



AD HOC REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

January 10, 2005

The Ad Hoc Redevelopment Advisory Committee met at Anzio Landing Italian Restaurant, 2613 N. Thunderbird Circle, on January 10, 2005 at 5:40 p.m.

COMMITTEE PRESENT

Rex Griswold, Chairman
Steve Adams
Louise Daggs
Alex Finter
Art Jordan
Alan Rash
Dave Richins
Chuck Riekema
Joe Shipley

COMMITTEE ABSENT

Jordan Rose
Bev Title-Baker

STAFF PRESENT

Paul Wenbert
Lisha Garcia
Shelly Allen
Patrick Murphy
Bonnie Andersen

OTHERS PRESENT

Brian Powell – Tribune

Chairman Griswold excused Committeemember Riekema from the beginning of the meeting. He arrived at 6:14 p.m.

1. Approve minutes of December 7, 2004 meeting.

Committeemember Richins requested that his name be removed under the listing of "Committee Present." He noted that the minutes also correctly list him as being absent.

It was moved by Committeemember Adams, seconded by Committeemember Rash, that the December 7, 2004 minutes be approved, as corrected.

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 item 2 on page 2 of the revised draft report dated January 4, 2005 (see Attachment) and recalled that the Historic Preservation Office once required an archeological excavation for a case in an approved M-1 zone. He encouraged the Historic Preservation Office to cooperate with developers.

Town Center Development Administrator Shelly Allen advised that staff has changed the process to address that issue. She explained that future cases would include an archeological excavation as a suggestion rather than a stipulation.

Chairman Griswold directed the Committee's attention to the "Recommendations" section on page 6 of the draft report.

In response to a question from Committeemember Shipley regarding recommendation 1.a, Ms. Allen advised that the Downtown Development Committee (DDC) handles variances by making recommendations to Zoning/Civil Hearing Administrator John Gendron. Ms. Allen stated that two or three cases are normally on the agenda, and that the current process operates smoothly and in a timely manner.

Committeemember Richins suggested that the role of the DDC be broadened to consider infill projects rather than forming a new committee for that purpose.

Discussion ensued relative to the fact that additional support staff would be required in order to broaden the role of the DDC; that as the City approaches build-out, the number of infill and rehabilitation cases will increase as the number of large developments on open land decrease; and that the effectiveness of a committee depends on the qualifications of the appointees.

Committeemember Jordan inquired about the proposal a few years ago to consider forming a Redevelopment Committee rather than having the DDC handle any potential new redevelopment areas.

Deputy City Manager Paul Wenbert indicated two possible reasons: 1) to keep the DDC's focus on downtown because of the downtown's importance to the City; and 2) the fact that interest had been expressed by representatives from other boards such as the Planning and Zoning Board and the Design Review Board in serving on a Redevelopment Committee for continuity and to utilize the expertise of those Boardmembers.

Chairman Griswold stated that he discussed the possibility of creating an infill board with several Planning and Zoning (P&Z) Boardmembers, and that the members indicated support for the proposal.

Committeemember Finter expressed the opinion that the DDC model, which streamlines processes and combines various board functions, is a good approach to addressing infill. He added that concerns exist regarding an infill board's decision-making process being impacted by a lack of consistency and the potential for political pressure. He also stated the opinion that an effective infill board would include experienced representatives from the Board of Adjustment, the Planning and Zoning Board, and the Design Review Board.

Additional discussion ensued relative to the fact that a Committee recommendation accepted by the Council would be implemented in a manner determined by the Council; that a streamlined, one-stop process is proposed for small, complicated infill projects; and that infill projects require special handling due to the fact that significant neighborhood input is usually generated.

Further discussion ensued relative to the fact that Recommendations II.a and II.b were acceptable to the Committee; that the volunteer board described in item II.c could effectively

address issues without being subject to the Open Meetings Law or Robert's Rules of Order; and that the volunteer board could serve as a "keeper of the vision" for downtown Mesa.

Ms. Allen noted that the Committee's recommendation is to continue the current practice outlined in item II.d.

Additional discussion ensued relative to item 11.d, and the Committeemembers agreed to insert the word "previously" as follows:

Continue the practice of only assessing impact fees for the service demand that the new development may create over and above what previously occurred on the site.

Chairman Griswold reviewed items II.e, f and g, and the Committeemembers expressed concurrence with the items as presented.

