



AD HOC REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

November 16, 2004

The Ad Hoc Redevelopment Advisory Committee met at the Mesa City Plaza, 20 E. Main Street, Room 170, on November 16, 2004 at 5:30 p.m.

COMMITTEE PRESENT

Rex Griswold, Chairman
Steve Adams
Louise Daggs
Alex Finter
Art Jordan
Alan Rash
Chuck Riekema
Joe Shipley
Bev Tittle-Baker

COMMITTEE ABSENT

Dave Richins
Jordan Rose

STAFF PRESENT

Paul Wenbert
Shelly Allen
Lisha Garcia
Pat Granillo
Patrick Murphy

ALSO PRESENT

Tom Verploegen

1. Approval of the October 12, 2004 minutes.

It was moved by Committeemember Riekema, seconded by Committeemember Adams, that the minutes of the October 12, 2004 meeting be approved.

Chairman Griswold declared the motion carried unanimously by those present.

2. Discuss and consider the Ad Hoc Redevelopment Advisory Committee report to the City Council.

Chairman Griswold referred to the December 2, 2004 City Council Report outlining proposed recommendations that the Committee may wish to forward to the City Council and requested input from the Committeemembers in that regard. (See Attachment 1.) He also provided a brief chronology of some of the key points discussed by the presenters at the Committee's earlier meetings.

Committeemember Rash referred the Committeemembers to the following Recommendation:

I. Town Center Development Area:

1. Retain existing redevelopment area designation, and retain existing Downtown Development Committee (DDC) structure. This structure grants the DDC the duties of the Planning and Zoning Board and the Design Review Board, acting in an advisory capacity to the City Council.

Committeemember Rash stated the opinion that the second sentence of the above-referenced paragraph is ambiguous when it states "This structure **grants** the DDC the duties of the Planning and Zoning Board and the Design Review Board, acting in an advisory capacity to the City Council."

In response to Committeemember Rash's comments, Town Center Development Administrator Shelly Allen clarified that the intent of the above-referenced language is to convey that the DDC would remain intact and would be charged with the same duties as the Planning and Zoning Board and the Design Review Board.

Committeemember Riekema suggested that the verbiage be modified to state: "This structure **results** in the DDC having the duties of the Planning and Zoning Board and the Design Review Board, acting in an advisory capacity to the City Council."

(It was the consensus of the Committee that the language in I.1 be modified to address the concerns expressed by Committeemember Rash. A consensus was also reached relative to the wording of Recommendation I.2.)

Committeemember Adams advised that he recently read a report from the Morrison Institute for Public Policy that discussed the importance of a community having "a vision" relative to development and its ability to attract businesses to the area. He questioned whether there is a committee currently in existence in Mesa that is responsible for addressing such concerns and bringing business into the downtown area. Committeemember Adams suggested that if such an entity were not in place, he would like the Committee to recommend to the City Council that the City, in some manner, adopt a vision for the downtown area besides the Mesa Arts Center.

Discussion ensued relative to the fact that among its many duties, the Mesa Town Center Corporation does business recruitment in the downtown area; that proposed Recommendation III, Other Issues, addresses the development and implementation of a pro-active, aggressive marketing plan to attract new development in the Town Center Redevelopment Area (TCRA) and will implement the recommendations contained in the Hunter Interests, Inc. report to develop City-owned properties in the TCRA (which was an outgrowth of the Mesa Town Center Concept Plan); that the Concept Plan is implemented per City Council direction; that private developers have invested funds in the downtown area including the current restoration of the Paul Sale building and the One Macdonald Center building; that because of the Mesa Arts Center, art-related businesses are now attracted to the downtown area; and that it is anticipated that Mesa Community College (MCC) would have a greater presence in the downtown area in the future.

