



GRANT ROAD

Improvement Plan



www.grantroad.info



This project is managed by the City of Tucson.

For more information please visit www.grantroad.info or call the project hotline at 624-4727.

GRANT ROAD IMPROVEMENT PLAN TASK FORCE

August 14, 2014

Donna R. Liggins Recreation Center

2160 N. 6th Avenue

Tucson, Arizona 85705

MEETING RESULTS

MEETING TOPICS

Major Streets & Routes Plan Amendment Update
Land Use Presentation & Discussion

TASK FORCE PARTICIPANTS

Alice Roe

Andrew Jones

Beverly Rutter

Jay Young

Jim Hogan

John Wakefield

Joseph Maher

Linda Marie Small

Moon Joe Yee

Rebecca Ramey

Robert Tait

Roy Garcia

Moon Joe Yee

TASK FORCE MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE

Dale Calvert

Henry Jacobson

Susan Alexander

Wayne Cullop

Call to Order

Quorum was established. The meeting was called to order by the facilitator, Nanci Beizer.

Project Team & Task Force Introductions

The GRIP Project Team, City Staff, and Task Force members introduced themselves. Overall Grant Road Improvement Plan team members in attendance are listed below.

Name	Department	Role in Project
Beth Abramovitz	Tucson Department of Transportation (TDOT)	Project Manager
Alejandro Angel	Psomas Engineering	Engineering Project Manager- Design of Phase 2 of Grant Road
Rebecca Ruopp	Office of Integrated Planning (OIP)	Coordinate projects that cross multiple departments and have significant public involvement

This is a project of the Regional Transportation Authority.

The voter-approved, \$2.1 billion RTA plan will be implemented through 2026. Details about the full plan are available at www.RTAmobility.com.

The Regional Transportation Authority has a nine-member board with representatives from local, state and tribal governments.

This project will be managed by the City of Tucson.

Approved February 24, 2015

John Beall Jim Mazzocco	Planning and Development Services	Land Use information/ City planning
----------------------------	--------------------------------------	--

Review and Approve April 1, 2014 Meeting Summary

The Task Force reviewed and approved the April 1, 2014 Meeting Summary.

Major Streets and Routes Plan Amendment Update

Rebecca Ruopp provided the Task Force with an update to the Major Streets and Routes Plan Amendment. She explained that in June 2014, Mayor and Council recommended that staff amend the Major Streets and Routes Plan to reflect the Grant Road alignment between Oracle Road and Swan Road. Currently, the Major Streets and Routes Plan identifies Grant Road as an 'arterial street' with a future right-of-way width of 120 feet. The amendment will ensure and that the right-of-way designated in the Major Streets and Routes Plan for Grant Road is consistent with the Mayor and Council approved alignment. There will be amendments to the text and the map as appropriate.

Task Force Discussion on Major Streets and Routes Plan Amendment Update

- Jim Hogan: I thought this was all done. What constitutes public outreach and public hearing? What if there is a push back from the public regarding the alignment.
 - Jim Mazzocco: We received legal advice to make everything consistent and to have one set of rules. Currently, we have to look at the Grant Road Alignment and the Major Streets and Routes Plan separately. This was an oversight and is in the process of being rectified.
- Alice Roe: Did this have any implications on the Oracle Road and Grand Road intersection? Were there any problems?
 - Jim Mazzocco: The Sausage Deli may have been impacted. This was a situation that was a red flag and a major indication that this needed to be fixed.

Land Use Presentation

John Beall from Planning and Development Services Department presented Land Use topics to the Task Force focusing on existing conditions in Phase 1, lessons learned, land use requirements, and Phase 1 case studies. This presentation will be available on the website and will identify the types of parcels in Phase 1 and includes maps with land use concepts. Planning and Development Services reviewed the case studies and showed the challenges and responses to the impacted properties. The project team emphasized the importance of the Task Force Guiding Principles and Vision Statement when it comes to implementing land use guidelines.

Task Force Questions/Comments Regarding Land Use Presentation

- Jim Hogan: If the City end up with a non-functional parcel, what will you do? Leave it vacant, sell to the adjacent property?
 - John Beall: We will work to make the property functional. We are also reviewing opportunities and strengths as we go forward.
- Linda Marie Small: When did you do these case studies?
 - John Beall: After Phase 1 construction of Grant Road was complete.
- Joseph Maher: After looking at the Kelly Paper case study, the City owned the properties. This made it easier to resolve challenges. If the properties were individually owned, achieving the outcome would have been harder.

