



LAND REUSE STRATEGY

Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport
Land Reuse Strategy (LRS)
South Area Roundtable/Community Meeting
December 7, 2016, 6:00 PM – 9:00 PM
Broadway Heritage Neighborhood Resource Center
Meeting Summary

A combined Roundtable and Community Meeting was held on December 7 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

Courtney Carter, City of Phoenix Aviation Department (AVN Rep. Carter) welcomed attendees and thanked them for their input in developing the draft plans which would be presented during the meeting. He explained that the meeting would focus on Working Paper #2 and then go into what the next steps are once the document has been submitted to the FAA.

Process to Date

AVN Rep. Carter 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. The South Area has some different circumstances in terms of development, but the Central and North Areas made it clear that development that takes place must be compatible with the residents that chose to stay.
- 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. Carter stated that this process is unlike any other planning process that has taken place in the past and it was difficult to find other cities which were similar to Phoenix with relation to the Airport's location in the City. 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. The similarities that the project team was able to find, however, were other cities with a “patchwork” of parcels throughout a project area, the need for flexible outcomes, and agency coordination.

Inventory

AVN Rep. Carter again mentioned that the South Area faced some different circumstances than the North and Central. While there are not as many cultural resources in the South Area, there were still cultural concepts that the community wanted to see incorporated into the final plan. He stated that the area was well situated in terms of connectivity to other areas of the community, but unlike the North area, the Central and South areas don't have any strong planning processes that have already been done, allowing development to build off of those plans already in place.

Market Study

The Market Study showed that there is not a lot of interest in the South Area, based on how the lots are currently sitting. The Market shows that for development to occur, 1 ½ - 5 acre parcels are the desired footprint. However, in the entire study area, the average size of the parcels is 0.15 acre.

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

Jordan Feld, City of Phoenix Aviation Department (AVN Rep. Feld) stated that all of this previous work has now led to Working Paper #2 and the draft plans being presented. He began by stating that through this process, one of the main comments heard from the community was to do something about the vacant lots. There are existing businesses that can benefit from the lots that are currently vacant and available and they want to ensure that the plan will find a way to put those vacant lots back to use. Working Paper #2 takes a look at the different frameworks for the project area, it outlines an evaluation matrix, 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, bring back housing and doing Neighborhood Infill in the Central Area, 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. This includes focusing on mixed-use/residential in the North, applying a very light small business/industrial land use framework in the Central Area, while recognizing that there are still many residents and the development needs to be compatible. The market direction of the South Area has essentially already been decided, so the focus is on continuing that direction while acknowledging the need for the smaller available lots to be accessible to existing businesses.

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. *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. It was also stressed by the community that there should be the same amount, or more, of residential in the project area at the end of the process as there was at the beginning. *AVN Rep. Feld* explained that there was the possibility of locating an area that is outside of the 65 DNL boundary and making it available for residents from neighborhoods that are mainly vacant lots now, to voluntarily move to. This would then make the neighborhood they are moving to a stronger, more cohesive neighborhood, while allowing their previous residential parcels to be assembled into larger lots and attract commercial market development.

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 and wrapping around the area.

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, the zone designation does not mean that any zoning is changing for existing residents and property owners. However, it will be necessary for zoning to change on some of the Airport parcels so as to ensure that any development that happens will be compatible 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.

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.

Policies

AVN Rep. Carter stated that the different frameworks, the cultural corridor concept, and making sure the right zoning and uses get put in the right locations, 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. The detailed explanations are also available for people to review after the presentation. *AVN Rep. Carter* urged everyone to look at the different policies and make sure their ideas and concepts were correctly integrated into the different policies.

