

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

**DATE:** June 19, 2003 **TIME:** 7:30 a.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Dave Wier, Chair  
Art Jordan, Vice Chair  
Vince DiBella  
Theresa Carmichael  
Wayne Pomeroy  
Chuck Riekena

**STAFF PRESENT**

Shelly Allen  
Tony Felice  
Greg Marek  
Amy Morales  
Patrick Murphy  
Bryan Raines

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Matt Brown  
Dan Brock  
Kristjan Sigurdsson  
Tom Verploegen  
Tim Nielson

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Robert Fletcher  
Mark Reeb  
Terry Smith

**1. Call to Order**

The June 19, 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 June 19, 2003 Study Session**

It was moved by Wayne Pomeroy, seconded by Vince DiBella to approve the minutes.

**Vote: 6 in favor; 0 opposed**

**Approval of Minutes of June 19, 2003 Regular Meeting**

It was moved by Wayne Pomeroy, seconded by Vince DiBella to approve the minutes.

**Vote: 6 in favor; 0 opposed**

4. **Discuss and Consider a modification to Council Use Permit No. CUP93-4TC, to allow an additional service bay at 145 E. Main Street, Brown and Brown Chevrolet.**

Mr. Murphy explained that the purpose of the staff report is to consider a modification to an existing Council Use Permit (CUP93-4TC) and allow an additional service bay structure for Brown and Brown Chevrolet. Mr. Murphy explained that Brown and Brown Chevrolet, located at 145 East Main Street, had submitted an application to amend their existing Council Use Permit No. CUP93-4TC, which was originally approved on September 7, 1993, to allow a new open service bay at their site.

Mr. Murphy stated that according to Section 11-8-6 (C,1,k) of the City of Mesa's Zoning Ordinance, a vehicle sales lot requires a Council Use Permit (CUP). Mr. Murphy explained that the CUP that Brown and Brown had obtained in 1993 brought the dealership into conformance at that time with the City of Mesa's Zoning Ordinance and permitted an upgrade to the existing vehicle sales lot. Mr. Murphy further explained that a modification to the CUP93-004TC needs to be considered to allow Brown and Brown Chevrolet to add a new open service bay to their existing site. Mr. Murphy stated that according to Section 11-18-8 (P) of the City of Mesa's Zoning Ordinance, this proposed modification of the CUP must also be considered by the City Council.

Mr. Murphy stated that the modification to the CUP will help facilitate the expansion of Brown and Brown Chevrolet, which is important since Brown and Brown is one of Mesa's largest employers (approximately 575 employees work at the Downtown location), and generates a substantial amount of sales tax. Mr. Murphy explained that the new service bay will provide room for eight mechanics who will be performing light mechanic duty Monday through Friday between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. This will be an open-air facility constructed of materials consistent with existing structures.

Mr. Murphy stated that the plans received for this expansion were not very detailed. Because of this, staff has added a number of stipulations to ensure that the project is developed as discussed with staff. Brown and Brown is in agreement with the conditions of approval. The service bay will be located 112-feet east of Sistine Street (this includes the 92-foot setback from the property line and the 20 feet of sidewalk and landscape area between the curb and property line). The new structure will be adjacent to the masonry wall that separates the vehicle display area and used car sales building to the north and from the service repair area to the south. The new service bay will be twenty-feet (20') west of the existing service bay structure and 279-feet south of Main Street. The new service bay will be located in the parking area allocated for vehicles to be serviced.

Mr. Murphy stated that the parking layout is not accurate on the site plan, adding that these specific parking spaces are not for customers or employees, but are used for their auto service repair shop. Brown and Brown believes the loss of parking spaces where the new service bay is proposed to be located will not negatively impact their automobile repair operations.

Mr. Murphy then displayed photographs of the existing service repair facility, and passed around a color and material board, adding that the new service bay will be very similar to the existing service bay. Mr. Murphy stated that the west elevation exterior wall of the new service bay will be coated with sheet metal, the east elevation will be a solid masonry wall, and the north elevation will utilize the existing six-foot high masonry wall. Mr. Murphy stated that coated sheet metal will be used from the top of the existing masonry wall to the top of the new service bay, noting that the primary color of the exterior walls of the new service bay will be ash gray, and the trim will be a charcoal color.