In response to a question from Committeemember Adams, Ms. Allen explained that the Mesa Town Center Concept Plan, which was implemented in 1999, established land use relationships for the downtown area including mixed-use development, existing bus and future light rail service, government facilities and current/future redevelopment. She noted that the stakeholders in the downtown area played a major role in providing input and suggestions which ultimately resulted in the Concept Plan and she added that it was not a City-driven endeavor.

Committeemember Riekema concurred with Committeemember Adams' suggestion relative to the establishment of an entity to become the "vision keeper" for the downtown area and stressed the importance of the City Council acknowledging the group's existence and purpose. He stated that the Town Center Development Office does a great job of providing planning, economic development and project coordinator functions within the redevelopment area.

Further discussion ensued relative to the fact that the Committee was originally charged with determining whether the TCRA boundaries should change and examining the advantages and disadvantages of such a decision; and that at the June 22, 2004 Ad Hoc Redevelopment Advisory Committee meeting, it was the consensus of the Committeemembers to proceed forward with the revised goal of considering the potential for establishing new redevelopment areas throughout the City of Mesa and that a redevelopment district would be just one tool within the Committee's ultimate recommendations to the City Council.

Committeemember Shipley commented that throughout his tenure on the Committee, he has yet to see any justification as to why the Town Center area is considered more important than other areas of Mesa. He explained that although public money has been expended on projects downtown that have benefited the entire community, in his opinion, such funding could have been used just as easily, for example, in west Mesa for redevelopment and revitalization projects. Committeemember Shipley also questioned why the Town Center area "has been granted privileges and special treatment" with regard to the establishment of specific committees for its design review and planning and zoning matters. He added that sufficient public resources have already been contributed to the area and said that if private developers were anxious to locate to the downtown area, they would do so without the City offering them incentives.

In response to a question from Committeemember Jordan regarding why Mesa should maintain its City core, Tom Verploegen, Executive Director of the Mesa Town Center Corporation, stated that in his opinion, the Town Center area is "the heart and soul of the community." He explained that historically speaking, it encompasses Mesa's original square mile and maintains a unique character that cannot be experienced elsewhere in the community. Mr. Verploegen added that community, governmental and school board decisions are made in the downtown area and that it is also the venue for events such as Merry Main Street, as well as holiday lights and sculpture displays.

Chairman Griswold commented that in the next 20 years, he envisions that downtown Mesa will be located in the vicinity of Williams Gateway Airport. He explained that it is important that the City prevent the deterioration of the Town Center area and added that he would like to see the lessons that Mesa has learned relative to redevelopment, infill and the rehabilitation of older buildings in the downtown applied to the rest of the community as it ages.

Committeemember Riekema, whose business office is located in downtown Phoenix, explained that in the past five years, he has come to the realization that Phoenix has worked diligently to develop "a heart and soul." He commented that with Mesa's financial commitment to the Mesa Arts Center, he hopes that the Town Center area would soon become a source of pride for Mesa residents as well. Committeemember Riekema stated that throughout his tenure on various boards and committees, he has learned that it is more costly for a developer to become involved in a rehab project in the downtown area than it is on the fringes of the community. He noted, however, that those individuals seem to have more pride in the final product than developments completed in the outlying areas. Committeemember Riekema added that he is not opposed to City tax dollars being spent on the downtown area because he is confident that the redevelopment lessons that are learned there would eventually be applied to west Mesa where he resides.

Committeemember Jordan stated that at the October 12, 2004 meeting, the Committeemembers reached consensus with regard to Recommendations I and II and yet tonight he believes he is hearing a different perspective. He noted that as a professional builder, buildings in downtown areas are never constructed without public or private capital and that most projects in the City that do not move forward are the ones that are not properly capitalized and are seeking "handouts and tax rebates." Committeemember Jordan added that in his opinion, the Town Center Development Office staff provides project management to developers and with their continued support and expertise, he is confident the vision for the Town Center area would be met.