Addressing the recommendations listed under item III, Chairman Griswold requested that Ms. Garcia outline the definition of a Neighborhood Business Investment Area (NBIA).

Ms. Garcia stated that the City's traditional economic development focus is to attract major employers to large parcels of land. She advised that Committee discussions identified a need to provide assistance to smaller, neighborhood businesses located outside of the downtown area. Ms. Garcia explained that a Neighborhood Business Investment Area (NBIA) proposes streamlined City processes in order to assist "Mom and Pop" stores and neighborhood businesses improve their facilities. She noted that an NBIA is a concept and infill is a tool. She added that NBIA's could utilize infill tools from the planning function in combination with neighborhood economic development tools.

Further discussion ensued regarding the fact that the NBIA process would focus on small neighborhood business expansion rather than constructing a new building; that the process would provide small businesses access to capital and assistance; that an NBIA could be located within an Enterprise Zone; and that "Neighborhood Business Investment Area (NBIA)" is a term unique to the City of Mesa.

Ms. Garcia stated, and Mr. Wenbert concurred, that any fiscal impact would be addressed in the budget process as the internal team continues their efforts.

Mr. Wenbert noted that the internal infill team would consider this Committee's report and recommendations, but he cautioned that the team's progress depends on the resources available.

Ms. Garcia confirmed that development of criteria for designating NBIA areas will include neighborhood and business input. She stated that Mr. Wenbert's team would develop the necessary internal processes prior to soliciting neighborhood input.

Following discussion regarding item III.a, the Committee concurred that the item should be worded as follows:

Develop criteria for designating NBIA areas involving neighborhood and business input.

Chairman Griswold reviewed the remaining items listed under Item III.

Ms. Garcia noted that the Council could identify Neighborhood Business Investment Areas (NBIAs) by employing a process similar to the one utilized to designate Opportunity Zones.

Addressing Recommendation IV, Committeemember Jordan expressed satisfaction with the Committee's efforts, and he noted that infill has not been a priority issue in the City of Mesa until recently.

Mr. Wenbert advised that infill became a critical issue for the City in the past two years. He stated that the importance of infill would continue to increase as the City reaches build out, and he added that the City is attempting to anticipate future needs in this area.

Committeemember Shipley noted that the Committee is recommending a system and process that not only recognizes the law, but also accommodates special and unique circumstances for specific applications. He suggested that the City Attorney be involved in the process to ensure decisions are consistent and fair.

Committeemember Jordan noted that variances to zoning ordinances must be based on law and cannot be arbitrary. He expressed the opinion that candidates appointed to the board should possess the expertise to make appropriate decisions.

Chairman Griswold stated the opinion that the Town Center Development area has been successful, and he recommended that the same process be available in other areas of the City.

Discussion ensued relative to the fact that a decreasing number of cases are considered by P&Z each year; that small infill cases can be complicated and utilize a significant amount of P&Z time; that the City Council creates the City's policies; and that certain decisions could be shifted from the Council to the P&Z Board or the Hearing Officer level in order to streamline the process and provide better service to citizens.

Ms. Garcia noted that the Committee's recommendations would provide the Council with a menu of options targeted at streamlining the approval process.

Committeemember Richins stated that many of the present requirements that add time to the approval process, such as specific timeframes, postings and public hearings, are designed to benefit the neighbors of a proposed project.

Committeemember Shipley added that many aspects of the process are regulated by Arizona Statutes.

In response to a question from Chairman Griswold regarding item IV.d, Committeemember Finter explained that a minor site plan modification could be a change in ownership from one person to many individuals. He noted that this type of minor modification requires the same 85-day time period that is required for a major modification, which could delay the project and impact financing.

Chairman Griswold stated that the Committee's recommendations under item IV apply to infill, but he expressed the opinion that the Council could elect to apply certain recommendations on a Citywide basis.

Addressing the position of Zoning Hearing Officer, Mr. Wenbert stated that the City of Mesa employee reports to the Planning Director, who in turn reports to the Assistant Development Services Manager. He advised that some part-time Hearing Officers were hired to address minor issues, but he noted that their responsibilities are more limited than the position in the City of Phoenix model.

In response to a question from Chairman Griswold, Mr. Wenbert explained that item IV.f was added by Planning staff and that the wording is based on the City of Phoenix model. He expressed concern that the "Village Planning Committee" concept could add a layer of bureaucracy to the process.

Chairman Griswold recommended, and the Committeemembers and staff concurred, that item IV.f be deleted from the recommendations.

