



LAND REUSE STRATEGY

Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport
Land Reuse Strategy (LRS)
North Area Roundtable/Community Meeting
December 6, 2016, 6:00 PM – 9:00 PM
Eastlake Park Community Center
Meeting Summary

A combined Roundtable and Community Meeting was held on December 6 as part of the PHX Land Reuse Strategy. This was the third round of committee and community meetings. The meeting consisted of a presentation of the recently completed Working Paper #2 by members of the Land Reuse Strategy project team, with a Question & Answer session following for meeting attendees. Detailed displays of Frameworks A, B, and C were also available at the meeting for attendees to look at and ask questions about.

Presentation

Welcome & Opening Comments

Jordan Feld, City of Phoenix Aviation Department (AVN Rep. Feld) welcomed attendees and thanked them for their input in developing the draft plans which would be presented during the meeting. He also noted that a concept put forth by Juan and Patricia Gurule had not been properly documented in the draft plans, but the project team would be sure to include the concept in the document. *AVN Rep. Feld* stated that developing a plan for this project area was both challenging and exciting as there were so many different components, including cultural elements as well as multiple different uses for the project area.

Process to Date

AVN Rep. Feld stated that the project had started with goal setting. The main goals that were heard repeated throughout the planning process were:

- Preserve neighborhoods – enhance and preserve what is already there.
- Preserve and integrate history – use the various cultures to develop a Cultural Corridor and help tie the area together.
- Don't wait to implement these plans and take action – develop plans with contingencies built in to ensure plans on paper can be put into action.

Benchmarking

AVN Rep. Feld stated that this process is unlike any other planning process that has taken place in the past. In other airport planning processes in the country, there was not a strong drive to develop the properties that the airports had acquired. The various land uses and community driven planning process for this project was

unique from any other. One commonality of the different plans was figuring out how to navigate the guidelines and restrictions set forth by the FAA and ensuring that the plans are still able to meet the goals of the communities.

Inventory

The inventory in the North Area of the study area showed strong planning and development opportunity. *AVN Rep. Feld* stated that there were many cultural resources, a good street network, and a close proximity to key drivers, both downtown and the airport.

Market Study

The Market Study showed that there are many projects that are currently planned or underway which, in turn, absorbs the market demand for the near-term. For long-term planning, there is a competitive advantage for the north area because of the location. However, for development to occur, 1 ½ - 5 acre parcels are the desired footprint for development to take place on. In the planning area, there are no airport-owned parcels that match that criteria.

Stakeholder Charrette

In July, community meetings were held consisting of community-led discussions and brainstorming sessions. Those discussions showed that all of the suggestions and ideas written down by the meeting participants were in line with the goals set forth by the project. This showed a consistent trajectory for the project and confirmed that the goals were on the right track for developing a community-driven plan.

Working Paper #2

AVN Rep. Feld stated that all of this previous work has now led to Working Paper #2 and the draft plans being presented. Working Paper #2 takes a look at the different frameworks for the project area, potential recommendations, and the specific policies that would need to be put into place to be able to implement those plans. The project team also put together case studies which show examples of similar neighborhoods in cities across the country and what has been successfully developed there.

AVN Rep. Feld went on to state that in order to properly communicate the different plan frameworks and ideas, consistent terminology needs to be used to ensure that everyone has the same understanding of all the proposed concepts. Those terms and definitions are outlined in the working paper. *AVN Rep. Feld* also outlined a few of them with examples including Mixed Use Residential, Neighborhood Infill, and Transition Development Zone. He also talked about Small Business Zone and how that will be important in these areas with smaller sites and needing to be compatible with what is already there.

Framework A

AVN Rep. Feld began outlining the frameworks and how they differ from one another. Framework A is essentially taking what the general plan and market trajectory would be without engaging in a community-driven planning process. Industrial use starts to cover most of the Central area and all of the South area. Throughout the Land Reuse planning process, the community has expressed that that is not the plan that they want.

