

## GREATER AIRPARK COMMUNITY AREA PLAN



### LAND USE DISCUSSION GROUP SUMMARY

The City is in the process of updating its General Plan—a policy document that guides future growth and development for the entire city. To accomplish this, the Planning Department is using a process referred to as Community Area Planning (CAP). The CAP process divides the city into six geographic areas that will serve as the foundation for the 2011 General Plan update. The Greater Airpark CAP process was initiated in May and July 2008, with approximately 200 community members participating in events. The themes and ideas that emerged from these events served as the basis for this discussion group topic.

The **Greater Airpark Plan** will examine the existing conditions of the area and consider the Greater Airpark's future for the next twenty years. Like the City's General Plan, the Greater Airpark Plan takes a *broad* look at the future, setting *goals and policies* that will shape future development and investment. The specific zoning standards, design details, or development projects will not be part of the Greater Airpark Plan itself, but will be implemented subsequently based on the policies set forth by the plan. In considering the discussion questions, participants were asked to think of it as looking at the Greater Airpark from the "10,000 foot level".

Participants were asked to consider the following in this focus group:

Respect each other and each other's point of view at all times

Focus on ideas and refrain from personal attacks

No idea was a bad idea, participants were asked to feel free to dream big!

The goal is not to agree, it is about hearing and exploring different perspectives

The following pages consist of comments made by participants in a small discussion group of four people. The input received from this discussion contributes to the overall long-range vision, goals and policies for the Greater Airpark Community Planning Area. The results of all public outreach efforts, including the input received in this discussion, will ultimately be compiled to find areas of commonality and areas in need of further consideration within the community.

In the end, a vision, and goals to realize the vision, will be created based upon community input and data analysis.

## DISCUSSION QUESTIONS AND RESULTS

### 1a. Which land uses do you think are most important to maintain in the Greater Airpark?

- ❖ Existing neighborhoods should be maintained and protected
- ❖ Maintain the integrity of commercial and light industrial uses
- ❖ Maintain rural neighborhoods
- ❖ Maintain current single-story office areas; an increase to two-story office buildings may be appropriate, but much higher than that will cause transportation issues
- ❖ The area has complicated uses because many homes are second or third homes; and many people work out of their homes. This is more prominent north of the CAP Canal as opposed to the area south of it.
- ❖ Maintain the Airport, Tournament Players Club (TPC) and WestWorld
- ❖ Major land uses should remain
- ❖ Housing
  - It is important to minimize the walking distance to and from work. The city should encourage that. “Walking to work is ‘cool’”
  - Torn—I don’t like multi-family housing, but service workers need to live closer to work because of the cost of travel.
  - Multi-family housing may not be suitable for all people

### 1b. In 10 to 20 years, how do you envision land uses in the area?

- ❖ Residential areas need to be added closer to businesses/ work because of the cost of transportation
- ❖ Add multi-family housing
- ❖ Attract more hotel uses for people that come to events at the Airport, TPC and WestWorld
- ❖ “Down-zoning” should not occur because of Proposition 207
- ❖ A greenbelt and pedestrian/equestrian trail linkages for residential areas should be incorporated
- ❖ Accommodate mixed-uses, transit-oriented development (TOD) on major arterials, and multi-family residential
- ❖ Encourage horizontal and vertical mixed use where appropriate
- ❖ Expect vacant and developable land and buildings to remain the same for the first 10 years, but warehouse condos (the 2001 General Plan-designated employment area around the airport) will most likely go away because of land value
- ❖ We’re in a “mental revolution” of learning to be without cars

- ❖ Envision a beautiful place with walking and biking trails that connect neighborhoods to commercial areas so that people can use the car less often
- ❖ Do not envision high rises in the area. Maintain one to two stories for the next 10 to 20 years
- ❖ Mixed-use is the wave of the future

## 2. Are there areas in the Greater Airpark that need to be enhanced?

- ❖ Revitalization may be needed until the market can catch up again—current land costs do not support industrial uses today
- ❖ Need to understand the ability of the area’s infrastructure to stage potential redevelopment
  - Consider utilities, water, wastewater, cable, electricity, etc
- ❖ The employment zone around the airport (as designated by 2001 General Plan) is the oldest area with very small parcels and is in need of revitalization
  - Suggest mixed-use with multiple levels that would be more pedestrian-oriented. A shuttle circulator would assist this.
  - The above comment is especially true because they are small parcels. This approach may solve some of the traffic problems
  - Would hate to see the small parcels replaced with personality-free boxes. High-quality architecture is needed.
- ❖ The entire study area needs to be aesthetically enhanced
- ❖ Transition areas and edges of the study area need to be enhanced
  - A greenbelt could help
  - The zoning in these areas should be predictable/ set in stone
- ❖ Scottsdale Road Streetscape from Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard to Redfield Road needs to be enhanced with visual continuity
- ❖ Consider a design concept overlaid on buildings so that they have a somewhat similar style
  - Should that be encouraged or required?
  - One aspect of that overlay could be sun screening
  - It should only be in commercial areas
  - Traditionally, the Airpark has had more flexible design standards than other places in the city
  - If an overlay is established, stick with the zoning of it
    - Disagreement- That may work for 10 or 20 years, but it (the zoning) will need to change as society changes and has different needs
  - Consider the “Santa Fe-style” in California and how it dominates the architectural styles. We do not want to impose the same style on everything