Additional discussion ensued relative to the fact that item IV.g proposes to assign a primary contact or coordinator to each NBIA to assist small businesses through the City's approval process; and that small businesses in an NBIA are likely to have only one project during the life of their operation and as a result, they are unfamiliar with City processes and procedures.

Committeemember Adams advised that the architect is typically the person responsible for moving the process forward. He stated that a Project Coordinator presently assigned to one of his projects performs efficiently, but problems occur due to the fact that other City departments fail to communicate effectively with the Project Coordinator.

Further discussion ensued regarding the fact that processes are being redesigned in order to be business friendly; and that a Project Coordinator can quickly schedule a meeting with representatives of many departments to address a problem.

In response to a question from Committeemember Shipley regarding item IV.e, Chairman Griswold stated that the recommendation intends to empower the Zoning Hearing Officer to adjudicate minor cases with defined limitations relative to the power of the position.

Additional discussion ensued regarding the fact that the wording of IV.e limits the Zoning Hearing Officer to presenting recommendations to the City Council rather than making the decisions; that the City of Phoenix model empowers the Zoning Hearing Officer to make decisions on minor cases; that the City Council would hear appeals of the Zoning Hearing Officer's decisions; that the time involved for the process would be substantially shorter; and that public notification could occur earlier in the process.

Chairman Griswold expressed the opinion that IV.e was a good first step, and that in the future the Zoning Hearing Officer could hear minor cases. He advised that City of Phoenix applicants pay for the cost of part-time Zoning Hearing Officers who are retained on an "on-call" basis. Chairman Griswold continued to review recommendations IV.h, j and k, and he noted that item k might not be possible from a legal standpoint.

Chairman Griswold reviewed the items under section V, and stated a preference for the term “anti-slum lord laws” rather than a “rental housing inspection program” as indicated in item V.c.

Discussion ensued relative to the fact that the City Charter prohibits the internal inspection of private property; that the language “...which would require a change in the City Charter” should be deleted from the recommendation; that the existing law has made the City of Mesa an attractive destination for slum landlords; that the title of Section V would be changed to “Revitalization Recommendations;” that the report will be provided to the Council prior to being presented at a Study Session; and that the Council will provide direction to staff regarding implementation of the report’s recommendations.

It was moved by Committeemember Adams, seconded by Committeemember Shipley, that the report be accepted with the following changes:

- Insert the word “previously” in recommendation II.d, as indicated in the following: “Continue the practice of only assessing impact fees for the service demand that the new development may create over and above what previously occurred on the site.”
- Change recommendation III.a to read: “Develop criteria for designating NBIA areas involving neighborhood and business input.”
- Delete recommendation IV.f.
- Change the title of section V to state: “Revitalization Recommendations.”
- Change recommendation V.c to read as follows: “Consider establishing anti-slumlord laws.”

Chairman Griswold declared the motion carried unanimously by those present.

3. Discuss and consider the presentation of the Ad Hoc Redevelopment Advisory Committee report to the City Council.

Chairman Griswold suggested that he and Mr. Wenbert meet with the individual Councilmembers to discuss the report prior to the Study Session presentation.

Following discussion, the Committee concurred that the following sections of the report would be presented to the Council by the Committeemembers indicated below:

Section I	Steve Adams
Section II	Art Jordan
Section III	Joe Shipley
Section IV	Alex Finter
Section V	Dave Richins

Mr. Wenbert suggested that the Committeemembers obtain photographs depicting changes to the Town Center area from Tom Verploegen, Executive Director of the Town Center Corporation, for use in the presentation.

Chairman Griswold recommended that the presenters meet prior to the Study Session to coordinate the presentations.

4. Other items.

There were no other items.

5. Adjournment.

Without objection, the Ad Hoc Redevelopment Advisory Committee adjourned at 7:35 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 10th day of January 2005. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

BARBARA JONES, CITY CLERK

baa

Attachment

DRAFT

City Council Report

Date: TBD REVISED 1/4/05

To: City Council

From: Rex Griswold, Chairperson

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 Riekema
- 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 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 twelve (12) 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. 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.

COUNCIL REPORT

PAGE 2

The following is a list of these presentations, as well as a few key points discussed by the presenter. For a 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 in collaboration with the Office of Economic Development. 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

COUNCIL REPORT

PAGE 3

i. Encourage the integration of Diverse Developments (e.g., Broadway Corridor)

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.

COUNCIL REPORT

PAGE 5

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 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.).

