CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

DATE: April 17, 2008 **TIME:** 7:30 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT	**STAFF PRESENT**	**OTHERS PRESENT**
Jeff Jarvis, Chair	Shelly Allen	Winsome Boeing
Adam Decker, Vice Chair	Sue Cason	Marc Soronson
Steve Chucri	Patrick Murphy	Tom Verploegen
Kari Cluff	Mike James	
Linda Flick	Gordon Sheffield	
Gary Gallagher		
Scott Perkinson		
Dean Taylor		

MEMBERS ABSENT
Gregory Holtz

1. **Call to Order**
The April 17, 2008 meeting of the Downtown Development Committee was called to order at 7:34 a.m. at the City Council Chambers, Upper Level 57 E. First Street by Chair Jeff Jarvis.

2. **Approval of Minutes of the February 21, 2008 Regular Meeting.**

It was moved by Adam Decker and seconded by Dean Taylor to approve the minutes of February 21, 2008.

Vote: 8 in favor
0 opposed

3. **Consider and Take Action on Design Review Case No. DR08-01TC for a Public Arts Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Shelter located at 1 Main Street, and three regular BRT Shelters located at 20 East Main Street, 310 East Main Street and 311 East Main Stree.**

This item was removed from the agenda.

4. Consider and Take Action on the Text Amendment to the Mesa 2025 General Plan . Minor General Plan Amendment (Case No. GPMinor08-02) to describe how the City of Mesa defines the Land Use Categories for the Town Center Concept Plan.

Mr. Murphy stated that the Downtown Development Committee (DDC) is to consider a Resolution to amend the General Plan to include the definitions of the Land Use Categories. The City Council approved the Town Center Concept Plan in 1999. The Town Center Concept Plan was incorporated into the General Plan Update in 2002. The purpose of the amendment is to define the Land Use Categories to help people understand how staff and the City define these categories.

This is the second required public meeting that the Downtown Development Committee is required to conduct and make a recommendation to the City Council to approve the proposed Minor General Plan Amendment (MGPA). Staff has not received any negative comments from the public concerning this amendment.

Staff is recommending approval of the Minor General Plan Amendment.

It was moved by Adam Decker and seconded by Gary Gallagher to recommend approval of the Text Amendment to the Mesa 2025 General Plan. Minor General Plan Amendment (Case No. GPMinor08-02) to describe how the City of Mesa defines the Land Use Categories for the Town Center Concept Plan.

Vote: 8 in favor
0 opposed

5. Discuss and Consider the following cases GPMinor08-03 and ZA08-01TC for the property located south of University Drive, east of Pasadena, west of Mesa Drive, and north of East Second Street. Approximate total of 26 acres.

Mr. Murphy stated that the subject property is located on the southwest corner of University and Mesa Drives. The City owns all of the property except properties indicated on the aerial map (Exhibit 1) in yellow. The property owners (of the property noted in yellow) were contacted and they expressed no objections to the proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezoning change that will affect their property.

City Council approved a General Plan Amendment and a Rezoning of the property in November of 1998. The General Plan was changed to Arts/Cultural Entertainment. The Rezoning of the property was changed to Town Center Core District (TCC) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) Overlay District and a Council Use Permit (CUP). The intent of the City Council was to acquire all the properties for a specific redevelopment project, which did not occur. Therefore, the City will need to amend the Zoning and General Plan Land Use in order to accommodate future development

on the City owned property. The CUP and PAD will be eliminated with the proposed Rezoning and the General Plan Amendment will change to Mixed Use Town Center.

A neighborhood meeting was held in January. All property owners and tenants within five hundred (500) feet of the property were notified of the public hearings and the neighborhood meeting. Staff has not received any negative comments from the public or property owners.

This is the second public meeting that the Downtown Development Committee is required to conduct and make a recommendation to the City Council to approve the proposed Minor General Plan Amendment (MGPA) and the proposed Rezoning.

Staff is recommending approval of the proposed Minor General Plan Amendment (MGPA) and the proposed Rezoning.

