

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

**DATE:** April 19, 2001    **TIME:** 7:00 a.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Dave Wier, Chair  
Vince DiBella, Vice-Chair  
Theresa Carmichael  
Debra Duvall  
Shanlyn Newman  
Wayne Pomeroy  
Terry Smith

**STAFF PRESENT**

Katrina Bradshaw  
Craig Crocker  
Tony Felice  
Greg Marek  
Amy Morales  
Patrick Murphy

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Gary Matthews  
Chris Miller  
Lloyd Wrapley

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Art Jordan, AIA  
Lori Osiecki

**1. Call to Order**

The April 19, 2001 meeting of the Downtown Development Committee was called to order at 7:01 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 8, 2001 Study Session**

**It was moved by Wayne Pomeroy, seconded by Shanlyn Newman to approve the minutes.**

**Vote: 7 in favor; 0 opposed**

**Approval of Minutes of March 15, 2001 Regular Meeting**

**It was moved by Deb Duvall, seconded by Terry Smith to approve the minutes.**

**Vote: 7 in favor; 0 opposed**

**4. Discuss and consider Design Review Case No. DR01-001TC for Matthews the Printer located at 221 E. University Drive.**

**Applicant: Gary Matthews**  
**Staff Contact: Tony Felice, (480) 644-3965**  
**e-mail address: tony\_felice@ci.mesa.az.us**  
**Recommendation: Approval with conditions**

Mr. Felice said he would go over the design review plans for Matthews the Printer, but first stated that staff is recommending approval of the design review with stipulations. Mr. Felice went over each of those stipulations, which are as follows:

1. Full compliance with approved plans and all current Building Code requirements, unless modified through the appropriate review.
2. Compliance with the basic development as shown on the site plan and elevations dated April 2, 2001.
3. Landscaping plan must be revised to accurately reflect the revised site plan and additional landscaping added as noted in this staff report.
4. Development plans must indicate type and method of retention as per revised Redevelopment Area retention requirements.
5. The applicant must install an underground service entrance and work with the City's Electric Division to coordinate underground electric service (existing overhead power lines will be undergrounded as a part of this project).
6. Coordinate with US West to underground utility lines on site.
7. Compliance with the City's Outdoor Lighting and Control Ordinance (Night Sky Ordinance).
8. Redevelopment Staff shall have final approval of the colors and materials prior to issuance of a building permit.
9. A monument sign permit application will be submitted separately and designed to reflect the architectural character of the building.

Mr. Felice gave some background information on the project including surrounding land uses and zoning, a history of the business, reasons for their relocation, and projects that were previously proposed for that site. Mr. Felice said staff felt this would be a good development for that site because the building will have a strong residential character that is compatible to the West 2<sup>nd</sup> Street Historic District and proposed Robson Historic District.

Mr. Felice went over the site plan and indicated that the building is situated in such a way that it takes advantage of sight lines and curb appeal on University Drive without dominating the street frontage or imposing on the neighborhood behind. Mr. Felice also stated that the orientation of the building will allow the refuse container to be screened at the back of the site and also allows open space for a break/ lunch area.

Mr. Felice said the applicant has provided adequate landscaping on the site, however, staff has suggested that the applicant provide some sort of fast growing ground cover in order to break up the hardscape areas. He also pointed out that even though the code allows for a zero setback line, the applicant is proposing abundant landscaping on the east and west perimeters of the property.

Mr. Felice went over the elevations, colors, and materials and pointed out aspects of the design that are compatible to the historic neighborhood and are favorable to the project.

Mr. Felice said staff has notified residents and property owners within 300 feet and held a public meeting. He said the design plans were reviewed by the City's Design Review Team as well as the Mesa Town Center Corporation, which have indicated their support of the project. Mr. Felice also pointed out that the project is consistent with the Downtown Concept Plan.

Ms. Duvall asked why stipulation #5 is requesting the applicant to install an underground service entrance.

Mr. Felice explained that currently there are two service poles on the site. One is the City's electric overhead power lines, and the other are telephone lines from US West. The City's Electric Department has agreed to work with the applicant to coordinate the undergrounding of the utility lines.

Ms. Duvall asked if the applicant is required to assume the responsibility for putting the utility lines underground?

