

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

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

MEMBERS PRESENT

Dave Wier, Chair
Art Jordan, Vice Chair
Vince DiBella
Wayne Pomeroy
Mark Reeb
Chuck Riekema
Terry Smith

STAFF PRESENT

Katrina Bradshaw
Gerry Fathauer
Tony Felice
Kate O'Mara
Greg Marek
Amy Morales
Patrick Murphy
Bryan Raines

OTHERS PRESENT

Angela Dye

MEMBERS ABSENT

Theresa Carmichael
Robert Fletcher

1. Call to Order

The April 17, 2003 meeting of the Downtown Development Committee was called to order at 7:33 a.m. in the City Council Chambers located at 57 E. First Street by Chair Wier.

2. Items from Citizens Present

There were no items from citizens present.

3. Approval of Minutes of March 20, 2003 Study Session

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

Vote: 7 in favor; 0 opposed

Approval of Minutes of March 20, 2003 Regular Meeting

It was moved by Chuck Riekema, seconded by Wayne Pomeroy to approve the minutes.

Vote: 7 in favor; 0 opposed

4. Discuss and consider the upper elevation design in DR00-011TC for the One Macdonald Center Building (Site 21), located at 1 N. Macdonald St.

Chair Wier declared a conflict of interest for himself as well as for Vince DiBella, and turned this portion of the meeting over to Mr. Jordan.

Mr. Murphy stated that the DDC had originally approved the Design Review case for One Macdonald Center on January 18, 2001 along with eight stipulations. One of the stipulations was that upper elevations and an exhibit for the entire length of the building would be re-submitted for review to the DDC. Staff is asking for direction from the DDC for the upper elevations and for any additional changes to the plans.

Mr. Valentine stated that there were no color elevations available for the DDC's review. Mr. Valentine stated that he is seeking input on modifications to the previously approved design of this project by the DDC, two years ago by a different developer. The current developer is choosing not to develop the basement and to alter the building's core. In the previous core, the restrooms were in front of the elevators, which have since been relocated closer to where the original restrooms were located, in order to free up interior floor space. By having done this, slightly altering the exterior curtain walls on the east and north sides of the building.

Mr. Valentine stated that the previous plans showed the building's columns as being very pronounced and on the southwest column being very pronounced, with the curtain wall curving behind the column, which further emphasized that column. By previously curving the column it created a small exposed area of the floor plate, which he believes would cause a problem with bird landings. This has led them to the present design that will emphasize the corner, placing the curtain wall in front of the column creating a sleeker design.

Mr. Valentine stated that he was previously instructed to provide more detail and emphasis on the building's cornice, which he has done by emphasizing the cornice all the way across the freeze and the top of the building, providing a cap to the top of the columns. Mr. Valentine is proposing to come back to the DDC at a future date to provide more details. Mr. Valentine stated that he is seeking the DDC's guidance and acceptance of the new ideas and schemes. Mr. Valentine then opened the discussion up for questions.

Ms. Smith questioned what the design was of the lighting on top the doorway, as well as what type of material would be part of the covering.

Mr. Valentine responded that in the original concept that was approved those were light fixtures (luminaries), which have not been modified, but simply moved down. Their intention is to provide down-lighting; they are trying to light the face of the building. Mr. Valentine added that the material would be steel.

Mr. Riekema questioned if the lighting would be a lattice type light as opposed to a solid form of lighting.

Mr. Valentine answered that Mr. Riekema was correct; the lighting would be a lattice type. Adding that the original design concept created by the previous developer that was approved by the DDC had an active balcony, Out Source International does not wish to have this area as a balcony. In keeping with the same vernacular look, they would like to turn this area into a shade structure.

They propose to create a ramada by installing perpendicular metal slats that would create a nice filtered light, which would be open and break up the heat, and allow for ventilation.

Mr. Riekema questioned why the stonework that would be located on three of the four corners of the building could not be continued and be placed on all four of the corners.

