

Infill Incentive District Sunset Date Stakeholder Meetings Overview

(Meetings were held on August 22, August 24, and August 29)

Is the IID Working?

- The general consensus is that the revisions in 2015 addressed the concerns at the time and that the IID is working. Most who commented on this did acknowledge there were minor tweaks that could improve the ordinance. Some, however, were hesitant to make any large changes due to its success.

Historic Preservation

- What constitutes historic resources – buildings with façade covering don't get counted as historic (what's underneath isn't respected). Should we expand what is defined as historic to include something that is listed as a non-contributing structure, but could be contributing with some minor restoration work (i.e. façade restoration)? It was stated that the onus should be on the owner to prove a non-contributor is not historically significant - many of these buildings were assessed 30 years ago and the current situation is not the same as it was then.
- Concern about if a historic building is demolished, at what point can that property be redeveloped with the IID. If historic resource is demolished developer should not benefit from IID incentives for some period of time. Groups did not have a true consensus regarding this. Most acknowledged it as an oversight and that it should be corrected - but don't want to incentivize using the underlying zoning. Options discussed:
 - Set time period before IID may be used - i.e. 3 years, 5 years, etc.
 - Demolished after a certain date removes eligibility for utilizing IID - i.e. as of ordinance date.
- Should we create a process that allows for the demolition of a historic building to discourage people opting for a PAD or just utilizing the underlying zoning?
- These revisions should allow for additional building height, where appropriate, when the IID overlaps with an HPZ, however, that should be only after careful and thoughtful engagement with HPZs NAs.

Design Review

- There was a suggestion that we have the option for a Study Session prior to a Public Hearing for major projects or if a meeting went three hours that it should lead to a continuance. It was also stated that we need to be mindful that one of the incentives of Design Review was that it would be more streamlined (addressing time it takes to get project to market is largest incentive).
- Comment regarding consistency between the Design Professional's recommendation and the recommendation of the Design Review Committee. Many times the Design Review Committee will "undo" the work of the Design Professional.

- Concern about flexibility post approval of IID package. Design's tend to change as the construction documents are being developed and the code isn't very clear on what changes need to be re-reviewed and what changes are not substantive (minor vs major changes). Section 5.12.6.Q needs to be clarified.

Parking

- There was discussion about how downtown is a testing ground for density and if we want to promote transit oriented development, we need to assess how much parking is needed.
- Is there a way to tie parking reductions to supplying transit or bike share discounts or passes? Could coincide with Ward 3's efforts to build transit ridership.
- There was significant discussion about increasing the 25% automatic parking reduction in the Greater Infill Incentive Subdistrict (GIIS) portion of the IID.
- Even if we don't increase automatic parking reductions - the Individual Parking Plan (IPP) is an option for additional reductions and is not overly onerous.

Student Housing

- There was a suggestion that we should not be incentivizing student housing and therefore we should not allow for a developer to utilize the IID for group dwellings.
- Some attendees were hesitant to add additional restrictions on student housing within the IID especially considering the Main Gate area is nearly built-out.
- It was also suggested that the Mayor and Council Special Exception already required for group dwellings when utilizing the IID is essentially a restriction.

Transit Oriented Development

- We need to better incentivize development that supports transit and other public transportation options.
- Area between 4th and 6th avenues is going to fill out and the development needs to be mixed use and have ground floor commercial.

Design Guidelines and Overall Design

- City lacks thoughtful design criteria for the proposals within the IID. Should look at Pasadena's guidelines.
- Adopted design guidelines could be useful in mitigating the unease of more dense new development.
- Concern about lack of permeability of developments and public space being provided.
- Concern that if we were to have design guidelines, it would limit design options and lead to less character in the designs. Maybe it is just a best practices guide of projects that have utilized the IID.
- There should be an obvious connection between using the IID and better architectural design. Development should be strengthening our social and neighborhood fabric rather than destabilizing via incompatible development /use that encourages gentrification and the loss of diversity.

Impact on Neighborhoods

- Most IID examples are downtown; impacts haven't been drastic in neighborhoods.
- As development moves north, protections are needed for existing neighborhoods.
- Need more engagement of neighborhoods early on in the process.

Sunset Date

- Questions regarding setting another Sunset Date. Comment that because of how much change is occurring in trends and development patterns, it may be good to come back in 3 to 5 years.

Affordable Housing

- Suggestion that a certain percentage of housing be required to be affordable. Staff clarified that as a requirement of the lender, many of the developments already are required to have 20% affordable units.
- Allow a "free" residential upzone if the additional allowed units are assured low-income for at least 'X' number of years. E.g., allow someone with R-2 to build to R-3 if the units beyond the R-2 limits are kept affordable. This might be helpful for Grant Road and overlays.

Northern Portion of Greater Infill Incentive Subdistrict

- There is a lot of I-1 along the interior of this corridor, why not allow work live like in the warehouse triangle area?