

**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL] Infill Incentive District (IID) Planning Commission public hearing Wednesday, November 16, 2022

**Date:** Thursday, November 10, 2022 at 10:53:40 AM Mountain Standard Time

**From:** PlanningCommission

**To:** Daniel Bursuck, Koren Manning

---

**From:** Sloane Haywood <sloane.haywood@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Thursday, November 10, 2022 10:52:59 AM (UTC-07:00) Arizona

**To:** PlanningCommission <PlanningCommission@tucsonaz.gov>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Infill Incentive District (IID) Planning Commission public hearing Wednesday, November 16, 2022

The proposed changes to the IID are disturbing and counter to healthy planning for the future of the urban core.

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

The new IID proposal includes an *increase* in zero-lot line development. This makes for an unattractive streetscape for cars, and for walkers, a less inviting and much hotter experience, especially when unmitigated by trees or other forms of shade.

Just 15% of new residential development is proposed for affordable housing. This doesn't come close to satisfying the need, and I've even 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 priced out of center city units, and increasingly at risk for homelessness. The solution to homelessness is more affordable housing!

The IID, IPPs as they currently exist and are worsened in this new proposal, present a missed 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 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 disgraceful disrepair.

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 development that doesn't improve quality of life—even for those new 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 is 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 nothing to improve the

quality of life for those who live, or would like to live, within that ongoing development.

Please include my comments in the record for this meeting.

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

**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL] Infill Incentive District hearing 11.16.22  
**Date:** Monday, November 14, 2022 at 9:47:08 AM Mountain Standard Time  
**From:** PlanningCommission  
**To:** Daniel Bursuck, Koren Manning  
**Attachments:** BSN attachments A,B and C.pdf

---

**From:** rauleramirez1@aol.com <rauleramirez1@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 14, 2022 9:43:02 AM (UTC-07:00) Arizona  
**To:** PlanningCommission <PlanningCommission@tucsonaz.gov>  
**Cc:** rauleramirez1@aol.com <rauleramirez1@aol.com>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Infill Incentive District hearing 11.16.22

**Hearing date: November 16, 2022**

**Case number IID #C8-22-01**

**Name: Raul E Ramirez**

**Dear Commissioners,**

I am a resident of the West side and reside in Ward 1. I am part of a grass roots committee that represents Barrio Sin Nombre, which is one of three communities that make up Menlo Park Neighborhood Association (MPNA). These communities are Old Menlo, Barrio Sin Nombre and the Mercado District. For the last 8 months we have been working closely with City of Tucson (COT) Vice Mayor Santa Cruz, City Environmental Services Director Carlos de la Torre, and informally with COT Park's leadership and City Manager Michael Ortega, to develop a family park in the area.

We are applying \$300,000 monies left over from the Sin Nombre Barrio (BSN) 1.2-million-dollar infrastructure project, that gave us new street pavement, lights, speedbumps and two monuments at the entry ways to our Barrio.

In addition, we have been working with MNPA Neighborhood Plan to develop a land use plan that will guide future development for the immediate area. We have been advised that once the plan is completed and adopted by Mayor and Council that it will set the parameters for new development.

Thus far a good amount of work and engagement by the residents of the three communities has taken place. This is evident for BNS as under the category of "Choices Impacting Barrio Sin Nombre," the #1 choice is a park at the intersection of Cushing and Melwood (see attachment A). So, if we project into the future, the Family Park would likely have a very high priority and will be part of the total area Neighborhood Plan land use policy.

What caught us by surprise was the addition to the IID expansion of two lots know as PS Hughes lots #13 and #14 that border the cross streets Melwood and Cushing in BSN (see attachment B). The Barrio is unique in that area is considered Tucson's Birthplace. The history of these lots dates back to the sale of property by the Sisters of Carondelet, original French nuns that founded St Mary's Hospital, to PS Hughes who would create the subdivision.