Framework B

Framework B incorporates a lot more of the community goals and aspirations. It was expressed that industrial use go in more along the freeway corridor, and that if any new development would have any effect on housing that is currently there, it would be an issue. There is still a strong interest in looking for opportunities to setup up a new residential area which would now be outside of the 65 DNL contours. The goal would be to attract growth and development in these areas which would then provide the possibility of developing residential out from the area. This could then lead to developing a new residential core concept where new residential could be introduced. *AVN Rep. Feld* stated that there were a few catalyst sites being looked at to start bring out these proposed concepts. One of the sites is located on the northeast corner of 7th and Buckeye, where there is a lot of airport land, as well as being close to downtown and many cultural resources. The second catalyst site looks at trying to reuse Barrios Unidos as a Regional Sports Park/Commerce Center. This plan would present a regional draw to bring people into the area.

Framework C

Framework C also carries forward the community desires in terms of land uses. Changes in Framework C include a little bit less of a residential area, and keeping any new residential farther away from the 65 DNL boundary. In the North, you see the entire corridor designated for mixed use/residential opportunities. Towards the south, instead of limiting the regional industrial development to just the I-17 corridor, that development can be seen expanding out a bit.

AVN Rep. Feld commented that when looking at both framework B or C, it is important to take note of the area as a transitional zone. It contains many vacant Airport lots and has many different possibilities for that transitional development.

The Working Paper #2 provides many different evaluation criteria, including comparing implementation feasibility, policy acceptability and desirability of outcomes. When looking at the frameworks with the project team, it looks like somewhere between B and C is what delivers most of the criteria set forth by the community.

AVN Rep. Feld stated that while looking at the different areas on the map which have been designated with multi-colored zones, it does not mean that any zoning is changing for existing residents and property owners. Throughout the planning process, the community made it clear that any development that happens needs to harmonize with what is there today.

AVN Rep. Feld then showed examples of what could possibly happen if there was a block with only one or two remaining residential properties, surrounded by Airport-owned properties. He then also showed an example of a block that had remained mostly residential and had only one or two Airport parcels in the midst of it. In the case of a remaining residential property in mostly Airport-owned parcels, a home owner can choose to stay and have development compatible with their residence take place around them. Both of these cases are outlined in Working Paper #2.

Ruth Anne Marston, PHX Elementary School District #1 (Roundtable Rep. Marston) asked if there was a way to ensure that any zoning or rezoning decisions would be approved by the community, not by an outside entity. *AVN Rep. Feld* stated that that issue would be addressed later in the presentation. *Roundtable Rep. Marston* then stated that she hoped constant up-zoning would not take place, ultimately affecting the property value. *AVN Rep. Feld* commented that deciding whether to create higher valued zoning on a broad area and letting people choose that zone, or creating zoning based on what people want on individual parcels is an issue that would have to be looked into.

AVN Rep. Feld concluded that there are many ways in urban design to get to compatible development of the area, including the scenarios where existing residents want to stay in that area. In the example of only a few Airport parcels in the midst of a mostly privately owned area, interim uses are possible, pocket parks and possibly short-term leases for existing businesses could all be possibilities. *AVN Rep. Feld* then went into more detail regarding the cultural corridor, represented by the green line on Slide 21 of the PowerPoint presentation. He stated that the goal was to develop something that ties all of the cultural components of the area together, making them all easily accessible to visitors as well as creating a more pedestrian-friendly neighborhood. There is also a goal to create a destination trail that would draw people to the area to visit and learn about the different history and cultural aspects represented along the cultural corridor.

Glenn Hammond (Community Rep. Hammond) commented that he believed it was very important to connect the area to downtown, and right now, 7th Street was acting as a functional barrier to the downtown area. He stated that it would be interesting to consider something like the High Line in New York City. This would not just be a walkway with a chain link fence, but something designed to make a statement and that is branded to the area. *AVN Rep. Feld* stated that other community members had also shared similar ideas.

AVN Rep. Feld stated that the different frameworks, the cultural corridor concept, and making sure the right zoning and uses get put in the right locations in the project area, are all supported by very detailed policy statements. The policy statements follow the same project goals to protect, stabilize, and enhance the neighborhoods, as well as carrying forward the cultural tradition and making sure action begins to be taken quickly. These policies are outlined in detail in the working paper document. *AVN Rep. Feld* also mentioned that the project team found great examples of areas that have had the same types of issues and goals for their communities, with examples of how they reached those goals. Those examples are also outlined in the document.

