

The Meteor
Doug Zell & Chris St. Peter
901 and 905 W. Congress St.
Tucson, AZ 85745

VIA EMAIL

Mayor Regina Romero & Tucson City Council
cc: Planning Commission (c/o Koren Manning), Menlo Park Neighborhood Association
President Kylie Walzak, Mac Hudson

September 20, 2022

Re: Inclusion of The Meteor in Infill Incentive District

Dear Mayor Romero and Tucson City Council:

We respectfully submit this letter to voice our support for the inclusion of The Meteor, which is planning a future location at 901 and 905 W. Congress St., in the proposed expanded Infill Incentive District (“IID”).

The Meteor, a concept that combines an all-day cafe with a bike shop, has locations in Austin, Texas and Bentonville and Fayetteville, Arkansas. We promote cycling, active lifestyles, and alternative forms of transit, and we pride ourselves on designing beautiful cafes, bike shops, and outdoor spaces that serve as the “front porch” of the neighborhood.


Inclusion of The Meteor in the IID would, quite simply, make development in Tucson much more attractive, as it would ease parking requirements and other design constraints. Moreover, inclusion of The Meteor would further the original purposes of the IID, including promoting sustainable development in the infill district; supporting a pedestrian- and cycling-friendly neighborhood; protecting the historic structures located at 901 and 905 W. Congress; and providing a transition between development and family residences in the form of a beautifully designed community gathering space.

For these reasons, we strongly support inclusion of The Meteor’s future Tucson location in the expanded IID.

Best Regards,



Doug Zell
Founder



Chris St. Peter
Founder

Subject: [EXTERNAL] FW: Attend a public meeting to learn about potential updates to the Downtown Infill Incentive District

Date: Tuesday, September 27, 2022 at 2:57:58 PM Eastern Daylight Time

From: loispawlak@cox.net

To: Daniel Bursuck

Daniel,

I'm unable to attend any of the meetings in person or remote.

I have a couple of inputs though and didn't know where to send them as there is no information on inputting without attending, so I'm sending them to you.

1. Most everything downtown seems to be for wealthier people now. Hotels that are built are overly expensive to stay at as a local.
2. There is very little parking and it's not getting better. People who live outside of downtown can go there, but cannot park, so we go home or don't go at all. Same issues at the U of A. We cannot patronize the businesses that are near campus, particularly Speedway & Park area.
3. There are very few trees. I'm not sure why Tucson seems to have learned nothing from other cities who've made this same mistake of no or very small trees in their downtowns. Now they are all trying to figure out how to rectify this without tearing down any new buildings that they allowed to be built.

Thank you.

Lois Pawlak

From: City of Tucson <Tucson@public.govdelivery.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2022 10:49 AM

To: loispawlak@cox.net

Subject: Attend a public meeting to learn about potential updates to the Downtown Infill Incentive District

Having trouble viewing this email? [View it as a Web page.](#) | 



Comments received via online form on IID webpage and distributed at public meeting.

1	anonymous	<p>I'm struck by the limited tools the IID has to actually deal with transit oriented development Walkability is often mentioned too. Since the IID stops at the kerb the barriers to pedestrians, cyclists and transit users aren't being addressed. If when you walk along a roadway you cannot have a conversation with a companion because of traffic noise walkability is greatly diminished. 4th Ave and 6th St, tough intersection to cross because of the speed of traffic and encroachments by vehicles into what should be areas exclusive to pedestrians or cyclists. 4th Ave pre street car had mid block crossings and pedestrian refuges. Main Gate UOD, nice landscaping along Speedway but nobody will ever see it because the pedestrian environment is so hostile. Stone north to Grant, serious issues with pedestrian fatalities. Yes I know many of the injured were not in a crosswalk etc but I think that tells us something about the quality of the infrastructure. Beg buttons abound. If a car approaches an intersection sensors that do not require the interactions of automobilists alter the light cycle to let them pass. Imagine you are walking towards a red light, you reach to activate the walk signal, the light changes before you can reach the button, no walk signal. Utility poles in r-o-w, sidewalks at the very edges of roadways, non standard so called bike lanes. 5 foot bike lanes with drainage pan so you can't really use that entire lane safely. Free rights, grr. you're training cars to keep moving. This is not integrated planning. If what you seek is increased mobility for people who are not using cars you need to actually make some changes in roadways and sidewalks. In short, roads are too wide, intersections are too big, cars are too fast and if you aren't adressing those things nothing you do at the edges is really going to matter</p>	English (United States)
2	anonymous	<p>You should sunset the IID. End it. There's nothing to mitigate the ongoing displacement occurring in this area. In fact, it looks like you want to extend and turbo-charge this. When is it enough? When you see Barrio census tracts losing over 20% of their Hispanic populations, why does that not give you pause? It appears you're more focused on ensuring speculator and developer profit through Urban Renewal 2.0 policy that making sure people can live in Tucson.</p>	English (United States)
3	anonymous	<p>Barrio Sin Nombre wants a community park in the Nearmont landfill lot that the Infill Incentive District is attempting to extend its boundaries over. The community has a petition for said park and has been in conversation with COT, Ward 1 Office, and The Neighborhood Steering Committee (Menlo Park.) Menlo Park Neighborhood has been in full support of the park. The community wants open space in that area! Parking spaces shouldn't be reduced in these communities as it causes traffic to overflow into the neighborhood. For example Melwood Ave is closed off at Cushing</p>	English (United States)