Mr. Valentine responded that he believes that this section of the building that is located on the corner of Macdonald and Main is one of the building's most dominant corners to the downtown. Mr. Valentine's goal is to differentiate and emphasize this corner from the other corners of the building.

Mr. Reeb questioned what the material is on the horizontal bands on the columns of the top floor.

Mr. Valentine responded that the material is a brownish synthetic stucco system. Adding that the color of the stone is a type of sandstone color accented with a rose color.

Mr. Reeb asked for clarification as to whether or not the stone would be located on the vertical columns all the way up to the top floor and stopping, with stone being installed on the main level.

Mr. Valentine answered that Mr. Reeb was correct.

Mr. Reeb also commented that from a structural or functional standpoint, the southeast corner of the building is no different than the southwest as far as the ability of installing a matching or similar column on the corner.

Mr. Valentine stated that they are choosing to emphasize the southwest corner because it is one of the most prominent corners of the building. Mr. Valentine added that the southeast corner has an odd residual space, adding that they have no real interest to develop that corner.

Mr. Pomeroy questioned if the glass on the southeast corner of the building is rounded or straight.

Mr. Valentine answered that behind the column the glass actually does a soft curve, which is hardly noticeable in the provided rendering. The column is a freestanding column. Mr. Valentine stated that he does not feel that this column greatly differentiates this corner, adding that this corner needs a greater emphasis than just another column that was similar in design to the rest of the columns. He also felt that the curved curtain wall behind the column was so subtle, it was not going to achieve what the original designer had intended it to. However, Mr. Valentine does feel very strongly that other issues do exist, such as aesthetics and health. It was his desire to rethink the design of the southwest corner.

Mr. Pomeroy added that he favored the original look that was presented for the southeast corner, giving special character to the building.

Mr. Valentine stated that by relocating the curtain wall in front of the existing column and letting the greenish glass wrap around it, he is hoping to give the building a sleeker look.

Mr. Pomeroy questioned the approximate sizes of the top and bottom shades.

Mr. Valentine answered that the bottom shade projects approximately ten-feet (10') with the upper shade projecting about four (4') to five feet (5'), which would be very similar to the existing colonnade.

Mr. Jordan commented that the challenge presented when working with this building is the integration of some of the historical elements, which would require a larger amount of guidance. Mr. Jordan stated that he does appreciate the contemporary direction of this building, suggesting that there could some element included that could occur only in the top six feet (6') of this building, adding a signature to the building. Mr. Jordan also requested that Mr. Valentine provide a color board at the next presentation. Mr. Jordan questioned the material of the columns supporting the colonnade, adding that he does not feel that the building has to include the traditional downtown color of hunter green.

Mr. Valentine answered that the material is proposed to be painted steel.

Mr. Jordan asked if the DDC were to ask that this item be continued for a short period of time, so that the architect can integrate the comments.

Mr. Valentine stated that this continuance would be acceptable.

Mr. Marek stated that as part of the performance requirements in the Redevelopment Agreement the architect must do what ever is possible to make the recommended changes, and present this issue to the DDC at their May meeting.

Mr. Reeb wanted to make sure that the applicant knows he has confidence in the work that is being proposed, but is not convinced that he agrees with what is being proposed to be done on the southwest corner. Mr. Riekema agreed with Mr. Reeb.

It was moved by Charles Riekema, seconded by Terry Smith, that Case No. DR00-11TC be continued until the May DDC meeting.

Vote: 7 in favor; 0 opposed

5. Discuss draft guidelines for placement of permanent sculptures in downtown Mesa.

Mr. Jordan then turned the meeting over to Chair Wier.

Mr. Marek stated that Gerry Fathauer and Kate O'Mara from the Arts and Cultural Division were present, as well as Angela Dye, a landscape architect. The item was placed on the agenda to allow the DDC to comment on the guidelines that Angela Dye's firm has prepared regarding the placement of permanent sculptures in downtown Mesa. Mr. Mark explained that the draft report has been attached to the board's report.