Mr. Murphy stated that one of the stipulations for approval is that Brown and Brown provide screening for the new service bay; Brown and Brown agreed that they would display high profile vehicles along Serrine Street behind the wrought iron fence. Mr. Murphy stated by adding these vehicles, a substantial amount of screening will be provided for the new service bay. Staff believes that by the bay being located 112-feet east of Serrine and the installation of the additional landscaping, along with the display of the high profile vehicles, the site will be adequately screened.

Mr. Murphy stated that another component to the screening stipulations will be that a shade curtain similar to the existing service bay be added to the new service bay. The shade curtain shall be lowered to the ground after 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and all day Saturday and Sunday to provide additional screening of the structure's interior. Mr. Murphy stated that staff believes that the new service bay will be adequately screened from Serrine Street and the Mesa Arts Center.

Mr. Murphy stated that all property owners and tenants within 300 feet of this project (excluding right-of-way) were notified by mail of the proposed remodel to this site; no comments were received from the mailing. Staff also discussed this project with Ms. Gerry Fathauer, the Arts and Cultural Director, and Mr. Tom Verploegen of the Mesa Town Center, who are both supportive of this project.

**It was moved by Wayne Pomeroy, seconded by Vince DiBella to approve the modifications to Case No. CUP93-4TC to allow an additional service bay at 145 East Main Street, Brown & Brown Chevrolet Permit Case No. CUP93-4TC subject to the following stipulations:**

- 1) **Compliance with the site plan dated June 4, 2003, which depicts the location of the new service bay structure;**
- 2) **The west elevation exterior wall of the new service bay will be coated sheet metal that is the same as the exterior wall of the existing service bay located to the east of the new service bay. The east elevation exterior wall will be a solid masonry wall. The north elevation exterior will utilize the existing six-foot high masonry wall, and a coated sheet metal will be used from the top of the existing masonry wall to the top of the new service bay. The primary color of the exterior walls of the new service bay shall be ash gray, and the trim shall be a charcoal color.**
- 3) **To provide additional screening, Brown and Brown shall park new high profile vehicles along Serrine Street behind the wrought iron fence, from the masonry wall (located to the north of the new service bay) south to the property line of Brown and Brown.**
- 4) **The south elevation shall have a shade curtain similar to the existing service bay located to the east of the new service bay. This shade curtain shall lowered to the ground after 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and all day Saturday and Sunday to provide additional screening of the open service bay's interior.**
- 5) **Brown and Brown shall add landscaping along Serrine Street, and the final landscape plan shall be approved by the Redevelopment Division prior to the completion of the construction plans for the project.**

**Vote: 6 in favor; 0 opposed**

Mr. Marek added that this case will be presented to the City Council on July 7, 2003.

**5. Discuss and Consider Design Review Case No. DR03-002TC, for a commercial/retail building at 354 N. Country Club Drive.**

Ms. Allen stated that this case is for a Design Review project along with two Variances for the property located at the southwest corner of Country Club Drive and University. The surrounding zoning and land uses are retail to the north, a vacant lot to the east, a car wash to the south, and multi-family housing to the west.

Ms. Allen explained that this is small site, about .57 acres. This site was formerly a Union 76 station, which has since gone out of business and has been torn down. Ms. Allen stated that the applicant has been very willing to work with the City to ensure that this project is in compliance with the Town Center Concept Plan. Currently there is forty-nine feet (49') of existing

right-of-way along University Drive; the future right-of-way requirements are seventy-five feet (75'); the applicant has oriented the building ten-feet (10') behind the future right-of-way line, which brings the building approximately thirty-nine feet (39') from the back of the sidewalk along University Drive. If the applicant were to comply with the required Zoning Ordinance and provide the required seventy-five feet (75') of right-of-way, as well as a thirty-foot (30') building setback, there would not be very much of the site available to be developed. Ms. Allen further explained that there is a bus bay currently being constructed along Country Club Drive that the owners were not aware of, which has dramatically impacted the site. Based on the installation and location of the bus shelter and pull out, the northeast corner of the building would be placed approximately ten-feet (10') from the right-of-way. Ms. Allen explained that the distance between the building and the right-of-way decreases as you progress south, ending with the southeast corner of the building on the property line. Ms. Allen stated that the proposed Variance will allow the landscaping to vary from ten (10') to zero feet (0'). The applicant does intend to landscape three and a half feet (3 ½) of right-of-way that will exist between the building and the edge of the sidewalk.

