



**PLANNING COMMISSION
INFILL INCENTIVE DISTRICT SUBCOMMITTEE**

Monday September 9, 2013, 6:00 P.M.

Woods Memorial Library

3455 North 1st Avenue

Tucson, Arizona 85701

****DRAFT** Legal Action Report and Summary Minutes**

1. Roll Call

Meeting was called to order by Chairman Rex at 6:12 p.m.

Present:

Catherine Rex, Chairman	PC, Ward 5
Thomas Sayler-Brown	PC, Mayor's Office
Ruth Beeker	PC, Ward 6

Staff Members Present:

Ernie Duarte, PDSD, Director
Jim Mazzocco, PDSD, Planning Administrator
Adam Smith, PDSD, Principal Planner
Joanne Hershenhorne, PDSD, Lead Planner
Mark Castro, PDSD, Lead Planner
Belinda Flores-McCleese, PDSD, Administrative Assistant
Kristina Medina, PDSD, Administrative Assistant

2. Commissioner Patten to take place of Commissioner Rex on subcommittee

Discussion held.

No action was taken.

3. Approval of Meeting Summary, July 22, 2013

It was moved by Commissioner Sayler-Brown, duly seconded, and carried by a voice vote of 3-0 to approve the meeting summary.

4. Staff summary review of the field trips with individual commissioners

Mr. Mazzocco provided a summary of the observations made by staff that participated in the field trips. Additional comments were provided by Mr. Smith and Mr. Castro. Chair Rex suggested staff provide census data regarding poverty levels in the GIID at the next meeting.

No action was taken.

5. Open Forum to discuss the Six Key Points of Mayor and Council Direction.

Discussion held among commissioners, staff and interested parties. Participants included John Burr (Armory Park Neighborhood Association); Chris Gans and Richard Mayers (West University Neighborhood Association); Diana Lett (Feldmans Neighborhood Association); Keri Silvyn (Lazarus, Silvyn and Bangs); Allyson Solomon (Metropolitan Pima Alliance); and Shawn Cote (SAHBA).

The following are notes from the forum categorized under the key points discussed:

Give more prominence to Neighborhood Protection

- All HPZ properties should be ineligible for IID option
 - Does this include vacant HPZ properties and noncontributing HPZ properties?
 - Development of vacant HPZ properties and neighborhood edges affects character of entire historic neighborhood
 - The District (student housing project at 550 N. 5th Ave.) is outside the HPZ but affects it
 - Vacant and noncontributing HPZ properties should be subject to HPZ design review standards
 - Maybe IID option is OK for development of certain vacant and/or noncontributing HPZ properties, on a case-by-case basis
 - Pull out all HPZ and NPZ properties from IID?
 - Pull out contributing residential properties from IID?
 - Are a few ways to approach this issue
- Avoid incentivizing demolition of HPZ properties even if noncontributing
- Is it appropriate to use the IID in all areas where it currently applies?
 - Revise boundaries, remove GIIS areas where it's inappropriate
- Properties in both the HPZ and IID: HPZ should prevail
 - Need to address building height conflict between more restrictive HPZ and IID
- HPZ is about context/cohesion
 - Can be eroded by development that isn't in context
- Blanket IID overlay doesn't have the sensitivity to address characteristics of specific properties in historic districts
- IID as written doesn't provide sufficient time for real engagement between the developers and neighborhood
 - How much time is needed?
 - Like a PAD – PADs take longer/not that much longer
 - Not like a PAD – a PAD is a rezoning, usually an upzoning

- Need to find balance between neighborhood protection and keeping IID as incentive
 - How have other communities done this?

Clarify role of formal commitments that run with the land

This point wasn't discussed at the 9/9/13 meeting. Chair Rex requested this be addressed at 9/23/13 meeting, open forum.

Ensure IID remains incentive

- Consistent set of rules and design guidelines would benefit the development community
 - this was strongly expressed by the development community during the initial development of the IID
- Development community wants clarity in all aspects of the process: development standards, design guidelines, public process
 - clarity in what is required is key to the IID remaining an incentive
- A relatively quick processing time is an incentive to the development community
 - If the process is changed and a result is that it takes longer to process IID-MDRs, this could become a disincentive to the development community. What is the tipping point, in terms of timelines?
- Incentives should work in both directions: should benefit developers and neighborhood
 - What are the incentives for the neighborhood?
 - Is something that's an incentive for developers always a disincentive for neighbors?
 - To keep the IID as an incentive for developers, if certain developer incentives are removed, can others be added?

Provide design review element

- Vacant and noncontributing HPZ properties should be subject to HPZ design review standards
- Can design standards be tailored to require context/cohesion with neighborhoods, especially historic ones?
- Expand area where DT Links design review applies and add the RND design guidelines

Not create redundancy between proposed DT Links Expanded and IID

- Should coordinate/have consistent design review policies in IID and DT Links
- A more in-depth analysis of DT Links will inform this IID revision process

Consistency with Streetcar Land Use Plan

- Should coordinate/have consistent HPZ policies in DT Links and IID

No action was taken.

6. General Discussion

The following points and concerns were discussed under this item:

- Smaller IID-MDR projects have resulted in successful and creative redevelopment
- Most problems with the GIIS have been with the one student housing project that has been built
 - Maybe use different process for bigger projects versus smaller projects
 - Could be similar issues with bigger projects of any type, not just student housing. May not be more large student housing projects for a while, but may be other types of large projects, which should be considered. Shouldn't focus exclusively on problems with large student housing projects.
- IID should clarify where certain types of development are encouraged
- Development is occurring along the streetcar route – streetcar line is incentive
 - IID intended to facilitate appropriate development along streetcar route
 - Aren't that many development opportunities along the streetcar route
 - If remove all HPZ properties from IID, may alter development potential along streetcar route. Mayor and Council might not look favorably on that. Mayor and Council will consider DT Links on 9/10/2013 – hopes they'll expand DT Links are to include portions of Armory Park Neighborhood that are in the National Register District but outside the HPZ

No action was taken.

7. Future Agenda Items and Meeting Dates

Next meeting scheduled for September 23, 2013. Selection of a new Chair will be added as an item.

No action was taken.

8. Call to the Audience

Mr. Mayers noted that the HPZ is a public/private partnership that resulted in an "agreement" intended to bring stability to historic neighborhoods. The IID as currently written threatens the stability of HPZ neighborhoods.

9. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 7:50 PM.

S:\IID Revisions\Agendas and LAR\PCSC LAR Draft 9.9.13.doc