Additional discussion ensued relative to the fact that although an action plan has been created to implement the Mesa Town Center Concept Plan, it has been delayed due to various decisions and City budget constraints; that staff recently conducted a comparative analysis of public and private investment in the downtown area and learned that in 2004, there was a greater amount of private investment than in years past; that the proposed recommendations comply with the City's 2025 General Plan, which was adopted by Mesa voters in 2002; and that in the 2000 City of Mesa Community Survey, 91% of the respondents said redeveloping older parts of the community was very important or somewhat important, and that revitalizing downtown Mesa was also identified as an improvement that would make the biggest difference to the residents' quality of life.

Committeemember Finter expressed support for proposed recommendation I.1 and commented that although the City has invested substantial monies in the downtown area, private funds are also being infused into this part of the community. He concurred with Chairman Griswold's comment relative to expanding the use of development tools that have been effective in the Town Center area to the entire City. Committeemember Finter cautioned, however, that he is aware of Mesa residents who "are tired of pouring money into the downtown area" and are organized in their efforts to change the makeup of the City Council. He also stated that he has heard criticism from individuals in the community that the political climate changes whenever new City Councilmembers are elected and added that the Council's focus and policies shift as a result thereof.

(It was the consensus of the Committee that additional language be included under item I, Town Center Development Area, recommending that Mesa Community College have an increased presence in the downtown area.)

Committeemember Adams commented that in reading the Morrison Institute for Public Policy report, he learned that Phoenix does not charge developers impact fees in its downtown area, but rather in its fast-growing areas. He questioned whether this is a tool that the City of Mesa could consider in its downtown development area and asked whether it would be feasible to create a zone in downtown Mesa where no impact fees would be assessed.

In response to Committeemember Adams' question, Ms. Allen provided a brief overview of the manner in which Mesa has traditionally dealt with impact fees. She commented that by law, the City cannot waive Police and Fire impact fees, although staff has more flexibility with regard to water and sewer fees.

Chairman Griswold requested input from the Committeemembers relative to proposed Recommendation II (Create new Neighborhood Investment Areas in Mesa that focus on economic development within neighborhoods).

Further discussion ensued relative to possible language modifications to Recommendation II.5 (Building capacity for Community Development Corporations (CDC) within these areas.); the role that staff would play to assist in the establishment of a CDC; that sustainable mechanisms must be in place to ensure that the efforts of neighborhood organizations are not jeopardized by the political whims of present or future City Councils; that Mesa has strived to become more business friendly to ensure the successful development/redevelopment of not only the Town Center area, but also its outlying areas; that the Ad Hoc Redevelopment Advisory Committee was originally charged with the task of serving on a temporary basis and that there are no recommendations in the report that it continue its service (other than the recommendation under the Concurrence section of the report which speaks to the establishment of a new advisory board that reviews infill cases and/or projects in these areas, which would follow the DDC structure); and that many developers are hesitant to build projects in Mesa because of the current political climate.

Chairman Griswold commented that the Ad Hoc Redevelopment Advisory Committee is in a unique position to make recommendations to the City Council that could change the manner in which Mesa conducts business with developers and ultimately achieves "the vision."

Committeemember Jordan suggested the formation of an advisory committee, consisting of civic leaders from throughout the community, who would be charged with continuing to foster downtown development and redevelopment issues and present those items to the City Council on a regular basis. He commented that the advisory team would serve as a separate team from the currently existing Downtown Development Committee.

Committeemember Adams concurred with Committeemember Jordan's suggestion, but also commented that it may be appropriate to implement similar advisory teams for other areas of the City such as Falcon Field, Williams Gateway Airport, and Fiesta Mall.

Committeemember Tittle-Baker stressed the importance of including stakeholders in the downtown area as members of the advisory committee because they would have the greatest interest in whatever decisions are made relative to their neighborhoods.