Arthur Luera, Goldstein & Luera (Community Rep. Luera) commented that he had been a representative for the area in the late 1990's and early 2000's when they had created a planning document for the area. He asked if that plan was still in place. He had worked on plans for each side of the river, including Rio Solado from Mohave to Broadway, as well as the Central Village and didn't see any of those plans incorporated into the Reuse Strategy. He also mentioned that there were multiple schools and churches within the area that wanted and needed visibility and asked what was being done to address those issues. *AVN Rep. Feld* commented that the plan that *Community Rep. Luera* was referring to was the Voluntary Acquisition and Relocation Program which included residents voluntarily relocating as well as sound mitigation services. *AVN Rep. Feld* also commented that there were very detailed looks at all of the different neighborhoods within the project area, including Rio Solado and Central City, documented in Working Paper #2. He also stated that many community members had also voiced concerns about the preservation of schools and churches within the project area. *AVN Rep. Feld* stated that we were at the point in the process now of developing the plan for how these concepts and ideas are going to be put in place. He encouraged meeting attendees to look at the displays detailing the frameworks and policies and let the project team know if there were ideas that they didn't see represented in them.

Community Rep. Luera commented that the area should be thought of as the Gateway to Phoenix, and right now as you drive down Buckeye, it does not represent the area well. He stated that whatever plans get passed, he would like to beautify the area as it could bring pride to people that still live there, as well as those that are no longer in the area as well.

Alberto Chamberlain, Goldstein & Luera (Community Rep. Chamberlain) commented that the business on 16th Street and Buckeye was a great example of how parcels were successfully put together to develop a business.

AVN Rep. Carter mentioned that the project team found great case studies of successful development that has taken place in other cities which might be compatible with parts of the project area here. Those examples are also outlined in the document.

Next Steps

AVN Rep. Carter stated that the project would now move into a comment period and the Working Paper was available online for members of the public to review. He encouraged people to review and submit comments and feedback to the project team.

Community Rep. Luera stated that he had served as part of the Central City Noise Committee. He asked if this process had been shared with the Central City Village Committee. *AVN Rep. Carter* confirmed that they have been kept informed throughout the entire process.

AVN Rep. Carter stated that once all comments are received, they will conduct final edits and incorporate all those comments as the document is still in draft form. Once they have the final document, they will present it to the Village Planning Committee, the Aviation Advisory Board, the City Council Subcommittee, and finally to the City Council. Once the City Council has approved it, it will move to the FAA for review and approval which can take to 2-6 months.

Patsy Baran (Community Rep. P. Baran) asked if the City Council can change the plans the community has put forth while going through the Council's review process. If they can change it, will the community get a chance to see the changes and the final document before it goes to the FAA? *AVN Rep. Feld* replied that there is always the possibility that they could make changes. However, throughout this whole process, the focus has been on developing a community-driven plan, not just what the City or the FAA wants. The FAA will then be able to say whether certain parts of the plan are approved while other parts of the plan are not, or they need more time to review those specific aspects.

Peggy Neely, Johnson & Neely (Consultant Rep. Neely) asked if *AVN Rep. Feld* could identify the approval process. *AVN Rep. Feld* stated the City Council would review the plan in the coming months and likely "forward" the plan for FAA review. He stated he did not expect the Council to approve the draft plan by ordinance or resolution. Once the plan is forwarded to the FAA, *AVN Rep. Feld* stated their review could take approximately six months or longer.

A meeting attendee voiced a concern about the fact that since the area is now made up of the "patchwork" of parcels, once the Airport parcels get rezoned for commercial uses, it could present hazards to the existing residents. He stated that with certain commercial zoning, there could be paint or compressed gases stored in a commercial zoned area next to a homeowner. *AVN Rep. Feld* stated that one of the outcomes of this process has been the community's identification of the need for new overlay zones that would allow for neighborhood-level, compatible, commercial development that would not negatively impact existing residential uses.

Community Rep. Luera stated that he was concerned that once the City started changing the zoning in these areas, they would then begin taxing those properties at a higher rate. *AVN Rep. Feld* replied that the zoning would not be changing on the private parcels, as well as the use most likely not changing on the private parcels.

Immediate Actions

AVN Rep. Carter stated again that this process and experience that this project has gone through is quite different than the usual type of plan that the FAA carries out. Throughout the process, the community has been involved and has contributed valuable comments and raised good questions. Some of those questions can't be answered right now because nothing like this has been done in the past. However, some of the concerns from the community that can begin to be addressed right away are things like safety concerns, and lighting.

Community Rep. Luera commented that traffic as well as billboards and advertising for the sports arenas were causing a problem with too much light, which is bothersome in a residential area.