Ms. Fathauer added that the report was not intended to be viewed by anyone other than City Staff, adding that the report was in a rough draft form, and had not been finalized.

Mr. Marek added if anyone did have some suggested changes that they could give the comments to him, and he would be sure to forward the comments to the Arts & Cultural Division.

Mr. Wier inquired if any of the board members had any questions.

Mr. Reeb asked for clarification as to whether or not the Permanent Sculpture Panel was responsible for selecting the sculptures as well as the locations where the sculptures are to be placed.

Ms. Fathauer explained that she and Ms. O'Mara staff the Permanent Sculpture Panel in an advisory capacity, which is a partnership between the City and Ultimate Imaginations, Inc. (UII). Ms. Fathauer stated that they were asked to take on the responsibility of determining where the permanent sculptures should be located. Using Public Art funds, Angela Dye was retained to determine where the sculptures should be placed.

Mr. Riekema questioned Ms. Fathauer if she felt that the DDC should play a role in deciding where the permanent sculptures should be placed, especially because the sculptures are going to be located in the downtown.

Ms. Fathauer responded that the appropriate board to make any recommendations on anything pertaining to public art is the Museum and Cultural Advisory Board.

Mr. Riekema again asked if the DDC should play a role in the placement of sculptures. Ms. Fathauer responded no.

Mr. Jordan questioned Ms. Fathauer who was the beneficiary of reading the report and who was to be enlightened on how to place sculptures in the downtown.

Ms. Fathauer responded that the Permanent Sculpture Panel was to receive the report; they had originally requested the information.

Mr. Jordan stated that he believes that everyone involved shares a common goal, which is to place the sculptures in ideal locations so that the majority of people who experience the artwork will feel that their life has been enhanced in a certain way. Mr. Jordan added that any opinion shared by people that are going to make the final decisions should pass the acid test, that the decision is solid, enabling them to gain the surrounding committees' support.

Ms. Fathauer stated that she does agree with Mr. Jordan. Adding that as professional staff she has certain standards, and would have preferred if the DDC did desire to view the report, that the DDC viewed the appropriate version, and that the Arts and Cultural Division was part of that process.

Mr. Jordan then questioned Mr. Marek as to what had happened. Why was a copy of the report distributed to the DDC before Ms. Fathauer was ready to distribute the document?

Mr. Marek clarified that the Redevelopment Division was not copied on this particular report. Mr. Marek had obtained a copy of this report Mr. Tom Verploegen of Mesa Town Center, Corp., which included Mr. Verploegen's comments. Mr. Marek had discussed this issue with Ms. Fathauer and it was Mr. Marek's understanding that the DDC would not have any opportunity to review the draft guidelines before they were approved. The draft in the DDC packets is the only opportunity the DDC has to make comments before it is finalized. Mr. Marek further discussed this issue with Chair Wier, and the item was then requested by Chair Wier to be placed on the agenda.

Mr. Marek stated that he and Ms. Fathauer did discuss that this report did still need to be finalized. At that time, it was also discussed that the document was to be used as guidelines by the Arts and Cultural Division to place sculptures in the downtown. Mr. Marek then stated that the purpose of placing this item on the DDC agenda was to give the DDC the opportunity to review the information and provide comments to the Arts and Cultural Division to take under advisement, leaving it up to the Arts and Cultural Division to decide how to finalize the draft document. Mr. Marek concluded that he believed this was the only opportunity that the DDC would have to review and comment on the actual guidelines.

Mr. Jordan stated that he is not in favor of turning over the full authority of making decisions as to where the permanent sculptures are to be placed to the Arts and Cultural Division. Mr. Jordan feels that if the decisions that are being made by the Arts and Cultural Division are good enough, they should be able to pass the acid test and be able to sway the Permanent Sculpture Panel members.