		<p>St due to the influx of traffic created by surrounding businesses. Residents are left with the burden/inconvenience of these new businesses and reduced parking requirements proposed by the iid. Let's be honest Tucson is a car city. You have about a thousand cars to one bicycle and a thousand cars to three pedestrians. If a developer buys a property with no parking space they should be burdened with creating parking spaces communities shouldn't have to deal with developers issues. Maybe take your IID to the South Side of Tucson or Foothills.</p>	
4	anonymous	<p>No infill development on Nearmont / Melwood Ave. No Lack of parking need open space for established residence in Barrio Sin Nombre</p>	English (United States)

From: [Daniel Bursuck](#)
To: [Acacia Dupierre](#); [Koren Manning](#); [Corky Poster](#)
Subject: Fw: [EXTERNAL] Opposed to IID changes in Dunbar Spring
Date: Thursday, October 13, 2022 1:59:36 PM

FYI.

From: Jonathan Crowe <jlcrowe@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 13, 2022 1:56 PM
To: Daniel Bursuck <Daniel.Bursuck@tucsonaz.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposed to IID changes in Dunbar Spring

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Hello Mr. Bursuck,

I support the IID in general, but oppose any proposal to expand the IID boundary from Ash Avenue/alley to 9th Avenue further into the Dunbar Spring neighborhood. I request that the IID boundary remain as it is today along Ash Avenue.

The Dunbar Spring historic neighborhood has suffered over the years from commercial development encroachment around the edges of an intact, residential core.

Along the 900 block of North 9th Avenue in particular, a whole block of historic homes were demolished in the 1960s when the Sahara Motor Inn was developed. Another historic home along that same block was demolished in the 1999 for expansion of a parking lot for the redevelopment of that hotel into student apartments. In 2008, two more historic homes were demolished on the 1000 block of North 9th Avenue for a failed redevelopment project. More recently, the Sahara Apartments changed ownership and installed non-compliant outdoor lighting that shines directly into homes on 9th Avenue. Residents have repeatedly requested relief from City enforcement, but to no avail.

Future redevelopment of the Stone Avenue corridor should be encouraged, but not at the expense of adjacent residential neighborhoods. It is important to preserve and support what's left of the historic Dunbar Spring neighborhood along 9th Avenue.

I oppose further encroachment of the IIP into the Dunbar Spring neighborhood beyond the present Ash Avenue/alley boundary.

Thank-you.

Jonathan Crowe

939 N. 9th Avenue

From: [Corky Poster](#)
To: [Koren Manning](#); [Daniel Bursuck](#); [Acacia Dupierre](#); [Maria Gayosso](#); [Amanda Smith](#); [Alex Hollis](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] FW: IID
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 11:15:00 AM

I received this additional information from Chris Gans. Any thoughts?

Corky Poster

520.861.6320

PMM | POSTER MIRTO McDONALD

From: CHRIS GANS <CGANS232@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2022 8:21 AM
To: Corky Poster <cposter@pmm.design>
Subject: IID

Hi Corky,

Some ideas for changes to the IID.

Chris

IID suggestions;

1. **No student housing developers can use the IID regardless of how the developers describe their project.** Large student housing projects in and near residential areas have on-going negative impacts to residents. This includes traffic issues, behavioral problems, safety (objects thrown from balconies), gun shots, lack of maintenance that creates safety issues and impacts on local rents making it less affordable for the working population. Student housing creates large blocks of students paying high rents which impacts rents in adjoining neighborhoods. Main Gate, The District (West U) and Iron Horse have had ongoing issues from day one. Student housing development **removes properties from other uses such as affordable and residential housing where** it's needed. Current student housing projects include the Opus on 4th Ave under construction and the Union on 6th which is student occupied **If the UA needs more student housing locate it on campus using public-private partnerships that is common at many universities.**
2. **Affordable housing** A possible way to get more affordable housing is to encourage developers to either include it their projects or to help fund it off site in areas where it's needed most. This funding could be an alternative to requiring street activation space. If developers don't want to participate in building/funding affordable housing they have the option to use underlying zoning.
3. **Timeline from IID DRC / PDS approval to start of project.** Major projects that start construction of a project within 3 years of approval, should be required to inform PDS as to when they intend to start and what changes if any they propose to make in the project. Minor changes should be reviewed by PDS staff and the design review professional. Major changes should also include going before the DRC for approval.
4. **Review and Approval Procedures—A neighborhood meeting.** Written information should be sent early to any residential/ business areas impacted by a proposed project. It takes time for most people to understand a project and what the potential impacts are. It's rare that in an

early neighborhood meeting that a design is close to a final project. **As residential areas are the most impacted by new projects the required neighborhood presentation should occur when the project is closer to a final design.**

