the cornice will be one of the signature elements of the building.

Mr. Pomeroy said the architects who have worked on this project know the value of the building and it's historic value to the city of Mesa and thanked the architects for their hard work.

**Vote: 8 in favor; 0 opposed**

**5. Discuss and consider the Design Review Case No. DR03-003TC for the Pomeroy House, located at 213 N. Morris Street.**

Mr. Felice explained that the Downtown Development Committee is being asked to review the Design Review plans for the Pomeroy House located at 213 N. Morris Street, which was the subject of a Disposition and Development Agreement between the City of Mesa and the Mesa Violin Studios. Mr. Felice introduced the applicants, Patricia Cosand and Cathy Worchester, as well as the architect, Paul Moran. Mr. Felice said staff recommends approval of the Design Review plans subject to the stipulations listed in the staff report. The Historic Preservation Committee reviewed the plans at their May 8, 2003 meeting and also recommended approval.

Mr. Felice explained that there are two issues that still need to be worked out with the Building Safety Division. Due to the building's proximity to the side property lines, it would normally require fire rated construction. The Building Safety Division has agreed that a code exception would be appropriate in this instance and is working with the Redevelopment Office and the applicant to achieve that. The second issue is that the Building Safety Office would normally require the applicant to pave the alleyway since they are proposing to use it for three employee parking spaces. Currently the alley is half paved and half chip-stone and is currently used by other property owners for parking. Staff feels that it is onerous to require that the alley be paved.

Mr. Felice said staff feels the applicant has done a good job, not only complying with the Secretary of Interior standards for rehabilitating historic properties, but also is in keeping with the Design Guidelines for the Town Center Area. Mr. Felice explained that the applicant is making only a few modifications to the building, including a new awning and porch and also repairing some of the damaged brick. Mr. Felice continued to describe the details of the site plan, landscape plan, and elevations.

Mr. Riekena asked what portion of the alley is paved.

Mr. Felice said the northern portion of the alley is paved about halfway and added that there are concrete driveway aprons at both ends of the alleyway.

**It was moved by Wayne Pomeroy, seconded by Art Jordan, to approve Design Review Case No. DR03-003TC for the Pomeroy House, located at 213 N. Morris Street subject to the following stipulations:**

- 1. Compliance with the basic development as shown on the attached site plan and elevations dated April 24, 2003, with the rear porch issue to be resolved by the Historic Preservation Office and Downtown Development Committee.**
- 2. Coordinate with US West to underground utility lines on-site.**
- 3. Compliance with the City's Outdoor Lighting and Control Ordinance (Night Sky Ordinance).**
- 4. Outdoor lighting should be residential in character and sensitive to the neighborhood.**
- 5. Redevelopment Staff shall have final approval of the colors and materials prior to issuance of a building permit.**
- 6. Applicant shall obtain permission for roll-off barrel pickup service from the City's Engineering Plans Examiner in accordance with City policy and approval prior to submission of a building permit application.**

**Vote: 8 in favor; 0 opposed**

- 6. Discuss and consider amending Sections 11-19-5 and 11-19-8 of the City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance pertaining to electronic message display signs.**

John Gendron, Zoning Administrator, explained there are several Ordinances that will be presented to the Planning and Zoning Board meeting later this afternoon for recommendation to the City Council. This Ordinance proposal will involve allowing changeable signage through electronic means. Mr. Gendron explained that up until now the only way businesses could have changeable copy signage in the city of Mesa is via a zip change sign (plastic panels that can be moved in and out). Advances in technology have made it possible for almost every business owner to afford an electronic changeable message sign. Mr. Gendron explained that flashing signage has, and will continue to be, prohibited in the City of Mesa. This proposal would allow for signage to change its message through either immediate change, or fade and dissolve, however it cannot change more than once per hour.

Mr. Gendron explained that the business owners will have the option to apply for a Special Use Permit if they want to have a crawl or scrolling mode sign (not flashing). Factors that would be considered for the Special Use Permit would be cluttering of signage, speed of the traffic, and input from other divisions of the City.

Mr. Jordan asked if there is anyone who has been waiting to take advantage of this change in the Ordinance.

Mr. Gendron said many business owners have stated that they would take advantage of the opportunity if the law allowed it.

Mr. Jordan asked if the sign at the gambling casino along route 101 would comply with this Ordinance.

Mr. Gendron said any full animation sign would not be permitted under this proposed Ordinance.

Mr. Jordan asked if electronic graphics are allowed to change more frequently or does the same requirements apply for both text and graphics.

Mr. Gendron confirmed that the graphics and text are only allowed to change once per hour.

