

Subject: [EXTERNAL]RE: Commercial Parking Code Amendments
Date: Wednesday, February 23, 2022 at 8:12:15 PM Mountain Standard Time
From: Jim Tofel
To: Acacia Dupierre, Daniel Bursuck, Koren Manning, Scott Clark
Attachments: image001.png

I have a conflict, so unfortunately, I cannot attend. The only two points I would likely make are:

1. Affordable housing projects should not be looked at the same way as market rate projects. Most of these projects are near mass transit lines and the tenants tend to have fewer vehicles. Most of the projects we have worked on are significantly overparked.
2. As self driving cars work through all the bugs, it is a matter of time before Uber / Lyft and others are used for transportation on a regular basis instead of individuals owning their own cars. Long term trends are going to be that individuals and family's will own fewer vehicles. It would be good if our parking minimums recognized these trends.

Good luck with the meeting.

Thanks,
Jim

James B. Tofel, Managing Member - Development

Direct: 520.777.6280 | Cell: 520.907.8300

TOFEL DENT CONSTRUCTION

3555 East 42nd Stravenue, Tucson, AZ 85713

Office: 520.571.0101 | Fax: 520.571.0505

AZ Lic. ROC 139133 KB-01 | NM Lic. 80482 GB-9 | CA Lic. CSLB 987723 B | NV Lic. 79434 B

From: Acacia Dupierre <Acacia.Dupierre@tucsonaz.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, February 23, 2022 6:56 PM
To: Daniel Bursuck <Daniel.Bursuck@tucsonaz.gov>; Koren Manning <Koren.Manning@tucsonaz.gov>; Scott Clark <Scott.Clark@tucsonaz.gov>
Subject: RE: Commercial Parking Code Amendments

Good evening,

The item Commercial Parking Amendments UDC Text Amendment is currently scheduled for a public hearing with the Planning Commission on Wednesday, March 2, 2022 at or after 6pm. This meeting will be held virtually on Zoom.

How to join the meeting: Please join the Planning Commission meetings from your computer, tablet, or smartphone by going to the Planning Commission webpage at <https://www.tucsonaz.gov/pdsd/planning-commission> and clicking "Click Here to Join Meeting" at the top of the page. The most recent materials for this item have now been posted on the same webpage.

You can submit written comments or request to speak at the public hearing by emailing PlanningCommission@tucsonaz.gov

These commercial parking code amendments involve new requirements for Electric Vehicle parking spaces and some changes to the use of the Individual Parking Plan (IPP) to help support affordable

Date: February 25, 2022

To: Planning Commission members

From: Colette Altaffer

Re: Proposed changes to the Commercial Parking Code requirements

I urge you to reject the proposed draft ordinance for changes to the Commercial Parking Code. This ordinance needs to be returned to staff for revision and additional community outreach.

1. I was a participant in the Stakeholder's meetings. At no time did staff raise the issue of reducing the parking requirements for affordable housing.
2. Several architects serving on the Stakeholder group urged city staff to delay making any changes to the code. They argued that COVID had changed the behavior of bars, restaurants and their patrons and advised staff to wait until we had a better idea of what "normal" is going to look like.
3. Several business owners also advised staff to wait on making code changes. In particular, the representative from the Fourth Avenue Merchants Association complained about a property owner who obtained permission for extension of premises. The extension of premises is one of the justifications for weakening our parking requirements. That extension was creating problems for the surrounding properties and increasing the clean-up and policing costs for the Association. He urged staff to wait on code changes as he felt greater care needed to be taken to ensure that code changes did not come at the expense of other businesses.
4. Bar and restaurant patrons park and stay, causing a longer turnover rate of parking spaces. That, coupled with the fact that bars and restaurants are often located near residential areas, led to the current parking requirements. To prevent parking from spilling over into these residential areas and creating a host of safety and quality of life issues for the residents, it is imperative that the current zoning code regulations remain unaltered.

Alcoholic beverage service is regulated by the state. The state Liquor License Board is governed by rules set out in the Arizona Administrative Code https://apps.azsos.gov/public_services/Title_19/19-01.pdf As you can see, these are not zoning rules. Protecting residents and other businesses is the job of our city and its zoning codes.

Many of our residential areas lack sidewalks and streetlights. Parents raising their children and elderly or disabled residents have an expectation that our government will ensure that neighborhoods are safe. By reducing the parking requirements, the city is forcing bar patrons to park in the surrounding residential areas. This endangers both the residents and those patrons by forcing pedestrian activity into vehicle travel areas.

Please send this ordinance back for more public outreach and for revisions. Both you, and the community, deserve better input and thoughtful consideration on this issue.

Thank you.

Date: February 24, 2022

To: Planning Commission members

From: Bonnie Poulos; 1208 E Smoot Dr, 85719; 520-888-5062

Re: Proposed changes to the Commercial Parking Code requirements

I urge you to delay making any recommendations regarding the draft ordinance presented to you by City staff concerning changes to the Commercial Parking Code. There are several good reasons to ask you to send this back to staff for revisions and for more public outreach.