Ms. Allen stated that the required number of parking spaces was difficult to determine, since none of the proposed uses have been established for this site. The applicant has provided one parking space for every 175 gross sq. ft. of the building. Staff believes that this was a very good compromise. The parking spaces will be located behind the building to create an urban feel, locating the building towards the intersection. The elevation of the building height is twenty-feet (20'), and a tower element has been added on the corner of the building which is twenty-six feet (26') high. When designing this building, the architect took into consideration the City's desire (as noted in the Town Center Concept Plan) to create an entryway feature to the downtown.

Ms. Allen stated that the existing landscaping on this site will be retained, which includes some large palm trees and shrubs. The applicant will also provide the required number of trees and shrubs, in addition to what exists on the site, and add two trees and two shrubs over and above what is required by the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Allen stated that staff supports both requests and agrees that the variances are justified due to the existing conditions on the site.

Mr. DiBella questioned whether or not the proposed steel canopy would be a solid structure, trellis, or fabric.

Mr. Kristjan Sigurdsson from K & I Architects responded that the steel awnings are solid. Mr. Sigurdsson stated that the intent of the awnings is to help provide protection over the doorways.

Mr. Jordan asked about the condition of the existing date palm trees.

Mr. Sigurdsson answered that the trees were in good shape.

Mr. Jordan questioned if there was an existing SRP irrigation box on the property, adding if there was an irrigation box on the site, would there be any attempts made to try to enhance the appearance of the box?

Mr. Sigurdsson replied that yes there was an irrigation box at this site and that the box is not very obtrusive, adding that the height of the box is fairly low and not highly visible.

Mr. Jordan then asked Mr. Sigurdsson to attempt to revisit the irrigation box issue and that he attempt to contact SRP to try and make arrangements to dress the box up.

Mr. Jordan then questioned what the terms were on the existing billboard that is planned to be removed, inquiring whether or not the billboard would ever come back.

Ms. Allen replied that under the current sign code, billboards are not allowed; therefore the billboard would not be able to be relocated on this site.

**It was moved by Vince DiBella, seconded by Art Jordan to approve Design Review Case No. DR03-002TC for the property located at 354 N. Country Club Drive subject to the following stipulations:**

- 1. Full compliance with approved plans and all current Code requirements, unless modified through the appropriate review and stipulations outlined below.**
- 2. Compliance with the basic development as shown on the site plan and elevations dated April 30, 2003.**
- 3. The lighting plan shall be developed according to the City's Outdoor Lighting and Control Ordinance (Night Sky Ordinance), and shall ensure that light does not spill over into the adjacent properties.**
- 4. Mirrored window glazing and glass reflective in quality shall not be used on the buildings.**
- 5. Remove the existing billboard currently on the site.**
- 6. Sign design requires approval of the Redevelopment Office.**

**Vote: 6 in favor; 0 opposed**

**6. Discuss and Consider Variance Case No. ZA03-47TC, a Request for a Reduction in the Required Building Setbacks and Required Landscape Area, for the Property Located at 354 N. Country Club Drive.**

Please see Agenda Item No. 5 for staff report and comments.

**It was moved by Vince DiBella, seconded by Art Jordan to recommend approval of the Variance Case No. ZA03-047TC for the property located at 354 N. Country Club Drive to reduce the required building setbacks and required landscape area from the required thirty feet (30') to ten feet (10') along University Drive, and from the required thirty feet (30') to zero feet along Country Club Drive.**

**Vote: 6 in favor; 0 opposed**

**7. Discuss and consider a request to modify setback and building separation requirements for a project located at 302 North Hobson.**

Ms. Morales stated that the purpose of this report was to consider a request to modify the setback and building separation requirements set by the Zoning Ordinance for a new residential home in the R-2 Zoning District. Ms. Morales noted that the surrounding zoning is R-2 to the north, east and south, and R1-6 to the west. Ms. Morales stated that this business is owned by Prehab of Arizona, Inc., adding that this particular project is called Autumn House. Autumn House is a facility that assists women and children.

Ms. Morales stated that the DDC may modify the Design Guidelines and Site Development Standards when they are applied to specific development proposals in the Town Center Redevelopment Area on a case-by-case basis. Redevelopment staff is currently working to develop Design Guidelines and Site Development Design Standards that are more appropriate for the Redevelopment Area; until that time, the existing standards will need to be modified to meet the Redevelopment Area's needs. Ms. Morales added that staff is recommending that the DDC approve the request to reduce to the setbacks for this specific development site.

