

**Downtown Motor Apartments
STAKEHOLDER MEETING
Joel D. Valdez Main Library Lower Level Mtg. Rm.
Tuesday, October 7, 2014, 5:30 – 7:00 pm**

MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting Conduct and Agenda

This public meeting was arranged and facilitated by the City of Tucson Office of Integrated Planning (OIP) with assistance from the City's Planning and Development Services Department.

Meeting notice was emailed to the City's database of people who provided their contact information at the first stakeholder meeting on the proposed project in Friday, April 11, 2014, or who expressed an interest in the project via email or other means and provided contact information.

The meeting agenda consisted of (a) Welcome & Introductions, (b) Meeting Purpose, (c) The Basics, (d) Update Since April 11 Stakeholder Meeting, and (e) Questions & Answers. City staff addressed the project review process, and representatives of the development team provided an illustrated PowerPoint update on the project design. City and development representative answered questions as appropriate. A handout titled, "Overview of City Regulations & Review Process Pertaining to Stone Motor Apartments, 383 S. Stone Ave., Tucson," prepared by OIP, was provided to participants.

Staff Notes Taken During Question & Answer Period

- Would be helpful to have pictures of previous design and current design side by side.
- Would be helpful to have design shown in context.
- Was any interior square footage eliminated?
- Questions about design of interiors of units.
- Setback requirements are 0' on sides
- Parking on ground floor, entrance off of Stone Avenue
- How much parking is needed? Concern about impact on neighborhood.
Response: Development has reduced number of spaces given Downtown location and because, based on developer's experience, project residents are anticipated to have fewer cars. In response to concern that the reduced parking would result in residents parking on Stone Avenue, developer representatives said they would monitor parking on Stone Avenue by project residents.
- How many people will be living there?
- Who will live there? *Response:* Low income and veterans.

**Downtown Motor Apartments
STAKEHOLDER MEETING
Joel D. Valdez Main Library Lower Level Mtg. Rm.
Tuesday, October 7, 2014, 5:30 – 7:00 pm**

- Concern not with potential occupants, but with design and scale - incompatible with surroundings.
- Site swap should be considered, with City providing some financial assistance.
- Sec. 106 process – concern that neighborhood wasn't notified.
- Examples of good projects with better communication – Fire Central, El Paso Greenway.
- Number of people per bedroom? *Developer Response:* Based on experience, anticipate primarily single-person occupancy.
- Know there are varying opinions about reduced parking, but I applaud less parking downtown.
- Wrong place for this development. Would be better to renovate the building and create a boutique hotel.
- Others were trying to buy this property.
- How can we tear down a Joesler designed building?
- Historic preservation should be about saving entire building.
- City needs to step up – swap land, strengthen regulations.
- Spot zoning is not good. [*Note:* This was a reference to the site not being in the surrounding Historical Preservation Zone.] Need to help M/C think outside the box.
- Experience of “The District” [*Note:* Reference to a development in another Downtown neighborhood.] Negative ramifications from this development are ongoing
- Scale and rhythm are important in a building's design.
- Honorable intentions with project, but not in execution. I am all for density but have some concerns:
 - Amount of open space on site
 - Setbacks
 - Not a nice environment for potential residents
 - Needs a larger site
 - Consider other, vacant land
- Armory Park Neighborhood Association communication challenges. Limited notification requirements in applicable development regulations.
- Only win-win is another site.

**Downtown Motor Apartments
STAKEHOLDER MEETING
Joel D. Valdez Main Library Lower Level Mtg. Rm.
Tuesday, October 7, 2014, 5:30 – 7:00 pm**

- Mercado area – possible alternate site. El Rio Health Center is nearby, which could be helpful to residents.
- Developer representatives asked whether they would consider a land swap.
Response: Would be open to a conversation.
- How is property managed?
- Where are you with the Sec. 106 process? HUD says process wasn't followed.
- Does developer have any other funding applications?
- 2015 project groundbreaking projected.
- Are there restrictions on property after low-income requirement expires? (40 yrs.)
- Are there restrictions on when project can be sold?
- Historic Neighborhoods mapping project has been helpful – why these neighborhoods are important? Housing on scale with neighborhood is important.
- Setbacks aren't consistent with surrounding properties.
- Could project work with fewer units?
- Garage entry from Stone Avenue not consistent (vs. from back). Could driveway be outdoor space?
- Could mixed use be included?
- Encourage developer to consider a Plan B.
- Athena Studio is the architect.
- I appreciate refinements to the design in response to conversations.
- The underlying zoning in area was established in the 1950; this zoning needs to be revisited. However, Proposition 207 restricts us from changing zoning; current recourse is optional overlays.
- Encourage M/C to adopt new overlays and tools.
- Follow up meetings with SHPO and HUD State Housing.
- Speak to investors to think outside the box.
- Reputation of company at stake – project will result in a negative perception.
- Where can M/C put-low income housing that is more appropriate?