Mr. Riekema asked for more specifics about what kind of movement is allowed with the approval of a Special Use Permit.

Mr. Gendron stated that it would be limited to a message that crawls across or scrolling down. It would still not allow animation and illusions of movement.

Ms. Smith asked why the time limit was placed at one hour for the electronic changing signs.

Mr. Gendron said studies have been done which indicates that scrolling or crawling signs do not relate to additional traffic accidents, however, flashing or

moving messages can be a distraction for drivers. Mr. Gendron explained that the time limit of one hour was chosen arbitrarily.

Mr. Marek asked specifically what zoning districts the electronic changing signs are permitted.

Mr. Gendron said any zoning district allowing a freestanding sign will also allow the electronic changing sign, which includes multiple residential and commercial districts.

Mr. Marek pointed out that 5-foot-high monument signs are the only freestanding signs that are allowed in the Town Center Redevelopment Area. He asked if electronic changing signs are limited to such signs.

Mr. Gendron said that was correct. He explained that the new Ordinance will not affect the size or number of signs currently allowed in the Sign Code.

Mr. Jordan asked if the frequency of the changing sign can be increased with the application of a variance and if so, who would approve it.

Mr. Gendron said it could be applied for through a Special Use Permit with the approval by the Board of Adjustment.

Mr. Jordan asked how frequent the changes can occur under the Special Use Permit and asked if they could become full animation.

Mr. Gendron said the changes could be approved for less than one hour however, full animation is not allowed with a Special Use Permit. He explained that the Special Use Permit process is available so that the City has some flexibility to address situations that may not have been foreseen.

Mr. Jordan said he enjoys an environment such as that in Las Vegas with the electronic signs, however, he didn't think he would feel the same way if there were only one or two business owners in the downtown area who had a moving sign. In such a case he felt it would become a marketing technique rather than a character trait. He expressed concern that the Special Use Permit process would make it possible for that to happen.

Mr. Gendron explained that the Special Use Permit process has been used for over 20 years to provide a check and balance for situations that could not be predetermined. He also pointed out that in the Town Center Redevelopment Area, an appeal to a Special Use Permit goes to the City Council rather than to the Board of Adjustment.

Mr. Jordan asked if a Special Use Permit is approved by the Zoning Administrator or by the City Council.

Mr. Gendron explained that in the Town Center Redevelopment Area, the Special Use Permit first goes to the Downtown Development Committee for a

recommendation, and then to the Zoning Administrator for the final decision. Appeals from that decision would be referred to the City Council.

Mr. Jordan commented that if an applicant is successful in obtaining a Special Use Permit and has invested in the sign, that it would be difficult to have it removed, even if they sold the property or changed ownership.

Mr. Gendron said State Statutes allow a community to place conditions, restrictions, or limitations on Special Use Permits (which run with the land, not the owner). If those restrictions are violated to a point where the City can actually prove it in court, then the City will have power to revoke that Special Use Permit. He added that violations of code are more efficiently handled by requiring the violation to cease rather than requiring the sign to be removed.

Mr. Riekena asked if the electronic signs must fall within the current guidelines for sign area and amount.

Mr. Gendron said they would. The parameters of the Sign Code would not be affected by this Ordinance.

Ms. Smith asked if there is any data to support that electronic sign messages significantly impact marketing for businesses.

Mr. Gendron said he does not know if there have been any studies conducted on such matters but said he was not privy to that information.

Ms. Carmichael asked if the Ordinance addresses any issues regarding color.

Mr. Gendron said right now the colors are limited by the technology. He added that color options may increase as technology improves which could be looked at down the road. As of right now, however, Mr. Gendron said he believes the electronic signs are limited to two or three colors.

Mr. Fletcher expressed concern that the colors of the signage may not match the building. He felt that some type of stipulation to address this would be appropriate.

Mr. Gendron said staff will contact their sign consultants to get their feedback and consider it as an option.

Chair Wier said he noticed that many of the cities around Mesa have electronic signs whereas in Mesa they do not. He asked if Walgreens and other such businesses in Mesa who have previously been precluded from the electronic signage will now be able to apply.

Mr. Gendron answered that the Code in Mesa has prohibited illusions of motion, flashing, or intermittent flashing messages and because of the propensity for electronic signage to do that, the City has prohibited them. Mr. Gendron explained that the City needs to address the issue of electronic signage

however because it is becoming increasingly difficult to ignore this issue due to the competitive nature of the businesses and improvements in technology for signage. He said the City is trying, with this Ordinance, to actually address it, recognize it, and put some reasonable limitations on it.