Additional discussion ensued relative to the fact that the Neighborhood Services Department has limited staffing at this time, but would assist the advisory team as much as possible; the

responsibilities of the Zoning Hearing Officer under Concurrence 1.c; that the items listed under "Concurrence" are the preliminary recommendations of an internal staff team which may come before the City Council for consideration in the future, however, such recommendations could be included in the final report to the Council if the Committee so desired; the possibility of creating a new citizen board to hear revitalization, infill, and rehabilitation cases as compared to the Planning and Zoning Board which reviews "flat land" development cases; that the listing of possible Neighborhood Business Investment Areas be included as a possible recommendation in the Committee's final report; and that staff provide the Committeemembers with a comparative analysis of impact fee waivers, for example, on a \$500,000 building versus a \$2 million building.

Chairman Griswold thanked the Committeemembers for their input and informative dialogue. He suggested that the Committee hold one more meeting to review the final report, including the incorporation of tonight's input, which would be forwarded to the City Council for discussion and consideration. Chairman Griswold also encouraged the Committeemembers to submit any additional ideas they may have to Ms. Allen.

3. Other items.

Deputy City Manager Paul Wenbert advised that the next Committee meeting would be held on December 7, 2004 at 5:30 p.m. (The location is undetermined at this time.)

4. Adjournment.

Without objection, the Ad Hoc Redevelopment Advisory Committee was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the Ad Hoc Redevelopment Advisory Committee meeting of the City of Mesa, Arizona, held on the 16th day of November 2004. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

BARBARA JONES, CITY CLERK

City Council Report

Date: December 2, 2004
To: Mayor and City Council
Through: Mike Hutchinson, City Manager
From: Paul Wenbert, Deputy City Manager
Subject: Ad Hoc Redevelopment Advisory Committee Report to the City Council

Purpose and Recommendation

The purpose of this report is to discuss and consider the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Redevelopment Advisory Committee (Committee). The Committee recommends that the City Council approve the recommendations presented in this report.

Background

The Ad Hoc Redevelopment Advisory Committee is composed of the following members:

- Councilmember Rex Griswold, Chairman
- Steve Adams
- Bev Tittle-Baker
- Louise Daggs
- Art Jordan
- Alex Finter
- Alan Rash
- Dave Richins
- Chuck Riekana
- Jordan Rose
- Joe Shipley

Membership of the Committee does not include anyone who owns property or a business within the Town Center Redevelopment Area (TCRA) due to State Law regarding conflict of interest. The Mayor and City Council charged this Committee with determining whether the TCRA boundaries should change, and examining the advantages and disadvantages of such a decision.

The Committee met eleven (11) times since March 2004. All of the Committee's meetings were open to the public. The Committee also conducted a special meeting on September 14, 2004 to solicit public input. In addition to soliciting input from the public, the Committee also heard several presentations. The following is a list of these presentations, as well as a few key points discussed by the presenter. For a

COUNCIL REPORT

PAGE 2

more detailed synopsis of the presentation(s), please see the approved minutes of the Committee, which have been previously distributed to the City Council.

1. State laws governing redevelopment, including available redevelopment tools

Discussion centered on the various tools that are available to the City for assisting development in a redevelopment area. A few of these tools are: ability to abate Government Property Lease Excise Tax, form a Business Improvement District, and direct participation by the City in the development of infrastructure for a project. Due to the passage of Proposition 105, the use of eminent domain for economic development purposes is severely hindered.

2. Functions of Mesa's Town Center Development and Historic Preservation Office

This office handles the economic development and planning functions for the Town Center Redevelopment Area, and Historic Preservation for the entire City. Included in economic development functions are business recruitment, expansion and retention. This office also helps to resolve issues for downtown businesses by acting as a city liaison for them, coordinating with the various City divisions (i.e. Solid Waste, Building, Electric, Fire, etc.) relating to development issues. Planning and Zoning activities include processing design review, rezoning, Use Permit and Variance requests. In an attempt to provide a higher level of customer service, this office also offers an ombudsmen service (i.e. the same staff person will work with an applicant from the pre-application meeting to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy). This ombudsmen and "one-stop shop" planning service saves applicants processing time.