5. **Composition of the IID DRC- It's written that ad hoc members of a neighborhood association or an HPZ can be appointed to represent the areas impacted by a proposed IID project. It has not been common to see these reps at the IID DRC meetings**
6. **PDS D Directors Decision- page17-18 Item D.** Behavioral management plan should include immediate closure of any balconies that anything is thrown from. The renters of a unit that endangers public safety should be evicted.
7. **Maintenance and Safety.** This would be H. in this list and requires that all Safety issues including elevators, door locks, fire alarms and trash build up must be resolved in 48 hours or less. Maintenance issues should be resolved within 72 hours.
8. **5.11.9 Permitted uses;** Remove group dwellings- student housing. Student housing can be built on campus using the public -private process that was used to build the Honors College.
9. **Sale of an approved IID project before construction.** Any IID approved project that has been sold prior to construction should be reviewed by PDS D staff and the Design Professional for any changes to the approved plans. Major changes should also be reviewed by the IID DRC.
10. **Heat Island impacts—**How are proposed projects mitigating heat island impacts?

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: IID Proposed Changes and A Mountain Landfill
Date: Tuesday, November 1, 2022 at 11:36:41 AM Mountain Standard Time
From: Sloane Haywood
To: Daniel Bursuck

Begin forwarded message:

From: Sloane Haywood <sloane.haywood@gmail.com>
Date: October 31, 2022 at 6:31:15 PM MST
Cc: Mayor.Romero@tucsonaz.gov, citymanager@tucsonaz.gov, Ward1 <Ward1@tucsonaz.gov>, Ward2@tucsonaz.gov, ward3 <ward3@tucsonaz.gov>, Ward4 <Ward4@tucsonaz.gov>, Ward5@tucsonaz.gov, Ward6 <Ward6@tucsonaz.gov>
Subject: IID Proposed Changes and A Mountain Landfill

Hi Dan,

I attended the October 13 Zoom meeting addressing proposed changes to the IID, and I heard a number of things that I found very disturbing.

Rather than requiring *more* landscaping and a minimum number of trees per development square footage, the proposal on the table is for *less* landscaping than is currently required. And I now understand that the "open space" requirement includes rooftops. I know of no Tucson rooftops that are public space, and a rooftop certainly does nothing for the urban heat sink.

Under the new IID requirements, there would be a lessening of the minimum number of parking spaces required for IIPs. There is currently a totally unsustainable lack of parking in the downtown area. When granting IIPs, the same street parking is consistently re-allocated to multiple developments. The last time I checked, there was no map showing current IIPs and those currently proposed. Has this changed? How can IIPs be granted with no knowledge of the true parking picture?

The new IID proposal includes an *increase* in zero-lot line development.

Just 15% of new residential development is proposed for affordable housing. This doesn't come close to satisfying the need. (I've heard that developers speak up in public meetings and say 15% is TOO MUCH, and it should be only 10%.) Since the IID essentially subsidizes development, the city should be demanding that developers increase the ratio of affordable housing and stipulate that ratio be enforced for a longer period of time.

To talk about the Marist in the context of affordable housing doesn't take into account all the new, market-rate residential units that surround this project, while elders, working-class folk, and the disadvantaged are increasingly at risk for homelessness

The IID, IIPs, and the A Mountain Landfill are an opportunity for the City to chart a long-term livable course for Tucson. Where are the downtown public open spaces and tree-planting requirements that would provide residents and visitors with an inviting and comfortable place to enjoy, as well as mitigate the heat sink? Instead, what we see is promotion of more and more market-rate housing, restaurants, and bars.

More and more development is underway while the city provides fewer and fewer amenities for residents already living in the urban downtown. Where is the retail that residents require for

their daily lives and that make a downtown viable: a grocery store, pharmacy, etc.? The downtown neighborhood streets and sidewalks are in complete disrepair, but more and more money is pumped into more and more market-rate housing.

It has been my experience that attending and speaking up in public meetings and writing letters and emails to appropriate parties does nothing to influence this trajectory toward more and more development that doesn't improve quality of life—even for those people you're trying to attract to live in the downtown area. And certainly, it diminishes the livability for those of us homeowners who have been "holding down the fort" for decades when downtown was withering. Because of our persistence and ongoing property investments and improvements, we have made the downtown area a very attractive place for development that's now increasing our property taxes while we suffer the construction noise and closed and damaged roads.

This may sound like I'm anti-development. I'm not. I am opposed to development that does not improve the quality of life for those who live, or would like to live, within that ongoing development.

I will appreciate a response.

Thank you,
Sloane Haywood
33-year resident at 707 S. 6th Ave