Ms. Morales explained that the Zoning Ordinance currently requires the setbacks to be twenty-feet (20') on the east front yard, twenty-feet (20') on the north side, twenty-feet (20') on the south side, and twenty-feet (20) on the west rear yard. Staff is proposing to reduce the required setbacks to: twenty-feet (20') for the east front yard, ten-feet (10') on the north side, ten-feet (10') on the south side, and fifteen-feet (15') on the west rear yard.

Ms. Morales explained that this site currently has one home existing in the front of the property, which is 1,381 sq. ft., a garage that is 324 sq. ft., and a new addition to the rear of the property that is 1,200 sq. ft. The applicant is proposing to have this new addition match the existing home's color and material. Ms. Morales explained that applicant was recently awarded a grant from United Parcel Services to construct a new home on this existing property.

Ms. Morales stated that Mr. Nielson has also requested that the building separation requirements be modified from twenty-five feet (25') to eight-feet (8') for this specific project. Ms. Morales stated that staff supports the applicant's request and agrees that if staff were to require the applicant to meet the standards set in the Zoning Ordinance, it would be very hard or impossible for the applicant to complete any further development of this property.

Mr. Marek added that this is a good illustration of why the Redevelopment Area really needs its own design standards.

Mr. Jordan inquired if there was a possibility that the architect would consider installing a dahlbergia sissu (type of tree), adding that the proposed bottle tree to be used is one of the dirtiest trees in the valley because it is constantly dropping leaves. Mr. Nielson replied that he would be willing to consider using an alternate type of tree.

**It was moved by Chuck Riekema, seconded by Art Jordan to approve the request to modify the setback requirements required in the Zoning Ordinance which are: twenty-feet (20') for the east front yard, twenty-feet (20') on the north side, twenty-feet (20') on the south side, and twenty-feet (20) on the west rear yard, to be reduced to: twenty-feet (20') for the east front yard, ten-feet (10') on the north side, ten-feet (10') on the south side, and fifteen-feet (15') on the west rear yard. Also to modify the required twenty-five foot (25') building separation requirement to eight-feet (8') for this specific project.**

**Vote: 6 in favor; 0 opposed**

8. **Discuss and Consider the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for Redevelopment Site 7 generally bounded by Main Street on the north, Mesa Drive on the east, 1<sup>st</sup> Ave. on the south, and Hibbert Street to the west.**

Mr. Marek stated that the staff report has been combined with Agenda Item Number 9 and the RFQ is to take the first step in implementing the development scenarios prepared by Hunter Interests for both Sites 7 & 17. The intent of the RFQ is to solicit developer interest; based on that interest

the City Council, with the DDC's input, could develop a more formal Request for Proposals (RFP). The graphic formats were developed as a way to heighten interest; the RFQ is intended to be mailed to over four-hundred (400) developers nationally. Mr. Marek stated that the purpose of placing this item on the agenda was to give the DDC an opportunity to provide comments and direction as to whether or not to move forward and issue this RFQ, adding that the General Development Committee (GDC) will be discussing this item at their July 3, 2003 meeting. Mr. Marek explained that Ms. Allen will be answering questions pertaining to Site 7, and that Mr. Murphy will be answering any questions pertaining to Site 17.

Mr. Riekema asked what properties the City owns within Site 7.

Ms. Allen responded that the City of Mesa owns all of the property within Site 7 except for: the County Health Facility, the Taco Nazo, Wells Fargo Bank and Pete's Fish & Chips. Mr. Riekema suggested that the map included in the RFQ should be revised to delineate what the City owns and what the City does not own, so that the developers viewing the documents will have this valuable information.

Mr. Marek added that the RFQ does have a note that refers anyone interested to the City of Mesa website where they may view the entire Hunter Report, which has more detailed information on each of the sites, adding that he will attempt to have the map modified with this recommendation.

Ms. Carmichael questioned a note on one of the documents included in the report that was prepared by Hunter Interests, which labeled an existing historic building and asked for clarification as to which building that was.

Ms. Allen answered that the building that was being referred to was originally a portion of a wing of the old Southside Hospital, adding that the building no longer hold any historic significance.