3. Functions of the Mesa Town Center Corporation

The Mesa Town Center Corporation (MTCC) represents the downtown property and business owners as part of a business improvement district. Some of MTCC's duties are: Public Space and Parking Management, Holiday Lighting, Banners, and Sculptures. MTCC's goals are to:

- a. Work with the City to stimulate private-sector investment
- b. Influence Public Re-Investment Policies and Plans
- c. Encourage Higher Intensity - Office Development
- d. Encourage Higher Density - Residential (Condos, Apts, Townhomes)
- e. Encourage More CARES (Cultural, Arts, Recreation, Entertainment, Sports) Development
- f. Encourage 'New Economy' Facilities - Education Facilities
- g. Encourage Flexible Building Design and Mixed Uses
- h. Recruit Higher End Specialty Retail
- i. Encourage the integration of Diverse Developments (e.g., Broadway Corridor)

COUNCIL REPORT

PAGE 3

4. Improvements to TCRA over the past 20 years

The Committee enjoyed a tour of the TCRA as well as a Powerpoint presentation of the improvements to the TCRA over the past 20 years.

5. City of Tempe's Redevelopment Program, Dave Fackler, former Tempe Development Services Director

Mr. Fackler discussed Tempe's redevelopment program that currently consists of six development areas. Mr. Fackler discussed how the revitalization of Tempe's downtown would not have occurred without the City's use of eminent domain, and other redevelopment tools including the abatement of GPLET, sales tax rebates for infrastructure development, and direct participation by the City in the development of infrastructure for a project.

Mr. Fackler also commented that in speaking with members of the development community, he has learned that they view Mesa as somewhat "schizophrenic" and they are unsure whether the City would remain a partner, for example, on multi-phase, long-term projects.

6. Valley-wide perspective on redevelopment, Grady Gammage, Morrison Institute

Mr. Gammage stated that cities reaching build out have concluded that redevelopment efforts must continue, and he noted that both Tempe and Scottsdale are presently addressing redevelopment issues. He expressed the opinion that government entities should streamline the approval processes in order to assist redevelopment efforts. Mr. Gammage explained that the benefits derived by a City as a result of the redevelopment process include an improved visual appearance and a more stable community that requires fewer resources to address public safety issues. Mr. Gammage also expressed an opinion that a community that abandons the downtown area will experience decline in other areas, and that a stable downtown area encourages private investment throughout the community. Mr. Gammage stated that in his opinion a function of government is to create a stable environment for citizens that maintains property values and encourages investment over a long-term period.

Mr. Gammage stated that developers were "scared to death" of Mesa. He stated that developers are reluctant to consider redevelopment projects, and that lending institutions are reluctant to finance projects as a result of Mesa's political climate. Mr. Gammage further stated that the development community perceives that the City of Mesa is strongly opposed to redevelopment.

COUNCIL REPORT

PAGE 4

7. National perspective on redevelopment, Ernie Bleinberger, Hunter Interests Inc.

Mr. Bleinberger discussed how market and development trends favor suburban sprawl, which results in downtown areas fighting for an outflow of resources. In addition, over the years as the downtowns are revitalized, Mr. Bleinberger stated he has seen the need to revitalize strip malls and shopping centers, which initially caused the downtown areas to slip into an economic decline.

Discussion ensued relative to the multiple roles of a public partner in a redevelopment project; a comparison of the USA Niagara Development Corporation (which operates freely in terms of its latitude of power, including taking eminent domain action independent of the City of Niagara Falls) and the Mesa Town Center Corporation (an entity formed for the purpose of managing a municipal improvement district); the fact that a development corporation could enhance Mesa's effectiveness from a redevelopment and revitalization perspective; the benefits of a tax increment financing district; and various studies conducted by Hunter Interests for the City of Mesa.