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

I. Town Center Development Area

- a. Retain existing redevelopment area designation, and retain existing Downtown Development Committee (DDC) structure whereby the DDC functions as the Planning and Zoning Board and the Design Review Board. The DDC also acts in an advisory capacity to the City Council regarding projects in the redevelopment area.

II. Town Center Development Area --- Additional Issues

- a. Recognize the limitations that proposition 105 impose on economic development efforts, and that new development and/or redevelopment will be done without the use of eminent domain.
- b. Continue working with Mesa Community College to expand their campus in Downtown Mesa.
- c. Support a volunteer non-City board whose purpose is to champion the revitalization of Downtown Mesa. This board will maintain communications with the City Council on innovative ways to continue implementing the City's vision for revitalizing the downtown as set forth in the 1999 Mesa Town Center Concept Plan as amended from time to time.
- d. Continue the practice of only assessing impact fees for the service demand that the new development may create over and above what occurred on the site.
- e. Develop and implement a pro-active aggressive marketing plan to attract new development (retail, restaurants, office, and residential) in the TCRA.
- f. Implement the recommendations outlined in the Hunter Interests Inc. report dated September 12, 2002 including the use of, but not limited to the flexible and revised Request for Proposals system to develop city owned properties in the TCRA.
- g. Encourage new residential development, including multi-family, to help stimulate non-residential downtown development.

III. Create new Neighborhood Business Investment Areas (NBIA) in Mesa that focus on economic development within neighborhoods

- a. Develop criteria for designating NBIA areas.

COUNCIL REPORT

PAGE 7

- b. Develop a list of available tools for NBIA.
- c. Facilitate the development of NBIA specific plans to address economic development of designated geographic areas.
- d. Develop and implement a pro-active aggressive marketing plan to attract new development (retail, restaurants, office, and residential) in the new neighborhood business investment areas.
- e. Establish Neighborhood Business Investment Areas which allow the City Council to permit some waivers of development related fees (the waiver or rebate to be paid by the general fund) and relief from development standards within specific districts to encourage area revitalization.

IV. City-wide Infill

Including, but not limited to one or more of the following options:

- a. Define Infill.
- b. Implement a city review process for infill & NBIA's that mirrors the current DDC one stop shop process. Establish a new advisory board that reviews infill cases and/or all projects in the NBIA's, which would follow the DDC structure. The new committee may include members from several existing boards, such as Planning and Zoning, Design Review, and the DDC, as well as neighborhood representatives.
- c. Facilitate the development of specific plans to address land uses, development standards, and economic development of designated geographic areas.
- d. Delegate City Council authority to the Planning and Zoning Board to approve site plan modifications with an appeals process in place;
- e. 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); The Zoning Officer's actions will be guided by adopted Council policy and direction founded in long term community vision.
- f. 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).
- g. Expand the City's Project Coordination efforts within the Building Safety Division to include assigning a project coordinator to each NBIA's 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).

COUNCIL REPORT

PAGE 8

- h. 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.
- i. All development codes and standards should be reviewed to address barriers to infill development and rehabilitation of older buildings, and systems should be designed to expedite this development.
- j. Expand 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.
- k. Establish Infill Development Incentive Districts which allow the City Council to permit some waivers of development related fees (the waiver or rebate to be paid by the general fund) and relief from development standards within specific districts to encourage area revitalization.

V. Other Issues

- a. Provide City staff availability to assist the formation of Community Development Corporations (CDC) within these areas.
- b. Develop funding strategies for CDC(s). Assist in identifying grant opportunities, including possible CDBG application, etc.
- c. Consider establishing a rental housing inspection program, which would require a change in the City Charter.
- d. Support State legislation to allow Business Improvement Districts outside of a redevelopment area if so desired by the property owners within the proposed district.

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. The intent of investing in Neighborhood Business Investment Areas and the TCRA is to enhance their economic viability and tax base. 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.

City staff will be considering recommending adding or reallocating resources to devote to Neighborhood Business Investment Areas and infill as part of the 2005/2007-budget process.

Concurrence

COUNCIL REPORT

PAGE 9

The recommendations of the Ad Hoc Redevelopment Advisory Committee comply 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-2.1 c --- Use incentives to attract high quality commercial and industrial development to the employment centers/corridors.

Economic Development Element, Policy ED-2.1 e --- 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-1.1d --- 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

COUNCIL REPORT

PAGE 10

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.

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-1.1 f --- 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).