**It was moved by Wayne Pomeroy, seconded by Robert Fletcher to recommend approval to amend Sections 11-19-5 and 11-19-8 of the City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance pertaining to electronic message display signs subject to the following stipulation:**

- 1. Regulate colors of the signage so they are compatible with the existing development and do not contrast to the colors of the building.**

Ms. Smith asked for specific clarification of the motion.

Chair Wier answered that, pertaining to electronic signage, the sign area and numbers of signs must comply to current code requirements, the messages can change no more than once per hour, and a Special Use Permit is required for scrolling or crawling signs, or for messages that change more frequently than once per hour.

Mr. Marek also added that this Ordinance only applies to freestanding signs.

Mr. Gendron said he has never seen electronic signage for an attached sign, but clarified that there is nothing to restrict electronic signage for an attached sign.

Mr. Marek expressed concern that the electronic signage is not necessarily limited to freestanding signs, but could be applied to wall signs as well.

Mr. Jordan asked if staff would like a condition placed upon the electronic signage that it be restricted to freestanding signs.

Mr. Marek said the Redevelopment Office would prefer to see electronic signage approved through the Comprehensive Sign Plan process and considered on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Jordan asked how Mr. Gendron felt about the Comprehensive Sign Plan process being required in the Town Center area for electronic signage.

Mr. Gendron said there are separate sign regulations for the Town Center area already and did not object to the stipulations that were proposed.

Mr. Jordan expressed concern about that fact that the City currently does not regulate colors for either signage or development and felt that it was important to have a way to regulate that in some way.

Mr. Gendron suggested that if the Committee has concerns about color then they could certainly recommend that electronic signage in the downtown area be subject to the approval of a Special Use Permit. That way the Committee will have a chance to review each sign individually.

Mr. Reeb felt that downtown was different than other areas of the City and therefore agreed that electronic signage downtown should be subject to the approval of a Special Use Permit.

Ms. Carmichael did not feel it was fair to allow businesses outside of the Town Center Redevelopment Area to have electronic signage while requiring businesses within the Redevelopment Area to obtain a Special Use Permit.

Mr. Pomeroy said he would like to amend his motion.

The motion was amended as follows:

**It was moved by Wayne Pomeroy, seconded by Robert Fletcher to recommend approval to amend Sections 11-19-5 and 11-19-8 of the City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance pertaining to electronic message display signs subject to the following stipulation:**

- 1. Regulate colors of the signage so they are compatible with the existing development and do not contrast to the colors of the building.**
- 2. Electronic Signage in the Town Center Redevelopment Area is subject to the approval of a Comprehensive Sign Plan through a Special Use Permit.**

Ms. Carmichael said she is sensitive to the goals that have been established for downtown, however, she felt it needed to be balanced with property rights, and sometimes she felt the City retains too much control over what property owners are allowed to do. As a result, Ms. Carmichael stated that she would not support the motion.

Mr. Riekema said he supports the motion, however he expressed disappointment on how the City seems to put too much emphasis on promoting sales tax revenues over and above aesthetics. Mr. Riekema added that he feels the electronic signage will help improve aesthetics in this community and would support the motion for that reason.

Chair Wier said he felt the Committee has tried to work with business owners to allow otherwise prohibited signage to be allowed where appropriate through the Comprehensive Sign Plan.

Mr. Jordan asked how the stipulations that the Downtown Development Committee have placed will be treated as the approval process continues.

Mr. Gendron said staff will notify the Planning and Zoning Board at their hearing later in the afternoon. He explained that the recommended changes will be included in the Ordinance for review and approval by City Council. Mr. Gendron added that this Ordinance will not be introduced to the City Council until June 30, 2003.

**Vote: 7 in favor;  
1 opposed (Theresa Carmichael)**

**7. Discuss and consider amending Section 11-1-6 of the City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance pertaining to special events.**

Mr. Gendron explained that the Mayor and City Manager had several meetings with local auto dealers last Fall to see how Mesa could become more business friendly. Mr. Gendron explained that in the '70s and '80s the sign code prohibited the display of balloons and banners in Mesa. In 1992 several business owners, car dealers and fast food businesses in particular, came to the City Council and asked for the ability to use banners, balloons, inflatables, etc. for at least a limited amount of time. Through a series of meetings a compromise was obtained and Mesa's current regulations to allow for special events came about. The regulations specify that a special event is allowed 3 times a year for 3 days consecutive days at each occurrence. During the event, banners, balloons, inflatables, etc. are allowed. Even though these special events became permitted, the City Council decided to omit car dealers and RV dealers from being able to hold these special events at their own properties. The City Council felt that car dealers had enough street frontage that there was no need for these kinds of displays.