Mr. Bleinberger concluded his remarks by commenting that there are many exciting downtown redevelopment opportunities for the City of Mesa, including the Mesa Aquatic Center, Mesa Community College's increased presence in the downtown area, and an area located in close proximity to the South Center Campus which could be the site of a mixed-use project including a hotel, sports-oriented retail, and restaurants. He stressed, however, that an essential element for the success of such projects is the coordination efforts of Mesa's Town Center Development Office.

8. Proposed City of Mesa Infill Development Policy

The proposed Infill Development Policy was presented to the Committee. The Planning Division presented this report to the City Council in August 2004. One of the key points of the "Infill Working Committee Final Report" is that since the City is near build-out, development will once again focus on the center of the City as opposed to its outer edges. There are multiple reasons why an infill property may have gone undeveloped overtime, and it will take a collaborative effort to develop these properties. The proposed Infill Development Policy proposes several recommendations on how to facilitate infill development such as: use existing planning and engineering related programs and processes, develop modifications to existing zoning ordinance requirements, and create special districts/areas to assist with revitalization efforts.

9. Neighborhood Development Corporations, Karen LaFrance, NEDCO

Karen LaFrance, Executive Director of NEDCO, explained that a Community Development Corporation (CDC) is generally defined as a tool, methodology or process to engage both private and public sector in revitalization activities

COUNCIL REPORT

PAGE 5

and investment. Ms. LaFrance stated that the mission of CDCs is to achieve community economic and social betterment by empowering citizens and/or areas, which are not in the mainstream.

10. Impact of Proposition 105 --- Use of Eminent Domain

City Attorney Debbie Spinner advised the Committee that any property acquired through the use of eminent domain can not be dedicated, sold, leased, or otherwise transferred to a private person, partnership, corporation, or other entity for a period of ten years following the acquisition of the property by the City.

11. Conservative perspective on redevelopment, Tim Keller, Institute for Justice

Tim Keller, Executive Director of the Arizona Chapter of the Institute for Justice, addressed the Committee and advised that the Institute for Justice does not oppose Redevelopment. Rather, they are opposed to utilizing eminent domain as a redevelopment tool.

12. Public Comment

The Committee conducted a meeting on September 14, 2004 to obtain comments from the public. At the meeting there were 10 citizens who chose to speak. Basically, these citizens stated that the City should maintain the focus on revitalizing the Downtown, and encourage new residential development. One citizen expressed his frustration regarding the disposition of 146 W. Main (property previously owned by the City of Mesa).

13. Economic Development activities affecting redevelopment, Richard Mulligan, Mesa Economic Development Director

Mr. Mulligan discussed his Division's economic development efforts for the City of Mesa. Mr. Mulligan expressed his opinion that the City is in the second wave of economic growth, revitalization of the older parts of the City. Mr. Mulligan also stated that the City needs to maintain as many economic development tools as it can in order to be able to stay competitive with the Valley Cities. For example, companies that plan to relocate send out a questionnaire asking what incentives does your City offer (i.e. Enterprise Zone, Sales Tax abatements, Redevelopment, Abatement of Property Tax, Waiver of Fees, etc.).

Discussion

These presentations generated a substantial amount of discussion among the Committee. Consequently, the scope of work for the committee expanded to include commenting on how to address revitalization needs in the older parts of the City.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Redevelopment Advisory Committee:

I. Town Center Development Area

1. Retain existing redevelopment area designation, and retain existing Downtown Development Committee (DDC) structure. This structure grants the DDC the duties of the Planning and Zoning Board and the Design Review Board, acting in an advisory capacity to the City Council.
2. Recognize the limitations that proposition 105 imposes on economic development efforts, and that new development and/or redevelopment will be done without the use of eminent domain.

II. Create new Neighborhood Business Investment Areas in Mesa that focuses on economic development within neighborhoods

1. Create Neighborhood Business Investment Areas, and develop an aggressive implementation plan that includes goals to prevent the further decline of these areas and promote the long-term economic sustainability of same.

The Ad Hoc Redevelopment Committee expressed that it is important to address these areas while problems were still manageable so that they do not require more intensive redevelopment strategies in the future and to ensure long-term economic sustainability.