AVN Rep. Feld stated that to stay with the current project timeline, the project team would like to begin the FAA approval process as quickly as possible as it can take up to six months for their review. This would put the deadline for public comments on Working Paper #2 at December 30.

Community Rep. Hammond asked if the FAA review applied only to the airport lots or if it would apply to all the community lots within the project area. *AVN Rep. Feld* replied that they didn't necessarily know as this was the first community-driven reuse plan to present to the FAA. Typically, the FAA's only concern is if the Airport plans to keep the land, or if they have another use for it. *Community Rep. Hammond* asked if leasing a property technically released it from the Airport program. *AVN Rep. Feld* stated that anything leased for non-aeronautical use would be considered not in use by the Airport. *Community Rep. Hammond* asked if they would be concerned with privately owned property in the planning area and if so, what jurisdiction they would have over it. *AVN Rep. Feld* replied that they would only be concerned if it seemed there could be a compatibility issue with the Airport.

Deborah Ostreicher, Airport Assistant Director (AVN Rep. Ostreicher) commented on the December 30 deadline by saying that if the community felt that they needed more time to review the document, there would not be a problem with extending the deadline. The December 30 deadline is only in place to adhere to the current timeline. A later deadline could be put in place; it would just mean the rest of the review process would ultimately take longer.

Roundtable Rep. Marston commented that the current Working Paper #2 is not available to people who do not have access to download it, and it is not available in Spanish. *AVN Rep. Feld* replied that the project team would make sure it became available to everyone for review.

Next Steps

AVN Rep. Feld stated that while the plan goes to the FAA for review, we want to ensure that the project continues working and moving forward and doesn't simply wait for the FAA decisions. One of the main concerns community members have had is asking how they will continue to be involved with the decision making process and ensure that decisions are not being made which don't align with the project goals. This next stage of

the process is when the detailed planning really begins and looks at how things are actually going to get done. This Land Reuse Strategy plan has now set the stage for the next phase of planning.

AVN Rep. Feld then posed the question of what would happen if FAA did not approve single-family residential to take place in the North Area. He stated that they have been informally checking in with them regarding the issue and that they had explained the unique situation of the area and how it is no longer located within the new noise contours. While the FAA did seem receptive to mixed-use/residential, there was less of a chance for single-family residential to be approved. If it would not be approved, that area would not be looked at for industrial and manufacturing development, but for less intensive uses such as interim use, green spaces and things compatible with what is already there.

AVN Rep. Feld talked about what happens after the FAA review and the next phase of the project begins. He explained that even before FAA provides their final approval, a new project team, RTKL Callison, will take over phase two of the project and begin holding focus groups to discuss detailed planning for development of the areas in which the FAA will not have any concerns. He stated that during the next steps of the project, stakeholders need to make sure and review the document, ensuring that the policies, goals, and ideas that they want for their community are represented in the plan. He ended the formal presentation portion of the meeting and opened up the rest of the meeting for questions.

Question & Answer

Calvin Goode, Eastlake Park Association (Roundtable Rep. Goode) asked what the timeline was for receiving the review back from the FAA. *AVN Rep. Feld* replied that if comments were received by the end of the month, they could move through the local process of presenting the plans and then submit to the FAA in March. That review by the FAA can take anywhere from 2-6 months.

Community Rep. Hammond asked when the first shovel could be put in the ground. *AVN Rep. Feld* replied that for things that don't require FAA approval, action could be taken on those within the next nine months. For the bigger items, such as mixed-use/residential, they would first need to wait for FAA approval and then it would take at least through 2017 for the detailed planning process to take place before anything could be started.

Jackie Berry, Berry Realty (Roundtable Rep. Berry) asked how other planning processes, such as Reinvent Phoenix, would also be acted on and incorporated throughout this process. *AVN Rep. Feld* replied that where there are already plans in place, especially in the North Area where a lot of planning processes have already taken place, the FAA typically wants people to still conform to those existing plans. Those planning programs that have already taken place can then be used as examples in what to do in other areas where planning and new overlay zones need to happen.