It was moved by Gary Gallagher and seconded by Linda Flick to recommend approval of cases GPMinor08-03 and ZA08-01TC for the property located south of University Drive, east of Pasadena, west of Mesa Drive, and north of East Second Street. Approximate total of 26 acres.

Vote: 8 in favor
0 opposed

6. <u>Review and make a Recommendation to the City Council on the Resolution for Planning Fees for the fiscal year 2008/2009 budget.</u>

Mr. John Wesley, Planning Division Director, gave a brief presentation of the proposed new planning fees for the fiscal budget year 2008/2009 at the Study Session. The City Manager has recommended that the Planning Division continue moving toward cost recovery for staff time spent on processing applications. For the fiscal year 2008/2009, a 30% target cost recovery has been set.

Staff also compared the City of Mesa's current fees to other valley cities such as Gilbert, Chandler, Tempe, Scottsdale, Phoenix and Glendale. Most of Mesa's current fees are comparatively less than the other cities fees, with the exception of Chandler. Mr. Wesley asked the Committee to exam the charts offered in his report. Staff is recommending an average overall fee increase of 20% in order to achieve a 30% minimum cost recovery.

The intent of the proposed fee increase is to bring the cost recovery of the Planning Division up to a point of 30% of the actual cost. Staff is asking for a recommendation of approval for the proposed fee increases.

Ms. Linda Flick voiced concerns among the development community about the timing of raising the cost of planning fees. It is a difficult time for developers in this economy to try to bring sustainable and quality developments to the community. Ms. Flick stated that it is a difficult time for staff and the City in trying to work a budget and

continue to encourage quality development. Ms. Flick feels that the proposed new fee for the Design and Review process is a substantial increase, and asked if perhaps there might be an opportunity to have some of those functions referred to staff administratively, potentially saving cost on staffing and also help the development process as well.

Ms. Flick also is concerned with the Technology Improvement Fee at 4% and asked that staff from the Building and Safety Division put together some models for a complete project, to determine the total project impact.

Ms. Flick stated a concern for the increased fee for the SKIP process, which could discourage redevelopment projects instead of encouraging them and generate negative impact.

Mr. Gordon Sheffield, Zoning Administrator, responded that there are some thoughts toward less Design Review cases going through the Design Review Board process and have staff do them administratively. However, there still is a need to have staff available to process the reviews administratively.

Ms. Flick also stated that she is very pleased with Planning and Building and Safety engaging the development community. There have been very productive focus groups, so the emphasis is not just on raising the fees, but on improving services or sustaining a high level of service to the community.

Mr. Scott Perkinson agreed with Ms. Flick that the increase of the fees is a real concern for the development community, but feels that developers would be willing to pay higher fees to achieve higher quality service. Mr. Perkinson asked if the planning staff would be decreased by eleven (11) positions without the fees being increased.

Mr. Sheffield answered that three (3) positions out of the eleven (11) could be maintained with the fee increase.

Mr. Adam Decker stated he is in support of the City increasing the fees although it will impact the developers. In order to offer quality services to the development community, the City needs to be fully staffed with quality people.

Mr. Jeff Jarvis stated that he feels the fees are not high enough and are still below average according to the comparative cities, and believes if you have below average fees, you will have below average projects. The City of Mesa does not want to attract the marginal projects, but instead wants to demonstrate great service from staff and building in a quality community.

It was moved by Adam Decker and seconded by Gary Gallagher to recommend approval to the City Council on the Resolution for Planning Fees for the fiscal budget year 2008/2009.

Vote: 8 in favor with listed concerns
0 opposed

7. Review, Discuss and Suggest direction regarding Zoning Ordinance Update Project (Title 11, Chapters 1 through 18 of the Mesa City Code).

Mr. Gordon Sheffield, Zoning Administrator, gave a presentation on Module 2: Development Regulations of the Zoning Ordinance Update. Module 1 dealt with land use. Module 2 deals with development standards specific to individual land use types, such as residential densities, building setbacks, commercial setbacks and building heights. Module 3 will deal with supplementary provisions such as design standards. The Planning Division is anticipating Module 3 will be ready for review in late June or early July. Module 4 deals with administration and definitions and anticipated for review in late August or late September.