- Maybe the buildings should have a “high-tech” appearance

**3. What do you think is the most acceptable range of building heights and where should they be located?**

- ❖ Must be within FAA regulations
- ❖ Orange County, California is a bad example of how to deal with height
- ❖ Protect the airport when considering height changes
- ❖ Consider what will work with orderly growth
- ❖ Appropriate area for increase in height is in the area generally bounded by Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard, Scottsdale Road, and the Airport. (Northwest portion of “old Airpark”)
- ❖ 4 to 5 stories may be appropriate in some areas; three stories is very limiting for employment uses
  - 4 or 5 stories may increase the workforce population and impact traffic
    - It depends on building type, for example, hotels have different height requirements than office buildings. Hotels do not generally increase the amount of traffic at peak times, whereas office uses may.
- ❖ If we don’t build up, we will have to build out into the desert more. We need to encourage densification in the center of the city to be more sustainable
- ❖ Height increases are more appropriate south of Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard than they are north of it—except around the Loop 101 Freeway
- ❖ I like the current 36-foot zoning and don’t think it needs to change
- ❖ The population will double in 20 years—where will all the people go? They need to go up, and good design will help density feel better
- ❖ 4 to 6 stories, or 60 feet, makes sense along Scottsdale Road. I would hate to see it go much higher than that or it will feel like we’re in a tunnel.
- ❖ Hayden should remain at 36-foot limit because of the residential areas around it.
- ❖ 36 feet is not reasonable for three story-buildings today. The 36-foot limit should be increased to 45-feet because of floor plate requirements.
- ❖ Design needs to be good, however. A continuous wall of 36 feet is not any better than 60 feet with a park
- ❖ Trade-offs for increases in height:
  - Definitely need some tradeoffs
  - Open Space
  - Underground parking
  - Public Art
  - Water features
  - Workforce housing

- Quality design—but this is difficult to determine (subjective)
- ❖ Whatever the height, the lower 40 feet should be pedestrian-oriented
- ❖ The Costco area has zoning that recently changed because the developer could not profit from 36 feet—the zoning changed it to 52 feet
- ❖ One limitation is water. If we bring in more people, we need to look at the amount of water it will require

**4. Please identify any sensitive areas you think exist between the employment areas in the Greater Airpark and the surrounding neighborhoods?**

- ❖ They exist in the south, where rural neighborhoods back up to employment areas
- ❖ They exist to the northeastern portion of the study area where it abuts suburban neighborhoods
- ❖ There should be no five-story buildings backing up to single family neighborhoods
- ❖ Be sensitive about everyday noises that businesses make, like air conditioning equipment
- ❖ Need a transitional zone or buffer around sensitive areas
  - Consider utilizing multi-family housing as a buffer
  - Avoid single-family residential areas against intense commercial areas
- ❖ Should not look at these areas in isolation
  - Pedestrian linkages should be encouraged
- ❖ A good model is the Perimeter Center where residential areas are adjacent to offices
  - The area has good visual appeal
  - There are some height issues there though
  - There is a “green zone” that buffers the two uses
- ❖ Separating pedestrian traffic from vehicular traffic—like the use of pedestrian bridges—will help with buffering
- ❖ A sensitive area is the Thunderbird Road area
- ❖ To transition to the neighborhood sides, redevelop the commercial areas that abut them to where they allow greater heights on the interior portion of the lot and shorter heights next to the residential areas. This may require a larger parcel, however.

**5. How do you view the area north of the CAP Canal as opposed to the area south of the CAP Canal?**

- ❖ They are two different worlds
- ❖ The area at the end of the runway (to the north) has its limitations
- ❖ The north area doesn’t feel connected to the Airpark, it is more connected to WestWorld
- ❖ This has changed recently. People up north used to shop in the southern portion of the study area. Now people go north to the Loop 101 (in Phoenix) to shop
- ❖ The southern portion is more oriented to surrounding neighborhoods

- ❖ Circulation in the two areas is different now than it was two years ago. It is now more convenient to go north.
- ❖ The northern portion of the study area is more inline with northern Scottsdale with people that own two or three homes a piece
- ❖ The northern portion is more freeway-oriented, especially along the bend of the Loop 101. Businesses that locate along the freeway will want visibility
- ❖ South of Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard, the Loop 101 drops down and creates a different atmosphere than the elevated portion to the north

**6. Do you have anything else to add?**

- ❖ Avoid reflective glass on buildings
- ❖ Allow developers to be more innovative
- ❖ Consider building orientation in designs
- ❖ Take the General Plan Land Use Map (from 2001) and 3-D model what the area would look like if it were built out
- ❖ Picture the Phoenix (FBR) Open and plan to the 18<sup>th</sup> hole. Do you want to see a building? Or do you want to see mountains?
- ❖ Until the transportation problem is solved, none of this can be done