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Executive Summary

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) created the Neighborhood Stabilization Program 2 (NSP2) to address neighborhoods adversely affected by the housing crisis and economic recession of 2007-2009. The goal of NSP2 is to stabilize neighborhoods by expanding opportunities for homeownership, halt declining home values, and improve neighborhood conditions by reducing the number of vacant and abandoned properties. In Pima County, Arizona, the Pima Neighborhood Investment Partnership (PNIP) is using NSP2 funding to target thirty census tracts in south and central Tucson, the City of South Tucson, and an unincorporated area of Pima County.

In order to gauge the effectiveness of NSP2-funded activities, in 2010 Pima County contracted with the Drachman Institute at the University of Arizona’s College of Architecture, Planning, and Landscape Architecture to provide a record of existing baseline conditions in sample neighborhoods. The purpose of collecting baseline conditions is to inform future community planning efforts, as well as to provide a base from which to assess neighborhood improvements or deterioration over time. Volume I in this series of reports presents the existing baseline conditions for five selected neighborhoods in the NSP2 target area (Elvira, Rose, Julia Keen, Santa Cruz Southwest, and Cardinal/Valencia area), and one control neighborhood outside the target area (Stella Mann). In 2012, the Drachman Institute conducted assessments for an additional six neighborhoods (Bravo Park Lane, Wakefield area, A-Mountain, Fairgrounds, Los Niños area, and Sunset Villa). These six neighborhoods are the subject of this report (Volume II).

In addition to collecting baseline neighborhood conditions, Drachman Institute developed survey instruments and trained County interviewers in data collection skills to obtain baseline data from individual residents in selected NSP2 neighborhoods and from families that have moved into homes with NSP2 assistance. The results of those surveys are presented in Volume III of this series.

The findings in this report are based primarily on windshield surveys conducted by Drachman staff in the selected neighborhoods, combined with U.S. census data, Pima County GIS data, and other relevant third party sources. Data in this report indicate the following:

• **Demographics and Housing Characteristics**
  Residents in Fairgrounds, Sunset Villa, and Wakefield area have both the lowest median incomes and the highest percentage of households under the federal poverty threshold.

  All of the selected NSP2 neighborhoods have a high percentage of the population identifying as Hispanic (the lowest is 70.5 percent; significantly higher than the City of Tucson at 41.6 percent).

  Of the selected neighborhoods, Sunset Villa has the highest proportion of elderly residents (12.5 percent are sixty-five years or older). In contrast, A-Mountain has the lowest proportion of elderly
residents and the highest proportion of residents under age 18.

With the exception of Los Niños area, the selected NSP2 neighborhoods are almost evenly split between homeowners and renters. In Los Niños, the majority of residents are homeowners rather than renters (78.3 percent). Los Niños also has the most long-term residents, with half of all residents moving into the neighborhood prior to 1998. All of the selected neighborhoods have median home values that are significantly lower than the median for the City of Tucson.

• **Assessment of Structures**
  The general condition of structures in the neighborhoods studied is good, with the majority of structures in each neighborhood assessed to be in “Good” or “Excellent” condition. Structures rated “poor” or “replacement” range from none in Bravo Park Lane to 10.5 percent in Fairgrounds.

  The visual windshield assessment found that Los Niños area has the largest vacancy percentage of the NSP2 selected neighborhoods (2.2 percent of parcels have structures that are missing doors, windows, or are boarded up). In comparison, according to the 2010 U.S. Census, Wakefield area has the highest vacancy rate at 12.6 percent. The Census definition incorporates all vacant housing units including those for rent or for sale, those vacant properties that are vacant due to seasonal, recreational, or occasional use, and “other vacant” which may be recent foreclosures or units that owners or renters have walked away from. Wakefield area has the highest number/percentage of “other vacant” units (5.4 percent) as well as the highest estimated foreclosure rate (10.1-11.2 percent).

• **Assessment of Landscapes**
  With the exception of A-Mountain and Sunset Villa, the general condition of landscapes in the neighborhoods is “Average.” In A-Mountain, almost half of all landscapes are assessed as “poor.” In Sunset Villa, the area is split fairly equally between “Excellent,” “Average,” and “Poor.”

  The high percentage of parcels with poor landscaping is partially explained by the condition of vacant lots in these neighborhoods. In A-Mountain, 97.6 percent of the vacant parcels are in poor condition. In Los Niños, 98.3 percent of vacant parcels are in poor condition; all of them had litter and almost half had graffiti at the time of the windshield survey.

• **Walkability, Transportation, and Accessibility**
  None of the selected neighborhoods can be considered pedestrian-friendly due to the lack of shade and lack of sidewalks, curb cuts, and access ramps. Furthermore, many bus stops in all of the neighborhoods are not easily and universally accessible.

  According to data from the Center for Neighborhood Technology (2012), with the exception of the Los Niños area, in the NSP2 selected neighborhoods housing costs constitute less than 30 percent of household income and are thus considered affordable. The housing costs in Los Niños are just over this figure at 34.2 percent. However, when transportation costs are considered, none of the selected neighborhoods is considered affordable (defined as housing + transportation costs constituting 45 percent or less of household income). A-Mountain neighborhood stands out as the least affordable as residents are spending, on average, over 60 percent of their income on housing and transportation.