**BNS is next to the historic site of the Mission and Convento San Agustín. Later a red brick factory was created and after the clay mining had played out, the COT used the pits for garbage dumps. Three active landfills, Nearmount, Congress and the A Mountain dumps surrounded BSN. These landfills were in operations for at least 10 years and were not closed until the mid-1960's.**

**We have been working hard to reclaim our history and develop a sense of pride in our community that had for so long been disinvested in as a result of red lining and deed restrictions (No Blacks and Brown people). Now, that we are "sitting at the table" we were blindsighted by the IID boundary expansion proposal.**

**As Commissioners you are aware of the tremendous development that has been occurring in Menlo Park since the completion of the trolley. Just within the Gadsden development 1000 rental units have been constructed or planned (see attachment B). If we add other planned development to the immediate area and factor in the existing residences, the need for open space and a recreation area becomes extremely importance. The Neighborhood Plan is 8 months out from completion. However, with the IID sunseting in January 2023, we are caught in an unforeseen situation.**

**We don't see any value in including these lots in the IID expansion. They are zoned as R2 and owed by COT, which zoning allows for a family park. We are aware that the property adjacent is currently zoned as Light Industrial (I1) and will be offered as an incentive for those developers that make a commitment to build affordable rentals (15% of units). We support and applaud the City for its efforts in this area. However, the need is so great that we think that the incentive should require 40% for I1 City owned properties. One of our concerns is that the developers insist on having a 20 % return on their capital investment. This is blatant greed!**

**Thus far, we have requested a joint meeting with Vice Mayor Santa Cruz and City Manager Ortega. Hopefully we will meet prior to November 16<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission Meeting. We also had a discussion with the Steering Committee that is working on the Neighborhood Plan and gave a preliminary overview at MPNA meeting held on November 10<sup>th</sup>. A formal presentation to the Menlo Park community will be made at the December 8<sup>th</sup> meeting which will be prior to the Mayor and Council Public Meeting in December.**

**However, we are hopeful that we can resolve this matter at the joint meeting with Vice Mayor Santa Cruz and City Manager Ortega. Otherwise, we plan to make a presentation to your commission meeting on November 16<sup>th</sup> and the public M/C meeting that follows**

**Sincerely, Raul E Ramirez (520) 250-1615, email [rauleramirez1@aol.com](mailto:rauleramirez1@aol.com)**

**7 Points)**

**More Local Jobs for Residents and Youth (16 points)**

## **Choices Impacting Barrio Sin Nombre**

1. Park at the Intersection of Cushing & Melwood at Barrio Sin Nombre
2. Support Neighborhood Assets (Mission Gardens) **(19 points)**
3. Pedestrian and Bicycle Connectivity to the Loop/Santa Cruz River, Mission Gardens, Parks, Recreation, and Open Space **(17 points)**



Attachment B





January 24, 2022

Dear Neighbor:

The WLB Group and PEG TUC BAUTISTA, LLC are pleased to invite you to a virtual neighborhood meeting to receive your comments regarding the Individual Parking Plan (IPP) application for The Bautista. The Bautista is a proposed 256-unit multi-family residential project with approximately 13,300 square feet of retail/commercial space on the street level and an approximate 8,000 square foot restaurant located on approximately 5.5 acres between Congress Street and Cushing Street on South Linda Avenue (see site plan below).

The Bautista will encourage pedestrian connectivity within the Mercado District by extending the Paseo from the Monier Apartment building, through the future Mercado Centro, to an open courtyard area in the center of The Bautista and to the Santa Cruz River Park. The IPP application is necessary to achieve design goals in compliance with the City of Tucson Unified Development Code.



**Site Plan**

Engineering • Planning • Surveying • Urban Design • Landscape Architecture  
 Offices located in Tucson, Tempe, Flagstaff and Las Vegas • E-mail: [tucson@wlbgroup.com](mailto:tucson@wlbgroup.com)  
 4444 E. Broadway Blvd., Tucson, Arizona 85711 • (520) 881-7480 • FAX (520) 881-7492