Mr. Felice added that because the building is an original portion of a wing of the former Southside Hospital, the building does have historic significance, but the building's integrity has been compromised.

**It was moved by Art Jordan, seconded by Theresa Carmichael to approve the request to forward a recommendation of approval of Redevelopment Site 7 (approximately 10 acres located between Main Street and 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue and Mesa Drive and Hibbert Street) to the City Council.**

**Vote: 6 in favor; 0 opposed**

9. **Discuss and Consider the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for Redevelopment Site 17 generally bounded by University Drive on the north, Mesa Drive on the east, 2<sup>nd</sup> Street on the south, and Pasadena Street on the west.**

Mr. Dan Brock of 145 East University Drive stated that his building is located to the northwest of Site 17. Mr. Brock stated that in the early 1980's a proposal had gone out to develop the lot between 3<sup>rd</sup> Street & University Drive and between Pasadena & Hibbert Street. Mr. Brock had made a proposal at that time and received approval to construct his building as part of this project. He further explained that when he first began developing this project there was a huge real estate crash, and portions of the project remained undeveloped. Mr. Brock stated that he feels that what is being proposed for Site 17 is more compatible to what the original intent to develop the property was, which was to develop commercial and offices along University Drive. Mr. Brock hopes that the vacant lot just to the east of his property will be developed, similar to what the original intentions for the development of this property were.

Mr. Marek stated that he had met with Mr. Brock, and they have agreed that it would make more sense to develop both sides of Hibbert Street as entryways.

Please see Agenda Item No. 8 for staff report and additional comments.

**It was moved by Theresa Carmichael, seconded by Art Jordan to approve the request to forward a recommendation of approval of Redevelopment Site 17 (approximately 10 acres located between Main Street and 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue and Mesa Drive and Hibbert Street) to the City Council.**

**Vote: 6 in favor; 0 opposed**

10. **Election of the new Chair and Vice Chair**

**It was moved by Wayne Pomeroy, seconded by Vince DiBella to elect Art Jordan as Chairman.**

**Vote: 6 in favor; 0 opposed**

**It was moved by Wayne Pomeroy, seconded by Art Jordan to elect Chuck Riekema as Vice Chairman.**

**Vote: 6 in favor; 0 opposed**

**11. Selection of the DDC representative to the Permanent Sculpture Panel.**

Chair Wier acknowledged that he is the current representative from the DDC for the Permanent Sculpture Panel.

Mr. Marek stated that Mr. DiBella is on the Sculpture Panel as a representative from the Mesa Town Center Board, adding that Mr. Pomeroy is a member of the panel, at large. Mr. Marek stated that it would be staff's preference to have continuity, to have Mr. Pomeroy be the representative for the DDC taking Chair Wier's place, and have Chair Wier replace Mr. Pomeroy as the panel member at large.

Mr. DiBella added that he would like to be replaced on the Permanent Sculpture panel when it is convenient for the panel.

**It was moved by Art Jordan, seconded by Chuck Riekema to nominate Wayne Pomeroy to be the representative from the DDC for the Permanent Sculpture Panel.**

**Vote: 6 in favor; 0 opposed**

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

**Site 24** – The City Council has amended the agreement with Mesa Discount (Palm Court Investment), they are now permitted to begin construction of Phase 1 of the area between Maaco and the building that Mesa Discount currently occupies, which will include some retail shops along with a warehouse building and a screen wall with landscaping along Pepper Place. Staff will continue to work with two additional properties that are Bailey's and Maaco. For the second Phase of the Palm Court Investment project it is necessary to acquire the Maaco property and the Maaco property is necessary for the Lenharts project.

**Sheraton Hotel** – The hotel is in the process of being purchased. If the property is purchased, the closing loan date will be the 31<sup>st</sup> of July 2003. Tom Verploegen from the Mesa Town Center Corporation, Mesa Visitor and Convention Bureau and a vast number of City staff members have been working with the potential buyer to work out some issues. The invested party is proposing to place the Marriott name to the project and complete both interior and exterior renovations to the property. To date the acquisition appears to be very positive.

**Centennial Center** - The Center has not had any makeovers since it was constructed in 1978. Along with the improvements that will be made at the

Conference Facility at the Hotel, there will be increased pressure to the City to do improvements to the Centennial Center.