- Jim Hogan: In the Kelly Paper case study, the City acquired all three parcels. Would this solution be able to be accomplished by the individual property owners?
 - Beth Abramovitz: You could have private shared agreements if the properties are not City owned; however, you cannot force shared agreements.
- Joseph Maher: I do not want the City to create more non-conforming buildings.
 - Beth Abramovitz: We are looking at a way to make every parcel functional or semi-functional.
- Jay Young: Is this whole exercise going to apply to the overlay zone?
 - John Beall: Before we address an overlay zone, we need to identify issues that need to be addressed. We wanted to look at the conditions that exist on Grant Road.
- Jim Hogan: My concern is that the City is setting a precedence to have non-conforming parcels along Grant Road.
- Linda Marie Small: Do you have an overlay now? Are you working on that?
 - Jim Mazzacco: We will address the overlay momentarily.

Call to Audience

No members of the public addressed the Task Force.

Land Use Presentation Discussion

Jim Mazzacco, Deputy Director of Planning and Development Services, presented overlay concepts to the Task Force. He explained that Grant Road is being widened with two basic functions; to be a cross town arterial and to be a transit corridor. He emphasized that a land use analysis needs to be complete to determine where transit oriented development is possible. Additionally, after reviewing Phase 1 of the Grant Road Improvement Plan, the City determined that each parcel needs to be addressed on a case by case basis. The next steps going forward are dependent on the diagnostic of our current land use analysis and the integration of the Task Force vision. An urban overlay district can be used as a tool to achieve desired outcomes; however, it will not be efficient if it doesn't conform to the current land use plan.

Task Force Discussion on Urban Overlay/Land Use Discussion

- Linda Marie Small: Can you expand on what you mean by 'Transit Oriented Development.'
 - Jim Mazzacco: Transit Oriented Development means that the customer base/consumers of a corridor is not limited by just a car, it is multi-modal. This type of development has more options for development.
- Robert Tait: Along Grant Road, there is a variety of zoning, and properties next to each other could be zoned differently. For example, you can have C1 zoning next to C2 zoning. From what I understood in our previous work, the whole idea behind the urban overlay was to have the ability to by-pass the normal process of re-zoning for property owners and stimulate development. There are some segments of Grant Road that do not have land use elements.
 - Jim Mazzacco: The General Plan is used when there is no Land Use plan. Additionally, if you wanted to have unified development, you would have to rezone the area. In some cases where you don't have a Land Use Plan, the General Plan is a good back up.
- Alice Roe: I would like to take us back further than our Vision Statement to when we were working on the promo to receive RTA funding. I have been in the area since 1975, and I have seen the decimation of businesses when there are roadway improvements. I have seen areas become dead zones and taken a long time to recover. After recognizing this process, we

- determined that we had to do better – that is why the overlay zone concept was developed for this corridor. If you don't stimulate economic development and vitality, then it is just a transportation project.
- Roy Garcia: We have reviewed the corridor and identified Districts for transit vs. residential segments, including heights, density, setbacks, etc. I am trying to understand why we are going back to do this analysis.
 - Jay Young: What context are we conducting this meeting? The overlay district was supposed to be put in place to eliminate the bureaucracy of the rezoning process. It seems that we have taken a step back of two years. It seemed to me that we were at the point where the overlay zone was the next step. There has been no context as to why we are bringing this back in the forefront of the discussion.
 - Jim Mazzacco: When working on the overlay, the land use plan was overlooked. The land use plan allow what exists on Grant Road right now. We understand that everyone wants the corridor to be developed and we are looking at the opportunities.
 - Jim Hogan: Current zoning for Grant Road is vehicle oriented. The whole design project was supposed to have the ability to have New York City style streets with landscaping and café seating. I presume that this cannot be accomplished under existing zoning. It seems to me that it is a transit corridor that requires an overlay zone.
 - Beverly Rutter: I feel like we are treading water. We were making some progress. We ran into a citizen's snag with the University of Arizona. It did not suit our group to institute the overlay in segments because we had a vision for the entire corridor. This feels like we are taking a step backwards.
 - Jim Mazzacco: The overlay needs to be based on the land use plan. The ground work for instituting the overlay needs to be more developed.
 - Alice Roe: If the current zoning was working for businesses, we would see development. It's not working, we need to make incentives so property owners develop the area. I don't know what the tool is, but I do know that we need to do something. We have had an enormous amount of time to work on this.
 - Moon Joe Yee: As a committee, we bought into the overlay zone for certain segments. Ward 3 and Ward 6 said no overlay zone. Many constituents did not understand the purpose or function of the overlay zone – that it was an option for the property owner.
 - Jim Hogan: From the beginning, we agreed that we wanted the corridor to be more urban. That is what we expected all along.
 - Joseph Maher: The overlay zone was intended to be customized for Grant Road to provide design guidelines and protect neighborhoods. I sit on the Planning Commission, if there is no overlay, there is no reason for me to be here.
 - Roy Garcia: I would caution that we have gone out and done a lot of outreach to the neighborhoods. The neighborhoods are going to feel that we promised one thing and delivered something else.
 - Jay Young: I feel like there is a disconnect in our role as a Task Force. We intellectually understand what you are saying. We thought we understood the process and now we are talking about something different.
 - Beth Abramovitz: We understand that there was a significant amount of work done with Community Design and Architecture. We did not want to throw it all away. Some