2. Facilitate the creation of a new committee that handles infill and projects in these areas, which would follow the DDC structure. The new committee may include members from several existing boards, such as Planning and Zoning, Design Review and DDC, as well as neighborhood representatives. This recommendation is one of many options addressed in the concurrence section.
3. Develop criteria for designating these areas.
4. Develop a list of available tools for these areas.
5. Build capacity for Community Development Corporations (CDC) within these areas.
6. Develop funding strategies for CDC(s). Assist in identifying grant opportunities, including possible CDBG application, etc.

7. Develop concept plans for these areas.

III. Other Issues

1. Support State legislation to allow Business Improvement Districts outside of a Redevelopment Area if so desired by the property owners within the proposed district.
2. Develop and implement a pro-active aggressive marketing plan to attract new development (retail, restaurants, office, and residential) in the TCRA, and the new neighborhood business investment areas.
3. Implement the recommendations outlined in the Hunter Interests Inc. report dated September 12, 2002 including the use of Request for Proposals to develop city owned properties in the TCRA.

Fiscal Impact

The recommendation to retain the existing Town Center Redevelopment Area (TCRA) designation does not have an immediate fiscal impact on the City of Mesa. Investment in the Neighborhood Business Investment Areas and the TCRA will continue to attract revenue streams to the City and other government entities. The committee believes that the City has a strong role to play as the facilitator of public and private partnerships in the TCRA and the new Neighborhood Business Investment Areas. The more resources that the city invests in these partnerships, it will lead to higher levels of economic stability for the neighborhoods.

City staff will be making specific recommendations in the 2005/2006 budget for resources to devote to Neighborhood Business Investment Areas.

Concurrence

City staff has recently formed an internal team comprised of staff from the City Manager's Office, City Attorney's Office, Development Services and Neighborhood Services Departments and the Office of Economic Development to address service improvements and staffing issues related to new and existing development. One of the main purposes of the Team is develop ways to assist neighborhood small businesses through the development process. Some of the recommendations that may come before City Council for consideration include:

1. Streamline citywide and/or Neighborhood Business Investment Area planning and zoning processes including, but not limited to the following options:
 - a. Establish a new advisory board that reviews infill cases and/or all projects in these areas, which would follow the DDC structure.
 - b. Delegate City Council authority to the Planning and Zoning Board to approve minor site plan modifications;

COUNCIL REPORT

PAGE 8

- c. Utilize a Zoning Hearing Officer to recommend minor rezoning cases or modifications to zoning conditions to the City Council (instead of going before the Planning and Zoning Board);
 - d. Establish a Zoning Hearing Officer process for Planning and Zoning and Design Review cases in conjunction with the development of Neighborhood or Village Planning Committees (City of Phoenix model).
2. Expand the City's Project Coordination efforts (currently housed within the Building Safety Division) to include assigning a project coordinator to each Neighborhood Business Investment Area who will serve as the customer's primary point of contact through the entire development process (beginning with planning/zoning through building permits ending with certificate of occupancy).
 3. Develop modifications to the existing zoning ordinance requirements such as creating modifications to existing standards in order to enable infill development to be more economically competitive.
 4. Modify the list of permitted uses in zoning districts to create opportunities for mixed land use zoning districts i.e. permit residential uses in commercial districts or small service or office uses in residential districts through a Special Use Permit.
 5. Facilitate the development of Specific Neighborhood Plans to address land uses, development standards, and economic development of designated geographic areas.
 6. Establish Infill Development Incentive Districts which allow the City Council to permit some waivers of development related fees and relief from development standards within specific districts to encourage area revitalization.
 7. Analyze staffing needs to implement the above recommendations.

The recommendation of the Ad Hoc Redevelopment Advisory Committee complies with the City of Mesa's 2025 General Plan:

Land Use Element, Goal LU-6 --- Provide for a diverse and dynamic Town Center within the City of Mesa that exhibits Mesa's historic character, supports the governmental campus, and offers opportunities for reinvesting in neighborhoods and businesses that offer a unique character or history.