Mr. Gendron explained that the proposal that is being discussed today, will essentially keep the same restrictions that are currently in place, but would now allow car dealers to hold a special event on their own properties whereby allowing them to display banners, balloons, inflatables, etc during the special event.

Mr. Reeb asked how the mechanics of the special event work.

Mr. Gendron said there is a Special Events License that must be obtained which requires the date, location, explanation of the event, and a site plan if applicable. The license allows the City to be able to track how many events have taken place at each address per year.

Mr. Pomeroy asked how the City controls the sales tax at these special events if some of them are coming in from other cities.

Mr. Gendron said if the event is held within the city of Mesa, then Mesa receives the sales tax revenue.

Ms. Smith asked if there is any kind of planning to ensure that special events do not coincide with other events.

Mr. Gendron said special events downtown should be coordinated by staff and would allow for planning at that time.

Mr. Riekema pointed out that many businesses may capitalize upon events taking place at the Mesa Arts Center by coinciding their special events at the same time.

Mr. Fletcher was concerned of the possibility for several car dealers to hold special events on the same day thereby having a negative impact on surrounding neighborhoods.

Mr. Gendron said the City reviews all applications for special events to ensure that they will not have a detrimental impact upon the surrounding properties and works to resolve any issues. Mr. Gendron added that most of the car dealers just want to put out balloons and banners to attract attention to their sale.

Mr. Jordan asked if a business decided to hold a fourth event through the approval of a Special Use Permit how long would it take to process and how much is the fee.

Mr. Gendron said the fee is currently \$600 but will increase to \$800 if City Council approves the new fee schedule. He added that it takes a minimum of one month to process the application.

Mr. Jordan asked if there is a post event inspection done by the City to ensure that the cleanup and termination of the event has occurred.

Mr. Gendron said he was unaware of an official inspection. He said the City will go investigate if it receives a complaint.

Mr. Jordan pointed out that the banners that have been approved for the Mesa Arts Center and other City facilities have been required to be of high quality and design excellence and therefore he felt he would not support the idea of allowing balloons and such items for special events.

**It was moved by Art Jordan, seconded by Chuck Riekema, to recommend denial of amending Section 11-1-6 of the City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance pertaining to special events.**

Mr. Wier asked how the Merry Main Street event, which is sponsored by the City, obtains its approval.

Mr. Felice said Merry Main Street is a one-day event which is allowed under the approval of a Special Event license.

Mr. Gendron clarified that the motion will not affect current regulations for special events. The motion will only restrict car dealers from holding special events on their own property.

**Vote: 4 in favor (Art Jordan, Robert Fletcher, Terry Smith, Chuck Riekona)**  
**4 opposed (Dave Wier, Wayne Pomeroy, Theresa Carmichael, Mark Reeb)**

Motion did not pass.

Ms. Smith asked for comment from the Board members on their vote.

Chair Wier said he did not feel there was any way to prevent businesses from capitalizing on events going on at the Mesa Arts Center. He added that there are only a small number of car dealers in downtown Mesa and the event is subject to the review and approval of a special event license.

Ms. Carmichael said that the \$95 million investment to build the Mesa Arts Center was not only to provide arts and cultural services but to become an economic engine for downtown. She didn't feel it was fair to punish one type of business from benefiting from a taxpayer's investment and for those reasons she could not support the motion.

Mr. Reeb said he also felt that there will be other businesses that will try to capitalize on the events going on at the Mesa Arts Center and did not feel that the City should discriminate against car dealers.

Mr. Pomeroy said he did not want to be a part of running a business out of downtown that is valuable to the City. He also felt that the special event policy has not been abused and could be looked at again in the future if problems arise.

Ms. Smith asked if there is some way to create restrictions to this ordinance regarding the "pleonastic frippery."

Mr. Gendron stated that is would be a matter of enforcement, and the City does not have the staff to be able to monitor that. He added that the City of Scottsdale has tried to build restrictions into their Ordinance but have been unsuccessful in enforcing it. Mr. Gendron said as long as the paraphernalia is kept off City property, streetlights, and sign poles, then most anything else will be allowed for those three days.

Mr. Riekona said he did not view the lack of support for this Ordinance as discrimination against car dealers because they have hundreds of feet of street frontage on major roads. He also was not in favor of adding more clutter to what was, in his opinion, an already cluttered up City. He explained his philosophical belief that as long as the City continues to do these things, this community will be addicted to sales taxes and, as a result, will suffer the consequences when the economy takes a dive.

Mr. Jordan said he was concerned with the possibility of car dealers holding more than just three special events per year by utilizing the Special Use Permit process.