of the Community Design and Architecture plan does not align with our current Land Use Plan. We want the plans to work together.

- Roy Garcia: There may be other tools that can deliver the desired outcome. My main concern is having the residents buy into it. The reason we went to the segments was because there was such neighborhood opposition.
- Andrew Jones: My neighborhood has been watching the process. Ward 6 had issues with what was going to happen when there were tall buildings in the overlay. I want to see development along Grant Road.
- David Sunderman: I represent Catalina Vista Neighborhood. I disagree how the overlay was presented. The neighborhood saw pictures of 3-6 story buildings between Tucson Boulevard and Campbell Avenue where there are currently residences, and they are irate. The overlay needs to be presented better.
- Alice Roe: We were working on neighborhood plans. As a Task Force, Community Design and Architecture was making presentations to the neighborhoods. My fear is that we do nothing and the area decays a little more.
- Roy Garcia: Can we review the portions of the land use plan and the overlay that do work and fit?

Next Steps/ Grant Road Project Update/ Roundtable

- Jay Young: I have mentioned this before, I am confused about the overall context and role of the Task Force. We had a clear mandate when we formed as a Task Force, then our term was extended – why and what are we trying to do? If I am moving forward as a Task Force member, I need more clarity.
- Robert Tait: I am struggling with staying on the Task Force if we are not moving forward.
- Andrew Jones: I am ultimately not sure why we got together tonight. If you don't know what is going on, you shouldn't be on the Task Force. I hope that this changes, and the Task Force moves forward as a group. I am tired of being identified as new or seasoned members.
- Alice Roe: Our original charge was the RTA vote. Every transportation project had a corridor planning component. We have done a lot of work on our corridor planning component.
- Linda Marie Small: I would like to do some actual research and sit down with some other members from the Task Force and the City. I would like to see a plan for some section and what that entails. Do we have something the majority of constituents could support? We need to consider both sides of the streets.
- John Wakefield: I am grateful to the older members for sticking up to these principles. We all see this as a civic duty that we are here. Tonight has been a fairly substantial waste of my time.
- David Sunderman: This was not presented to the people. If we are going to do something then let's do it and sell it.
- Joseph Maher: I don't want to create a series of non-conforming properties. The overlay zone was meant to protect from this issue and provide incentives. This is a little frustrating. Weren't we going to have a planning consultant on this project?
- Beverly Rutter: I welcome to an additions that come to our group. I appreciate the fresh input to our group. I did not know that new people felt not included, if that happened, I want that to 'unhappen.' If we need to align the overlay with the land use document, I need that to be

presented to me in a direct manner. I need to see a specific document explaining where the overlay and land use do not align.

- Moon Joe Yee: I hope that staff is receptive of what they heard tonight.
- Jim Hogan: There is a reason why we all came tonight, which is to hold the City's feet to the fire. All of these meetings have been documented. There is no reason why the City can't look back and see what has been done before and what the Task Force's wishes are. I encourage the City to do that. I would like the City to pick a District or area showing the land use plan and the possible conflict of instituting an overlay. We would like to have a better idea.

After the Roundtable discussion, the project team expressed to the Task Force that they were in the process of selecting a private consultant and developing a scope of work. When selected, the project team and the private consultant will meet with the Task Force to continue to make progress from a land use perspective.

Adjourn

7:55 pm