Land Use Element, Objective LU-2.1 --- Promote Mesa's unique identity by encouraging the revitalization, preservation, or development of community sub-areas throughout the City.

Economic Development Element, Policy ED-2.1b --- Through the use of public and private funding mechanisms, provide the infrastructure needed to support mixed use,

high intensity development within the employment centers/corridors.

Economic Development Element, Policy ED-2.1c --- Use incentives to attract high quality commercial and industrial development to the employment centers/corridors.

Economic Development Element, Policy ED-2.1e --- Encourage the continued development and revitalization of office and retail centers within Mesa Town Center, Fiesta Quadrant, and Superstition Springs.

Economic Development Element, Objective ED-3.2 --- Support a comprehensive educational system to produce a competitive workforce that supports the employment centers/corridors.

Economic Development Element, Objective ED-3.4 --- Maintain a well-rounded community in terms of recreational, cultural, educational, and health care opportunities.

Growth Area Element, Policy GA-1.1 d --- Promote infill and new residential development in areas convenient to the City's Economic Activity Areas.

Growth Area Element, Objective GA-1.2 --- To maximize public investment in both residential and employment uses that will directly and indirectly generate municipal revenue in growth areas.

Revitalization and Redevelopment Element Policy RR-1.1 d --- Promote mid and high rise mixed residential (i.e. 40 du/ac) and office uses in the Town Center, reserving ground floor space for retail and other supportive uses in the Pedestrian Overlay Area.

Revitalization and Redevelopment Element Goal RR-2 --- Attract development to vacant areas within an urbanized community through the use of infill incentives and innovative design.

Revitalization and Redevelopment Element Goal RR-3 --- Promote the active participation of citizens and local business leaders in addressing the needs of their neighborhoods.

Revitalization and Redevelopment Element Objective RR-7.2 --- Encourage private investment and development within established and mature areas of the City.

Revitalization and Redevelopment Element Policy RR-7.2a --- Provide technical assistance to existing businesses and investors/developers proposing projects within the Mesa Town Center Concept Plan and other redevelopment plans.

Revitalization and Redevelopment Element Policy RR-7.2d --- Consider the creation of business improvement districts within redevelopment areas to provide enhanced municipal and management services.

COUNCIL REPORT

PAGE 10

Housing Element Objective H-1.1 --- Identify and recognize the changing needs of the City's maturing neighborhoods and take steps to stabilize and upgrade these areas.

Housing Element Policy H-1.1b --- Identify and prioritize neighborhoods where reinvestment will result in net improvement.

Housing Element Policy H-1.1f--- Explore other alternative techniques for the stabilization of existing neighborhoods, including financial incentives and loan programs.

Housing Element Objective H-1.3 --- Encourage development and revitalization projects in all areas of Mesa that provide a variety of housing types to meet the needs of the growing population.

Housing Element Objective H-1.4 --- Encourage redevelopment and/or renovation of substandard residential neighborhoods.

As stated earlier in the report, the Ad Hoc Redevelopment Advisory Committee conducted a public meeting on September 14, 2004. At this meeting the stakeholders were very supportive of the proposal to maintain the revitalization efforts of the Downtown. In the 2000 City of Mesa Community Survey, 91% said redeveloping older parts of the community was very important or somewhat important (50% Very Important, 41% Somewhat Important). Revitalizing Downtown Mesa was also identified as an improvement that would make the biggest difference to the quality of life in Mesa.

Patrick Murphy, Sr. Town Center
Dev. Specialist

Shelly Allen, Town Center Dev.
Administrator

Lisha Adela Garcia,
Neighborhood Services Manager

Paul Wenbert, Deputy City Manager

Mike Hutchinson, City Manager

K;Redev/adhoccommittee/ccrptadhoc