Ms. Carmichael said she did not believe that the City could base decisions of law upon the wealth of a business or the lack thereof. She felt that the City is not here to subsidize people who can't afford advertising, to the detriment of people who can. Ms. Carmichael asked if the special events could be limited to three events per year without providing the option for more through a Special Use Permit process.

Mr. Gendron explained that the ability to hold a special event has been in the Code for a number of years and was the result of a compromise between the business people and the City Council as explained earlier. Mr. Gendron explained that the Special Use Permit process allows legitimate special events to take place longer than the three day limit, such as for haunted houses at Halloween or the Barnum and Bailey Circus. These events would not be possible if the suggested restriction were enforced.

Ms. Carmichael asked if the restriction could be placed upon the number of individual events rather than the number of days for each occurrence.

Mr. Gendron said that it was a possibility, however, the Superstition Springs and Fiesta Malls tend to hold a lot of different types of events on their parking lots. He said there have not been a lot of requests over the years to exceed the number of allowances.

Chair Weir asked if this would preclude the Mesa Arts Center from holding a special event, using balloons, tents, etc.

Mr. Gendron said they could apply for a special event under the current Ordinance. He added that it is not considered a special event unless it takes place outside.

Chair Wier asked if anyone wanted to make another motion. After no response from the Board, Chair Wier announced that there will be no recommendation forwarded.

Ms. Carmichael asked that with no recommendation how will the City Council be made aware of the feelings of this Board.

Mr. Gendron said they would receive a copy of the minutes of today's meeting.

Mr. Jordan asked for feedback from the Redevelopment Office regarding their position on this Ordinance.

Mr. Marek said staff did not oppose the approval of this Ordinance.

**8. Discuss and consider amending Section 11-18-6, 11-18-8, and 11-18-10 of the City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance pertaining to fees for planning services.**

Mr. Gendron explained that this Ordinance has been proposed because the City Council has asked to look at the total fee package for Planning fees as part of the budget predicament this year. The fees are being looked at to make sure they are similar to other surrounding cities, and to ensure that the fees are covering the actual costs incurred by the services that the City provides. Mr. Gendron said the City of Mesa only has one Zoning Inspector for the entire City and explained that the fee increases are needed in order to offset the cost for an additional inspector. Mr. Gendron stated that the result is a number of planning fee increases and he provided some brief examples.

**It was moved by Art Jordan, seconded by Theresa Carmichael to recommend approval to amending Section 11-18-6, 11-18-8, and 11-18-10 of the City of Mesa Zoning Ordinance pertaining to fees for planning services.**

**Vote: 8 in favor; 0 opposed**

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

**Orientation for New Board Members** – The Council Office is holding an orientation for new Board members; however, current Board members are also invited to attend. Orientation will be held on June 23, 2003, at 6:00 p.m. in room 170 of the Mesa City Plaza Building.

**June DDC Meeting** – Items on the June meeting agenda include:

1. Election of a new Chair and Vice-Chair. (Three current members will be leaving, Dave Wier, Robert Fletcher, and Vince DiBella.)
2. Design Review for a shopping center on the southwest corner of Country Club Drive and University. (Design Review for a shopping center on the southeast corner of Country Club Drive and University will also be coming to the DDC in the near future.)
3. Request for Qualifications for Site 7.
4. Request for Qualifications for Site 17.

**Eminent Domain/Redevelopment** – 60 Minutes will be featuring a story on eminent domain and Redevelopment. Mike Wallace will be in town researching the story on the Site 24 and Bailey's Brakes case. He will interview Randy Bailey and Ken Lenhart for the story. City staff was also asked to be interviewed; however, the City Attorney has advised against any on air interviews while still in litigation. Mr. Marek said he will inform the Board members once he knows when the story will be aired.

**Brown and Brown Chevrolet** – Brown and Brown Chevrolet has requested a modification to their Council Use Permit to allow an additional auto service bay

at the property. The Redevelopment Office has some concerns with the placement of the service bay because it is visible from Serrine Street. Mr. Murphy provided a site plan and explanation of the proposal. The Downtown Development Committee will consider this at an upcoming meeting.

**Qwest Expansion** – Qwest purchased the 40-foot wide parking area to the east of their building for expansion purposes. A City easement will need to be abandoned in order for the expansion to take place. Staff is working with Qwest on other alternatives for the easement. This project does not trigger Design Review so the expansion will be an administrative review.

**Permanent Sculpture Panel** – Dave Wier will need a replacement on the Permanent Sculpture Panel since he will no longer be able to represent the Downtown Development Committee.

**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 9:25 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

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