AVN Rep. Carter stated that throughout the process, they have relayed the concerns that community members shared with the City departments so as to see what kind of action could begin to be taken on some of the issues.

AVN Rep. Carter stated that in the next phase of the project, and during the FAA review, action would be taken to develop a small property release process. During the next phase of the project, there would also be smaller focus groups formed so people could remain involved with issues that affected them, rather than bringing everyone together for general, overall meetings. The next phase will also focus on heritage and placemaking, identifying strategic partners, and reaching out to property owners.

Community Rep. P. Baran asked if purchasing parcels was going to be an option. *AVN Rep. Feld* responded that the FAA generally prefers that the Airport retain the title to the property, even if that means doing a 100-year lease. He added that the South Area, however, does have different circumstances from the North and Central areas, as there are no concerns such as height or compatibility with surrounding properties that are already used for industrial use. *AVN Rep. Feld* added that they do understand that while a 100-year lease is one solution, they recognize that it would be more beneficial for existing businesses to have the option of combining those vacant parcels with their own. He stated that they will continue to try and push this issue forward with the FAA.

AVN Rep. Carter then posed the question of what would happen if the FAA did not approve single-family residential to take place in the area. While this doesn't directly affect the South Area, it would have implications for the North and Central areas. 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. Carter 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 continue the community-driven planning process. He ended the formal presentation portion of the meeting and opened up the rest of the meeting for questions.

Question & Answer

Ken Johnson (Community Rep. Johnson) stated that he had conducted a survey regarding the area from 24th Street to 16th Street. At one time, there were 350 residential lots in that area. There are now eight remaining residences within that area. He stated that while he sympathized with the remaining home owners, he disagrees with the premise of basing the entire planning concepts around those eight residential lots when they are no longer the majority type of property within that area. He added that there are also 35 City-owned lots in that same area. He stated that he thought it would be beneficial for the current property owners to just be able to acquire those vacant City-owned lots and then be able to eliminate that portion of the project area and not spend unnecessary time and money debating about the development. *AVN Rep. Carter* responded that there was not any expectation from the project to carve out any section of the project area. As far as being able to purchase properties, he referenced *AVN Rep. Feld's* previous comments about continuing to look into that issue with the FAA. *AVN Rep. Feld* also added that releasing those properties would not be beneficial to the project since the FAA needs to see the plan that shows how those parcels can be returned to the market and help the industrial drivers in the area. The planning process will hopefully help the FAA reach the same conclusion about the South planning area.

Community Rep. P. Baran asked if any of the project team had visited the project area. *AVN Rep. Carter* replied that the project team had visited the entire project area.

Rowland Baran (Community Rep. R. Baran) stated that he was concerned someone else would happen upon the available properties if they were to become available for purchase, and buy the properties in the area before the existing property owners had a chance. *AVN Rep. Feld* replied that this planning process will ensure that existing property owners, and people who have been involved with the process and shown interest in specific lots, will be given priority when the time comes to actually release those properties. In the implementation phase of the project, those property owners will be contacted directly regarding lots they have previously shown interest in. *AVN Rep. Feld* added, in regards to some of the bigger parcels, this plan has put protections in place to ensure that if someone acquires a parcel and doesn't develop it in time or in the way the plan originally outlined, the parcel will be returned to the Airport to find the proper outlet for compatible development of that parcel.

Barbie Schalmo, C&S Companies (Consultant Rep. Schalmo) commented that as part of the implementation strategy, there can be a policy with a right of first refusal available to a vested land owner that is adjacent to an available parcel. She stated that that could

be a policy that they suggest as part of the implementation strategy so as to protect the interests of the adjacent land owners.

Community Rep. Luera asked if there were any plans in this process for eminent domain in the project area. *AVN Rep. Carter* responded that there are not any plans for eminent domain. He added that Prop. 207 now also makes it illegal for eminent domain to be used for economic development.

Closing

AVN Rep. Carter 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. He encouraged people to submit their comments to the project team to be able to incorporate into the plans. Project team members would also be available to answer any questions. He thanked attendees for their participation and the meeting ended.