

**Speedway/Campbell – Request to amend the University Area Plan (UAP)
Notes from Neighborhood Meeting, June 19, 2014**

The meeting began at approximately 6:45 p.m. with Richard Shenkarow providing an update on the status of the project. Included in his presentation was his recap of the team's trip to Austin to meet with Whole Foods regarding this project. He said that these meetings went very well, and that Whole Foods increased its desired square footage within the project to be 40,000 square feet (up from 38,000 square feet).

Prior to discussing the proposed UAP amendment, there were several general questions about the project:

- What is the planned height (in stories) for the portion of the project fronting Speedway?

Because we are at the general plan amendment stage, our planning is preliminary and therefore any project dimensions we provide are estimates and subject to change. That being said, we are asking in the Plan Amendment for the ability to utilize a portion of the site at the 20 story/250 foot level. We are requesting the ability to have between 10 and 12 stories along the arterials. We believe that the portion of the project facing Speedway will be between six and eight stories high by the time we get to the rezoning/final design phase. (See further discussion below about building heights and envelope.)

- What uses will be located in the portions of the project fronting Speedway?

At this point, we believe this portion will be used primarily for office space.

- There were several questions about the size of this Whole Foods in comparison to the other existing stores in Tucson.

The 40,000 square-foot Whole Foods would be one of the larger in southern Arizona. Casas Adobes is _____once remodeled.

Keri Silvyn followed by walking through the current version of our amendment to the UAP, explaining that the draft of the amendment has already been modified from the original application submittal based on discussions with the City. We expect at least one or two more revisions as this amendment moves through the process and will keep the neighborhood leadership informed as that occurs.

Below is a summary of the questions/comments that were made by the neighborhood leaders after the requested amendment was discussed:

- About a year ago, there were discussions about looking at all four corners of Speedway/Campbell. What happened to those efforts? (Ruth)

Those efforts were slowed by City process. Due to current private market considerations, we now have to move forward with our project. We believe the Mayor & Council will be discussing

the overall streetcar planning, which will incorporate a discussion of the “four corners,” in a study session in September 2014.

- There was further discussion about the ABOR owned property on the southwest corner, and how their ownership impacts zoning. There was also some limited discussion of how a public/private partnership could impact zoning.

Keri explained our language in the amendment would allow later University involvement in our project as a public/private partnership, but only for the ABOR lands around this project and only if truly a public/private partnership. .

- There was discussion about the existing helicopter traffic in the area, and questions on how this project might impact this air traffic.

A policy/guideline has been written to specifically require addressing the helicopter flight pattern and noise reverberation at the time of the rezoning of this project. .

- An attendee asked about the use of reclaimed water/extension of the City’s reclaimed water line.

There are no plans to use reclaimed treated water from the City or to extend the lines to this project; however, both active and passive water harvesting systems will be included in the project, throughout the site.

- An attendee asked about the proposed massing at the University, and made the observation that this proposed increase in University massing appears to provide some transition into this project.
- There was discussion about the height of this project, and several of the neighborhood leaders expressed that this was a concern they are hearing within their individual neighborhoods. One member expressed that she believes the height is acceptable in this area where mixed-use has been desired for some time.
- There was also discussion about the maximum heights in this proposal, specifically questioning whether the project will build up to all the heights proposed in our request (e.g., the 20, 12, and 10 story envelopes).

We explained that the final project is not intended to maximize all of the proposed envelopes. The purpose of the overall envelopes is to provide some flexibility during the design and the drafting of the Planned Area Development (“PAD”) rezoning to allow us to deal with any unknown variables that will impact the project design. We stressed that the 20 story/250-foot height allowance will be limited to only 33% of the envelope area in the Plan Amendment. After the meeting we confirmed that 33% of the envelope area is less than 25% of the entire footprint

of the property. We also explained that there will be a correlation between the envelopes, in that increases in height in one envelope will most likely lead to decreases in others.

- One attendee commented that the project team will need work hard to clarify the height concepts at all future meetings, as neighbors are expressing concern about height. Also, some neighbors likely will object to the envelopes based on an assumption that all developers will maximize heights in order to make more money.
- There was a question regarding how this project will impact sewer capacity and other utility capacities (water, electric, gas, etc.). Also asked was who would pay for any improvements required by the project.

We explained that for sewer, as well as all other utilities, we are aware that this area is at or close to capacities. We have already been in contact with many of the utilities on this subject. If, in order to build this project, upgrades are required, then the project will need to assume those costs. We are working on those costs now to build into our pro formas. Details on those issues will be addressed and determined during the rezoning and the development process.

- One attendee asked about where deliveries would be made, leading to more questions and concerns about traffic impacts to the area and particularly restricting traffic from entering surrounding neighborhoods.

We explained that we anticipate that traffic (including deliveries) to the project will be directed to Cherry and Helen, and that it is our responsibility to mitigate the traffic impact this project may have on the surrounding neighborhood as much as possible. Richard stressed that as a neighbor, he has an interest in keeping traffic out of the neighborhoods. This will be done at the rezoning stage, when a full traffic impact analysis will be done, and proper traffic calming techniques will be designed at that time.

- There were questions regarding the parking structure, and the cost of underground parking per parking space.

We explained that while all design elements are estimates at this stage, we anticipate parking will be in at least two underground levels, as well as several levels above the ground level (yet to be determined). We estimate that there will be around 1,000 parking spaces. The current estimated cost per underground space is approximately \$30,000/space; understanding that as costs of materials fluctuate, so does this estimate.

- There was a request that any design review committee or other formalized group of stakeholders created to deal with the issues that arise during design and/or construction of the project continue to exist after construction is complete (e.g., El Con Tripartite group,

which still meets 15 years after creation). This group would help capture the concerns of the neighborhood and help address issues sooner than later.

At this stage, there are policies written into the Plan Amendment requiring continued engagement. Our intent is to build into the PAD a design review committee to include surrounding leaders. At the time of the PAD, we can discuss ongoing service and responsibilities of that group post design/construction. .

- One attendee asked about the ability for this plan amendment to set a precedent for other properties in the area.

We explained that if this amendment is successful, other property owners within the UAP could certainly process their own amendments. This sub-area 1 amendment will only apply to Palm Shadows with the potential of inclusion of the ABOR property surrounding Palm Shadows as part of a public/private partnership. This amendment would have no impact on property owners outside the UAP.

- There was a question about LEED certification.

While we are committed to obtaining LEED certification, it is too early in the process to provide specific information on how or at what level.

- There were questions regarding the duration of the PAD process, as well as the next steps of this process.

There will be a Planning Commission study session on 7/16. The study session is not a public hearing. Generally the Planning Commission will hear from staff and applicant during the study session. At the conclusion of 7/16, the Planning Commission will be asked to schedule this item for a public hearing, which we expect will occur at their August meeting. Once Planning Commission has its hearing and makes a recommendation, the Plan Amendment will be scheduled for a public hearing at Mayor & Council. We are hopeful to be through the process in September/October.

We also reiterated our desire to come to neighborhood meetings to walk through this project (specifically Phillip's presentation on design). We were invited to the next Sam Hughes neighborhood meeting and Feldman's neighborhood meeting – both in August.