

Report on Neighborhood Infill Forum #3
December 13, 2004
Randolph Golf Course Clubhouse
600 South Alvernon Way

Participation

Number of people signed in (including city & forum staff)	85
Comment cards turned in	37
Question cards turned in	17
Descriptors checked on comment cards:	
Attended Forum #1	23
Attended Forum #2	24
Attended all three Forums	21
Neighborhood perspective	31
Development perspective	10
Government perspective	4
City of Tucson resident	32

Summary of Comments Identifying TOOLS Needed to Feel Empowered in the Infill Development Process:

- Neighborhood plans
 - City provide assistance to develop or review/revise
 - Experienced neighborhoods assist inexperienced ones
 - Adjoining neighborhoods unite to plan open space for the area
 - Plans be utilized for review of all Land Use Code uses, not just re-zonings
- Opportunities to increase knowledge
 - Continuing forums
 - Regular reports to community from the Planning Commission Infill Sub-committee and the City Council Growth Sub-committee
 - Classes for new neighborhood association officers to provide them clear understanding of the Land Use Code
- Improved neighborhood notification processes and materials
- Ombudsperson or neighborhood advocate on City staff
- Infill ordinance which uses zones for areas with common problems
- Design standards and design review process
 - Requirement that builders on vacant lots must meet with neighborhood
 - Correlation between size of project and type of neighborhood review process
 - Language clear, concise, and enforced as written
- Incentives such as fee waivers available for good infill projects

Summary of Comments Identifying CHANGES that Would Improve the Infill Development Process:

- Attitude
 - Residents respected as stakeholders/equal partners in review process
 - Compromises accepted; patience and communication needed
 - Builders held responsible for decisions they make
 - Neighbors be more willing to take risks
 - Recognition that what is good for the City should be good for neighborhoods also
 - Priority given to current residents, not those who may move here

- Better enforcement
 - Board of Adjustment should base decisions on findings, not “feelings”, few variances be granted, no retro-variances without penalty
 - “Crooked” developers be identified
 - Means to stop individual developers or investors from taking over neighborhoods by sub-dividing lots and/or changing owner-occupied homes into rentals
 - Citations for illegal rentals

- Citizen involvement
 - Committee and panel appointments

- Content of Land Use Code (LUC)
 - Definition of “infill”
 - Definition of “single family” residence
 - Residential Cluster Projects (RCPs) be used as a true incentive to conserve open space
 - Landscaping requirements needed
 - Integration of traffic, engineering, fire, sanitation into **design process**
 - Editing of LUC for clarity; then consistency in interpretation for predictability
 - Requirement that new construction be compatible with existing development in height, setback, density; discourage mini-dorm construction
 - Adequate off-street parking be required
 - Revisions of procedures and codes be less frequent
 - Process to align zoning with present use of land (R-2 to R-1)
 - Restriction of lot-splitting and a lower lot coverage of 605 to reduce infill problems
 - Neighborhood review of new construction and remodels
 - Revision of HPZ requirements to make it easier for neighborhoods with rentals to get that status

Report on Neighborhood Infill Forum #3
December 13, 2004

- Development Services
 - Reduction of city review turn-around time
 - Front-line city staff be on same page as City council and management objectives

Tabulation of TOPICS for Further In-depth Discussions from Comment Cards:

Open space options	18	3
Zoning regulations	17	3
Developing a neighborhood plan	16	5
Landscaping	16	4
UA student housing	14	2
Revising a neighborhood plan	11	4
Legal considerations in code revisions	10	1
Water management	9	4
Residential Cluster Projects (RCPs)	8	2
Working with realtors	7	1
Architects' frustrations	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>
TOTAL COMMENT CARDS	37	
“Development perspective” cards (included above)		10

Other topics written in:

More dialogue between citizens, elected officials, and city staff
Environmental Services
Innovative infill ordinances
Affordable housing
Working with rental property owners
Enforcing a neighborhood plan
Responsiveness of city staff – consistency, notification