Ms. Fathauer responded that she is one of the strongest proponents that anyone will ever see in a city anywhere for public input and comment, adding

that the development of the Mesa Arts Center was one of the most public and participatory processes in this country, having over 250 people invited to over forty meetings.

Ms. Fathauer welcomed everyone's comments at any time, and invited everyone to attend the Museum and Cultural Advisory Board meeting, stating that the meetings are held on the second Wednesdays of the month, and the next meeting is on May 14, 2003 at 3:30 p.m. Adding that the Permanent Sculpture Panel has yet to discuss the draft reports, that includes the cleaned up language. Ms. Fathauer once again asked that no one misunderstand what had actually happened during this hearing, and she could not agree more that the document is merely guidelines.

Mr. Jordan stated that he feels strongly if the people that comprise the DDC are not qualified to serve as the design review and planning and zoning board for all downtown issues, then why would they not be included as part of the process in deciding where items are placed in the downtown.

Chair Wier stated that he felt that the board should review these draft guidelines because the DDC is responsible for decisions made in the downtown area. Chair Wier's original intent was simply to bring the DDC up to date on the draft guidelines.

Mr. Verploegen stated that there is possibly some miscommunication going on. He stated that he was unsure who received copies of this draft document, when he received this document he originally had intended to respond with his comments to the UII Board, and then to the Permanent Sculpture Panel. As a part of MTCC normal process when completing correspondence, they copy the Redevelopment Office. Mr. Verploegen stated that the most important issue that he needed to stress was whether or not a majority of the sculptures were going to be movable or where they intended to be permanent. Adding that it is his experience that the majority of the sculptures should be moveable, and some of the sculptures should be permanent. Mr. Verploegen stated that it is very important to have a determination made whether a majority of the sculptures should be moveable or not. He feels that the guidelines are being created before the actual philosophy is decided. As part of the overall philosophy of Mesa being the City of Sculptures with the downtown being the showcase, the philosophy should be decided as to the placement of the sculptures being moveable or permanent.

Chair Wier expressed his appreciation to Ms. Fathauer and apologized for prematurely bringing this issue to the DDC.

Mr. Jordan stated that the DDC should determine whether or not they make decisions and recommendations that include Mr. Verploegen's philosophy when it comes to moveable or permanent sculptures, and most importantly whether or not the DDC should be given the opportunity to make a decision regarding the guidelines that Ms. Fathauer is working on.

6. Director's Report, Greg Marek

Four Wheel Parts – Staff has worked with the business to properly install and reposition the landscaping.

Revisions to the sign ordinance that redefined the window definitions was approved by the City Council on April 7, 2003.

Upcoming items to the City Council, Monday, April 21, 2003 – Rezoning for City Well Site, Tribune C.U.P., approval of the agreements for the Mitten & Pomeroy houses.

Arizona Bronze – Amendments are being made to the M.O.U. to allow for direct purchases of the land and extend the time period. It will be brought to the next available City Council Meeting.

Upcoming DDC projects – Two small retail centers, one on the southeast corner of Country Club Dr. and University, and the other on the southwest corner of Country Club Dr. and University.

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

Strategic Priorities – MTCC & UII has come up with 36 new projects and 54 that have been continued, currently working to prioritize projects for next fiscal year.

MTCC Board Nominations – Nominations are being accepted, and welcomed; currently there are seven to eight openings.

Celebration of Sculptures – Tuesday, April 22, 2003 at 8:30 a.m., Mesa City Plaza.

10. Board Member Comments

Mr. Jordan stated that he shared Mr. Reeb's comments on the Bank One Building, and encouraged any interested board members to contact Mr. Valentine and Mr. Peters, to better articulate any comments that the DDC Members may have.

11. Adjournment

With there being no further business, this meeting of the Downtown Development Committee adjourned at 8:29 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mr. Gregory J. Marek, Director of Redevelopment
Minutes prepared by Amy Morales