1. The public outreach process has been woefully inadequate. Not only are there proposed changes that were not discussed in any of the public or stakeholder meetings (inclusion of affordable housing projects in the Individual Parking Plan), there was also no notification of neighborhood associations registered with the City asking for their participation in the public process.
2. The proposed ordinance would effectively eliminate numerical parking requirements for all new commercial and multi-family residential developments. This has not been made clear by staff in any of their presentations to the public or to members of the commission or to elected officials.
3. The State still has an Emergency order in place that allows for expansion of premises during the pandemic. A request from several members of the stakeholder's group to wait on ordinance changes until the Emergency order is rescinded and life for bars and restaurants gets back to normal was ignored in this process.
4. Is the Unified Development Code even the place for promoting Electric Vehicle charging stations? At this early stage of electric vehicle technology should the City be making requirements that will impact all new commercial and multi-family residential developments?

My biggest concern are the changes to the Individual Parking Plan (IPP). A decade ago, this ordinance was passed with community support precisely because it addressed the unique impacts of parking for restaurants and bars. This ordinance would gut those protections. Unless there is a provision in the ordinance that specifically prohibits on-street parking on local streets in residential neighborhoods from being used in the justification for a reduction in parking for restaurants and bars, the ordinance would allow such parking without regard for the adjacent property owners and residents who will be impacted by overflow parking. Please ask staff how many miles of local streets without sidewalks exist in Tucson and how many of them are adjacent to commercial and multi-family developments.

With regard to Electric Vehicle (EV) charging stations, I would suggest that the City first start with incentivizing them to private interests instead of burdening the land use code with that responsibility. In addition, EV charging stations will further reduce the number of available parking spaces for those not wealthy enough to afford such vehicles, thus exacerbating any parking issues that already exist. To incentivize EV charging stations around the city perhaps we should enact an ordinance that prohibits the construction of new gas stations in Tucson, as was recently done in the city of Petaluma, CA.

Please send this ordinance back for revisions and more public outreach before making your recommendations to the Mayor and Council members.

Thank you for your consideration.

Subject: [EXTERNAL]proposed commercial parking rules

Date: Friday, February 25, 2022 at 11:18:57 AM Mountain Standard Time

From: mattsomers@juno.com

To: Daniel Bursuck

Please forward to the Parking Commission.

Dear Commission,

Please hold off on any new parking requirements for commercial property that are being considered.

The Historic Block on the northside of Broadway between Martin and Warren has very limited parking in back. As such, any restaurant or bar proposed could cause parking in the neighborhood not anticipated by the RTA and the City of Tucson.

Please restudy the concept so that neighborhoods do not take the brunt of the problems caused by commercial property. Our neighborhood, the Rincon Heights Neighborhood Association, is affected by the daily parking in our neighborhood by students and staff as well as special parking for basketball and football.

thank you,

Matt Somers
125 N Vine Ave
over 60 years in Tucson, over 30 years in Rincon Heights

To: Planning Commissioners

From: Ruth Beeker

Re: Public Hearing Testimony on March 2, 2022: **OPPOSE IPP Elimination of 7.4.5. A.3.g.**

I urge you to reject the elimination of UDC 7.4.5.A.3.g. The exceptions for restaurants and bars were originally included in the code because their hours do not follow the typical business day and their service attracts social interactions among their patrons. When standing as individual sites, keeping the distance between the front door and the parking area to a minimum becomes a quality-of-life issue for near-by residential areas. To eliminate the certainty of the fixed numerical requirements with site-specifics introduces undo complexity.

Is there a PDS D process in place to ensure granting such an IPP will be in the best interest of ALL impacted parties?

--Does PDS D have adequate staff to process more site-specific applications error-free?

--How can PDS D ensure that its process is not applicant-biased?

--The 300' notification is to give the impacted public a voice, but does it?

Notification goes to property owners. With ever-increasing rental property, will the actual occupants impacted have a voice? Does the announcement go to a corporation or a person?

Notification goes to neighborhood associations (NA). Not all COT area has NA's. Of the ones registered with the City, how many are active at this time? How many have their current officers' addresses on file with the City? Is there adequate time allowed for response, especially in the summer? What effort does the City make to strengthen neighborhood associations, even though they are designated gate-keepers on land use topics?

--The neighborhood meeting is the responsibility of the applicant; how does the City monitor the content? Does the City provide citizens the background knowledge needed to be good land use decision-makers? The applicant submits documentation of the meeting to PDS D; who knows if it is accurate? What effort does PDS D make to address the public concerns raised, even when reported?

If the granting of a IPP results in troublesome behavior negatively impacting the surrounding area, what remediation does the City have?

**Once structural changes have been approved by the City and carried out on the restaurant or bar property, how likely is it to be required to be returned to its original state? We know the longevity of those businesses is short; how would that work with a new owner?

**TPD does not prioritize neighborhood noise complaints, nor can they get there in time to document or apprehend violators; what alternatives does the City have to offer citizens? Will owners be held responsible for its patrons' behavior off-site as well as any problems generated on-site?

**Neighbors find the City court system slow to enforce penalties; why would IPP violations be different?

I have seen no compelling reasons given by staff for the removal of UDC 7.4.5.A.3.g. Instead, its removal presents a whole new set of implementation difficulties. Please, do not create problems where there is such extremely limited evidence that any exist.