The current Zoning Code does not implement the General 2025 Plan. Therefore, the intention of the Zoning Code Update is to reflect the goals of the General Plan for new proposed projects in Mesa. The emphasis and format of the code update is changing to make it easier to use by reducing the narrative text and using more charts, grafts and illustrations. The new format allows for more information on a single page with tables, footnotes and a few cross-references to give a complete picture of what the development requirements will be for that particular project. The City of Mesa would also like to computerize the Zoning Code to hypertext cross-references and definitions, which can have profound effects on the overall quality of the development.

The Residential Districts will have substantial changes. For example, Mr. Sheffield spoke about the revisions to the RS -6 District (previously named R1-6 District). Currently the lot coverage, which is the roof coverage, is 40% and will be changed to 50%. Also, to allow living area to encroach into the front yard setback to give an "urbanized" feeling, which in turn could encourage some reinvestment in the home. The Planning Division wants to pay more attention to the "urban" districts to offer opportunities to add density.

The RS-90 Single Residential District (previously named R1-90 district) lot coverage is changing from 20% to 25%. A few new Residential Development Guidelines are being incorporated into the zoning regulations:

- Increased lot width on corner lots, varying by the classification of the intersecting streets
- Requirement for windows and prohibition on blank walls on street facing side facade of houses on corner lots
- Requirement that one bay of three-door garages be setback at least two feet fro the other bays
- Requirement that garage doors be setback at least five feet from the front facade of homes

A new proposed district is called Small-Lot Single-Family District, previously named R-2 or R1-6PAD. New supplemental standards will be set for this district with a menu board. This change, in essence, can bring about higher quality requirements for smaller lots and higher density to the projects.

The current height limit in the Residential Districts is two-stories or thirty feet. A possible third story may be allowed in the Single-Family and Small-Lot Districts, trying to add some interest to the architecture.

Change Summary for updating the codes:

- Agricultural Districts – No changes except the addition of corral fences
- Residential Districts – Significant changes such as: change in setbacks of lots, story and height requirements, lot-size ranges, garage setbacks, proposed new districts (RSL-Small Lot Single Family Residential, RS-Single Family Residential, RM-Multi Family Residential). Each district will have its own set of standards.
- Commercial and Mixed Use Districts - Maintain many existing standards. Adding two new character area standards to include a more "urban" set of standards to include smaller setbacks and greater allowed heights.
- Employment Districts – Relatively the same. Adding an employment district as an accessory to the M-2 District. Due to feedback from citizens, they did not want to limit properties already zoned into M-2 Districts. Also, adding minimum lot area and width standards.
- Town Center Districts – Retained all content, but reformatted to match the new format.

Mr. Sheffield thanked Jeff Jarvis, Adam Decker and Gary Gallagher of the Downtown Development Committee for volunteering to sit on the Technical Review Committee created to review one land use classification at a time to help advise staff in the Zoning Ordinance Update. Due to some changes in the meeting schedule, Mr. Gallagher is no longer able to be on the committee.

Ms. Linda Flick commented that the updates are impressive in that it gives some flexibility, creating articulation and shape in the pedestrian designated areas bringing vitality to future projects.

Mr. Jeff Jarvis stated that he feels the new Ordinance Update is a great piece of work.

8. Central Mesa High Capacity Transit Study Alternatives Analysis Update. An update on the alternatives being conducted to extend high capacity transit in Mesa.

9. Items from Citizens Present (No discussion or action can be taken)

Mr. Tom Verploegen, President of Downtown Mesa Association, stated that the Central Mesa High Capacity Transit Study was presented to the Downtown Mesa Association Board and had a good working session with them. The Board also has been working closely with the city staff and consultants.

10. Adjournment

With there being no further business, this meeting of the Downtown Development Committee adjourned at 9:06 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

_____

Shelly Allen, Town Center Development Director
Minutes prepared by Sue Cason