While new zoning could be put in place on airport parcels, that zoning should not interfere with what is already in place on other properties around it. *Roundtable Rep. Berry* then asked about areas where eminent domain could be possible and if the airport would consider that. *AVN Rep. Feld* answered that eminent domain would not be used, as well as the fact that Prop. 207 now restricts any kind of eminent domain from being used for economic development purposes.

Sheila Gauff (Community Rep. Gauff) asked if anyone from the FAA had actually been to the neighborhoods to see the collateral damage, as you can become desensitized to the situation when you don't actually see it. *AVN Rep. Feld* responded that he believes the FAA is aware of what is happening, which is why they tasked the Airport with developing the community-driven plan for development. He added that there are other communities around the country that are facing the same issues and Phoenix has the opportunity to be an example of how to tackle those problems.

Community Rep. Hammond asked for reassurance that this development in the North Area would actually happen and that after all the planning, those plans would actually come to fruition. *AVN Rep. Feld* replied that the market is showing a demand for mixed-use/residential so there shouldn't be problems with getting that to take place. Other areas where there are smaller parcels mixed in, those can be good places for pocket parks and interim uses. The examples that the project team found for similar areas in other cities and communities show that the partnership opportunities for the communities exist and are possible to achieve for areas like the ones in the project area. *Community Rep. Hammond* followed up by asking what the motivator was for the Airport to return the parcels to the community. He asked if there was a timeline that the Airport had for wanting to get the parcels in use and not have them sitting vacant. *AVN Rep. Feld* stated that there really isn't any sort of timeline, however there are economic motivators for all parties to develop the land so as not to pay for maintenance of an empty lot. While there is nothing forcing the Airport to have to take any kind of action with the parcels, they made the decision to go through a community planning process and develop the lots into something the community wants and needs.

Jessie Garcia, City of Phoenix (COP Rep. Garcia) asked if there was any thought to presenting the plan to the FAA in stages, so as to expedite the approval process and be able to work on one stage while another is being reviewed. *AVN Rep. Feld* stated that something that might happen, for example, is for the FAA to say it approves certain issues and action can go ahead and be taken on them, but they are going to continue looking into others for a bit longer. He stated that they hadn't thought of breaking it into phases like that and it could possibly be looked into.

COP Rep. Garcia then asked for further explanation on the short-term lease plan which was mentioned and asked if that would remain strictly as a lease. *AVN Rep. Feld* responded that when they say short-term lease, it really depends on the parcel. Generally speaking, however, they are only talking about short-term leases of anywhere from 5-20 years.

George York (Community Rep. York) asked if the City supported single-family residential development or if they supported the FAA and were not in favor of single-family development. *AVN Rep. Feld* responded that the City's position was that the community's plans should represent what the community wants. Historically the FAA has never allowed single-family development to take place where they had acquired properties and taken it out. However, it will stay as part of the plans as the community wants to continue to stress to the FAA how important that issue is to them.

Community Rep. Hammond asked why the FAA would be opposed to single-family but not mixed use as they share the same common elements. *AVN Rep. Feld* stated that they will say one use is better at mitigating the sound than others, as well as providing other economic drivers, where single-family does not.

Carlos Avila (Roundtable Rep. Avila) asked if the contours shown in the plans had been approved by the FAA. *AVN Rep. Feld* answered that the contours had not been approved, they were conceptually developed for the plan to show where the noise would be an issue today. *Roundtable Rep. Avila* asked if the contours shown were based off the new noise study conducted in 2013. *AVN Rep. Feld* stated they were not from that study as conducting a whole new study would not be necessary for getting fairly accurate current noise levels for the area. *Roundtable Rep. Avila* then asked what control the community had over ensuring that the City would not pass an ordinance preventing future development in the area. *AVN Rep. Feld* replied that *Community Rep. Avila* was correct in that there were not policies in place in a lot of the project area that supported residential development. One way to overcome that would be to make sure to adopt future ordinances that don't similarly restrict future development and encourage people and development to come back to the area.

Closing

AVN Rep. Feld closed the Question & Answer session of the meeting and invited attendees to stay and review the policies and frameworks which were displayed in the back of the room. Project team members would be available to answer any questions. He thanked attendees for their participation and the meeting ended.