Mr. Felice said the applicant only assumes the responsibility for providing the service entrance and assist with the alignment of the underground utility lines. Mr. Felice stated that the City is responsible to underground the utility lines.

Mr. DiBella asked if parking spaces are typically eight feet wide or was the City making an exception for this project. He thought the standard parking space width was nine feet. Mr. DiBella said it was not an issue for him, but he was curious to know what the standard was.

Mr. Marek said nine feet is the standard width. The eight feet that is proposed by the applicant might be a little tight but the applicant felt the eight feet would be sufficient.

Mr. DiBella suggested that the last parking stall at the south end of the building could be turned into a landscaped island, which would help break up some of the paving in that area.

Mr. Felice said staff could discuss that suggestion with the applicant and pointed out that the applicant has exceeded their parking requirements so it is an option that could be considered.

Ms. Smith asked if the Downtown Concept Plan provides any direction for color palettes on buildings in the downtown area or if staff is able to provide any direction on the color palettes that are chosen.

Mr. Marek said there is no direction in the Concept Plan, however, staff does hold pre-application meetings in which they can tell an applicant if the proposed color scheme is compatible to the surrounding area.

Ms. Smith asked why there is a red stripe on the elevations.

Mr. Felice said it is suppose to be a Spanish tile red stripe. Mr. Felice suggested that the designer, Lloyd Wrapley, explain his design choices.

Mr. Wrapley said City staff felt the original color scheme was a little bland and suggested that they brighten up the color scheme. He said the red stripe was originally just another level of stucco projection that was a different shade of green. They decided to put the red tile stripe on the elevations to brighten up the colors scheme.

**It was moved by Deb Duvall, seconded by Terry Smith, to approve Design Review Case No. DR01-001TC for Matthews the Printer located at 221 E. University Drive subject to the following stipulations:**

- 1. Full compliance with approved plans and all current Building Code requirements, unless modified through the appropriate review.**
- 2. Compliance with the basic development as shown on the site plan and elevations dated April 2, 2001.**
- 3. Landscaping plan must be revised to accurately reflect the revised site plan and additional landscaping added as noted in this staff report.**
- 4. Development plans must indicate type and method of retention as per revised Redevelopment Area retention requirements.**
- 5. The applicant must install an underground service entrance and work with the City's Electric Division to coordinate underground electric service (existing overhead power lines will be undergrounded as a part of this project).**
- 6. Coordinate with US West to underground utility lines on site.**
- 7. Compliance with the City's Outdoor Lighting and Control Ordinance (Night Sky Ordinance).**

8. **Redevelopment Staff shall have final approval of the colors and materials prior to issuance of a building permit.**
9. **A monument sign permit application will be submitted separately and designed to reflect the architectural character of the building.**

Mr. Pomeroy felt this project would be a big improvement to the entrance of Town Center on the northwest side and was supportive of this project.

Chair Wier also stated that he felt the design of the building was attractive.

**Vote: 7 in favor; 0 opposed**

5. **Director's Report -- Greg Marek**

**Site 21** – The asbestos is still being removed and should be completed by the end of May. The City Manager is holding a meeting in May with about 12 developers to discuss downtown Mesa, expand developer awareness of our projects, and include information and discussions on the former Bank One Building. A new Request for Proposals will be issued shortly.

**Site 24** – The City is completing environmental testing on the site. The City was unable to obtain permission to enter Buck's Auto. The City had to go to court to obtain right of entry in order to complete environmental testing. Staff hopes to have results from the testing by early May in order to move forward with land acquisition.

Staff is also in the process of finalizing the financing package for both Redstone Investments and Palm Court Investments along with finalization of the plans in order to begin the formal design review application process. Mr. Marek said the design review will probably be presented to the Downtown Development Committee at the meeting in June.

**Site 25** – The General Development Committee recommended to enter into a 120-day exclusive negotiation period with The Crow Group. This item will be brought to the City Council meeting on Thursday, April 26<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Marek said staff has continued to have discussions with The Tribune, and they still have plans to expand at their current location.

**Sign Ordinance** – Staff has been working on revisions to the Sign Ordinance and will bring the proposed revisions to the Downtown Development Committee at the meeting in June. One of the issues included in the revisions is the removal of the restriction of "A" frame portable signs.