**Northeast Quadrant** – Mr. Marek has received Council direction to obtain a proposal from Hunter Interests to look at some Planning issues for the northeast quadrant which include: the Post Office, the Irving School, the Centennial Center, the Rendezvous Center, Hotel and Site 17. Hunter Interests would be looking at different development scenarios to develop these sites together, tying these uses together with the Pedestrian Pathway System and the Aquatics Center. Staff is hoping to have a draft available by the September DDC meeting.

**Aquatics Center** – Mr. Marek stated that there are funds available to build the Aquatics Center however; there are no funds available to operate it, which would cost approximately 1.5 million dollars.

**Bank One Project** – The project is moving forward and is on track. Currently Outsource is working on their pre-leasing activities. BPLW is preparing the construction documents, with a targeted submittal date of August 2003.

**Diagonal Parking on 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue** – Staff attended a Transportation Advisory Board meeting, and the diagonal parking that is currently located on 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue will now become permanent, with the traffic flow being one lane in each direction. Staff is asking that the same diagonal parking be added to 1<sup>st</sup> Street between Robson and Center Street, there will be a high need for additional parking in this area in the beginning of 2004. Projects that will be underway at that time are the Construction of the Bank One Project, the Macdonald Streetscape Improvements in the Spring of 2004, and the Southwest Museum will have a huge dinosaur exhibit that staff expects will draw a large number of people.

**Qwest** – Qwest is currently considering expanding their existing switching facility, which is currently located on Pepper just west of Center Street. This building is currently at capacity, and if the City plans on bringing in additional businesses to this area, the switching capacity will need to be expanded.

**Brown & Brown** – At the July 2003 DDC meeting staff will be presenting a request to modify the forty-five foot (45') sign to extend the current timeline for which their permit will expire, which is August 2003. Brown & Brown has officially made a request to submit an application for a Comprehensive Sign plan to permanently allow the forty-five foot (45') sign.

**Ordinance Change Pertaining Electronic Message Signs** – The ordinance change has been introduced to the City Council along with the comments that the Planning Department received from the DDC. The City Council will be voting on this item on June 30, 2003.

**Four Wheel Drive Parts** – The landscaping issue that was brought up in the past is being resolved by the Redevelopment Staff along with the City Inspectors and if necessary the Code Compliance Office.

**Upcoming Agenda Items** – Rezoning Case for 450 West Country Club, Bill Barnhart has purchased this property and is proposing to locate his art gallery and studio there. Special Use Permit for 134 West Broadway, for a general auto repair.

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

Mr. Verploegen thanked both Chair Wier and Mr. DiBella for serving on the DDC and the Mesa Town Center Board. Mr. Verploegen stated that there will be eight (8) new members coming to the Mesa Town Center Board. The MTCC strategic plan and priorities is currently being circulated, this summer they will begin to generate an implementation schedule along with the plan. As for business development, they are strong supporters of the Rehab Code, and project that the Code will be in effect by September 2003. As part of their Safe & Sound program, they have sent out some “No Trespass” sign letters, in hope of addressing some of the issues that the downtown is having with homeless issues. MTCC has already started receiving responses. In the upcoming Downtown Focus, they will profile some of the new DDC members. MTCC has already planned for Sculptures V, which will run from November '03 – April '04. Mr. Verploegen and Mr. Wilson will be traveling to Loveland in August to try to recruit sculptures. Ultimate Imaginations is in the process of developing a new M.O.U. to assist designating staff's responsibilities. Mr. Verploegen also mentioned what a great job that the City of Phoenix had done with its work on “Copper Square” and stated that they have submitted an application to the International Downtown Association (IDA) for an award, adding that the President of the Downtown Phoenix Partnership, Brian Kearny will be attending the next MTCC Board meeting and will be speaking about “Branding.”

**14. Board Member Comments**

Ms. Carmichael wanted to thank Chair Wier and Mr. DiBella for serving on the Board.

Mr. DiBella stated that serving on the Committee has been a very interesting process-reviewing all of the different types of cases that come before the board.

Chair Wier stated that he is leaving the Committee in good hands, and thanked the City staff for everything that they do.

Mr. Jordan also thanked Chair Wier and Mr. DiBella for serving on the board.

**15. Adjournment**

With there being no further business, this meeting of the Downtown Development Committee adjourned at 9:07 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

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