



POSTER  
MIRTO  
McDONALD  
ARCHITECTURE  
PLANNING  
PRESERVATION

**DATE:** September 23, 2022

**TO:** City of Tucson, Planning and Development Services Department IID Team

**FROM:** Corky Poster, Architect and Planner (AICP), On-Call COT Design Professional

**RE:** City of Tucson IID Update, Outreach/Input Focus Groups

Attached are the detailed notes from the five outreach session to gather advice and commentary to assist in the Update of the COT UDC IID.

The Notes consist of five documents:

1. Design Professionals utilizing the IID, September 9, 2022
2. Design Review Committee (DRC) reviewing all IID applications, September 13, 2022
3. Planning and Development Services Department staff, administering the IID, September 16, 2022
4. Design Professional Reviewers together reviewing all IID applications, September 21, 2022
5. Design Review Board (DRB) reviewing IID applications in the Rio Nuevo Area (RNA), April 8, 2022

The issues that emerged (“What we heard”) are as follows:

1. BOUNDARIES:
  - a. The IID boundaries are in need of minor changes, but wholesale changes are beyond this scope. We need to study ways to rationalize property boundaries and rational expansion.
2. PROCESS:
  - a. The process would be improved if it were streamlined. Are there ways to combine reviews? Can there be elimination of overlapping reviews of the same topic by different reviewers (e.g., historic preservation). Consolidated reviews?
  - b. Can the overall timeline be shortened?
  - c. Is there a way to further simplify the process based on the size of the project in addition to Minor and Major reviews? Can small projects go quicker than large projects. Existing buildings differentiated from new buildings.
  - d. Can a graphic image more clearly summarize the process?
  - e. How can the Updates and Revisions be handled more expeditiously?
  - f. Can the IID and the IPP process be more simply integrated? How do make it mor simply concurrent?
  - g. More PSDS staff needed.
  - h. No sunset date would be preferable.
  - i. Clarify property Owner versus tenant signoff on improvements.
  - j. Increase the reliance on and the importance of pre-submittal reviews.
  - k. More flexibility in the language. Allow “Best Practices” to smooth over unanticipated difficult issues.
  - l. Better engagement. Maybe a second neighborhood meeting when project is more developed and understandable.
  - m. Better sharing of ideas and formats among Design Professional Reviewers.
3. CONTENT:
  - a. Can there more specific guidelines and rules for phased projects or “temporary uses.” How do we put a time limit on phasing?

- b. Encouraging 1<sup>st</sup> Floor commercial has been difficult. Is there another way to achieve the goal of street-level pedestrian interest without battling the low demand for retail or single use developers?
- c. Can the parking garage requirement be more flexible? Can it vary by proximity to the City center and be more lenient at the edges of the IID.
- d. Is there a way to control student housing beyond "Group Dwelling"?
- e. Historic preservation is tricky and needs more specific guidelines, especially being compatible with adjacent historic properties.
- f. How does the design more reflect Tucson?
- g. Better screening for all parking.
- h. Do we add affordable housing incentives? If so, how can we do it so that it actually works? Is there an *in lieu* fee that could be effective?
- i. Do we add alternate transportation incentives? If so, how can we do it so that it actually works? Is there an *in lieu* fee that could be effective?
- j. Do we add sustainability incentives? If so, how can we do it so that it actually works? Is there an *in lieu* fee that could be effective?
- k. How can we avoid lot-split workarounds to avoid preservation standards?
- l. How do we increase landscape in urban areas to mitigate heat island?
- m. 5.12.9.A should have and "O" and not and "AND."
- n. 5.12.7.D.4.b is wrong. It should be "12.00 noon."
- o. Better IID ADA enforcement language.
- p. Better design requirements for cool roof, green infrastructure, and other sustainable practices.
- q. The Stone Avenue Sub-Area of the Downtown Links District needs more reviews and scrutiny.