**Façade Program** – The Budget Adjustment Request for \$50,000 for the Façade Program was not recommended by management to be funded for the next fiscal year due to the budget cuts. There is still \$5,000 in Community Development Block Grant funds to do conceptual designs with some of the property owners.

**Downtown Tempe Community, Inc.** – The business improvement district in Tempe is planning their annual meeting on June 5<sup>th</sup>, at 8:00 a.m. at the Tempe Mission Palms Hotel. They have scheduled a nationally recognized speaker, Donovan Rypkema, to be the speaker at this meeting. He has written books and is very knowledgeable about downtown redevelopment. Other cities have also been invited to attend this meeting. The Redevelopment Office and MTCC have reserved 20 seats for those who would like to attend such as Board members, City staff, and City Council. Mr. Marek asked the Board members to RSVP to the Redevelopment Office by April 30<sup>th</sup> if they have an interest in attending this meeting.

Chair Wier asked for an update on the Main Street Streetscape Phase III project.

Mr. Murphy said they are a couple of days ahead of schedule and are planning to complete the project by November 1<sup>st</sup>. He said the underground work is complete from Lewis Street to Serrine. They are currently working of the underground work from Serrine to Mesa Dr. and it should be done in about three weeks.

Mr. Marek said the General Development Committee discussed the design for the Pedestrian Pathway at their last meeting. Mr. Marek explained the first phase of the project (from Main Street to the library) would cost about \$800,000, however, \$480,000 of that amount is paid for by grant money from the State. Staff recommended that \$320,000 be added to the CIP budget to cover the remaining costs. Mr. Marek explained that the City did not anticipate paying the administrative fee that ADOT is going to charge to manage the project. The administrative fee is 15% of the total project value, which will come to about \$120,000. The General Development Committee recommended the overall concept of the project but had concerns about the budget issues just mentioned. The City Council has asked the consultants to come up with a plan of what could be completed using only the grant funds.

Ms. Duvall asked if the Mesa Arts Center project will come back to the Downtown Development Committee for review again in the future, or had they already completed their review last year.

Mr. Marek said the project would come back to the Downtown Development Committee for consideration on the arroyo, the sails, and the project colors. Mr. Marek said staff is meeting with the design team next week regarding the comprehensive sign permit.

Ms. Duvall asked if the Aquatics Center is being considered for relocation to the Mesa Verde site.

Mr. Marek said there are discussions regarding that possibility. The original Aquatics Center site was decreased in size when the City put in offices at the old E.V.I.T. site. He said the project will fit at that location but it is a smaller site than was originally envisioned. For that reason, staff has been considering the pros and cons of moving the Aquatics Center to the location at Site 17. The Mayor has taken this project to the Mayor's Institute of Design to obtain some input regarding the issue of relocation. Mr. Marek said if they decide to move the project to Site 17, it would delay the project by about one year.

Ms. Duvall asked if there was a timeline when a decision had to be made for the land use at Site 17. Whether it be for the relocation of the Aquatics Center or the Mesa Verde project.

Mr. Marek said there is no specific deadline when a decision has to be made, however, the City feels very strongly that no matter what project goes there, the site needs to be master planned. He said Malcolm Ross is hoping to secure the financing for the Mesa Verde project before the City decides what is going to happen with that property.

Ms. Duvall asked if the City has any obligation to Malcolm Ross if he is able to secure the financing for the Mesa Verde project.

Mr. Marek said the Redevelopment Agreement has not yet been terminated. Mr. Ross is behind schedule on completing his construction documents and his code study, as well as being in default on his March and April payments of \$5,000. The City Attorney's Office is in the process of writing up a mutual termination agreement.

**6. Report from Mesa Town Center Corporation, Tom Verploegen, Executive Director**

There were no updates to report from Mesa Town Center Corporation.

7. **Board Member Comments**

None

8. **Adjournment**

With there being no further business, this meeting of the DDC was adjourned at 7:40 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Mr. Gregory J. Marek, Director of Redevelopment  
Minutes prepared by Katrina Bradshaw

K:\Redev\Ddc\DDC2001\01apmin.doc