  Because housing and transportation are the two largest expenses in most American household budgets, any programs aimed at housing affordability and neighborhood revitalization must consider ways to decrease household transportation costs by increasing transit choices and investing in healthy, safe, walkable neighborhoods.
Background: The Housing Foreclosure Crisis

Since 2007 the nation has seen an unprecedented number of home foreclosures. The state of Arizona has been especially hard hit by the foreclosure crisis, with rates well above the national average. According to RealtyTrac, as of June 2012, one in 346 housing units in Tucson is in foreclosure.¹

Studies have shown that increasing numbers of foreclosures in an area can have a ripple effect that results in both physical and social disorder.² On a personal level, families pay a high price due to the loss of a stable home, loss of credit and the potential for asset building, and increased physical and emotional stress. But the foreclosure crisis extends beyond those families that lose their home. At the neighborhood level families may experience a drop in their own home value as properties around them deteriorate and the potential for crime and vandalism increases. According to a 2006 study of foreclosures in Chicago, each single-family home foreclosure resulted in a decline of 0.9 percent in value to surrounding homes. The authors estimate that the result of 3,750 foreclosures in Chicago between 1997 and 1998 reduced property values by more than $598 million.³ The decline in home values can be seen in Tucson as home values have fallen 24.8 percent since their peak value.⁴

Along with deteriorating properties and declining home values, families may also experience a decrease in community pride and satisfaction. Decreasing perceptions of neighborhood safety may also lead to less use of outdoor spaces and a lack of connection among neighbors. The end result is neighborhoods that are unstable and families that experience a lower quality of life.

Neighborhood Stabilization Program 2

The Neighborhood Stabilization Program 2 (NSP2) was established by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to stabilize neighborhoods that have been adversely affected by the housing crisis and economic recession of 2007-2009. NSP2, funded through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, provides grants to states, local governments, and non-profits on a competitive basis.

Pima County and eight sub-grantees are charged with implementing the Neighborhood Stabilization Program-2 (NSP2) grant. Together these partners are known as the Pima Neighborhood Investment Partnership (PNIP).

The overall intention of NSP2 is the redevelopment of abandoned and foreclosed homes within the thirty census tracts that compose the NSP2 target area.

Specific NSP2 activities include down payment assistance, demolition of blighted structures, acquisition and rehabilitation of structures for sale or land trust, land banking, and redevelopment of demolished or vacant properties (all redevelopment thus far has involved new construction). See Figure 1.1 for a map of the NSP2 target area and NSP2 activities as of November 2012. Table 1.1 presents the number of properties impacted by NSP2 funds by activity type.

NSP2 Goals and Neighborhood Evaluation Strategy

The general stabilization goals of NSP2 are to expand opportunities for homeownership, halt declining home values, and improve neighborhood conditions. In order to determine the effectiveness of NSP2 activities, Pima County contracted with Drachman Institute in the College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture at the University of Arizona to 1) provide a record of existing conditions in sample neighborhoods from within the NSP2 target area and a control neighborhood outside the target area; 2) develop survey instruments and train County interviewers in data collection skills to obtain baseline data from individual residents in the selected neighborhoods and from families that have moved into homes with NSP2 assistance; and 3) report on the results of the survey instruments and other baseline data regarding home values and tenure of residents in the selected neighborhoods.

The purpose of collecting baseline conditions is to inform future community planning efforts, as well as to provide a base from which to assess neighborhood improvements or deterioration over time.

Volume I in this series of reports presents the existing baseline conditions for five selected neighborhoods in the NSP2 target area (Elvira, Rose, Julia Keen, Santa Cruz Southwest, and Cardinal/Valencia area), and one control neighborhood outside the target area (Stella Mann).

The following report is Volume II in the series and it includes assessments for an additional six neighborhoods (Bravo Park Lane, Wakefield area, A-Mountain, Fairgrounds, Los Niños area, and Sunset Villa). These assessments were accomplished through a windshield survey and the collection of secondary research.

Volume III in this series of reports presents baseline survey data from residents and NSP2 homeowners.
1. Introduction

**Figure 1.1: NSP2 Target Area and Activities**
The blue outline indicates the perimeter of the NSP2 Target Area and the original 29 Census Tracts. In 2011 Census tract 35.03 was added to the NSP2 Target Area. This map includes all NSP2 activities as of November 2012 as well as the location of NSP2 Study Neighborhoods (in brown).

**Table 1.1: Number of Properties Impacted by NSP2 Funds by Activity Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Properties (as of November 2012)</th>
<th>Estimated Final Total (as of February 2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition and Rehab (A&amp;R)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down Payment Assistance (HAP)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Banking</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition of Blighted Structures</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The purpose of collecting baseline conditions is to inform future community planning efforts, as well as to provide a base from which to assess neighborhood improvements or deterioration over time.

Under the Scope of Services with Pima County, Drachman Institute was to record:

- **Neighborhood Attractiveness, Physical Condition of Properties, Land Use, Traffic Patterns, Street Enhancements, Trees and Vegetation, Pedestrian Walks, Bike Paths, Transit Access, Bus Stop Appearance and Design, and Outdoor Space Design.**

In order to capture all of these characteristics, the Drachman team utilized several different methods of data collection:

- **Windshield Surveys**
The primary source of data is a windshield survey of parcels and right-of-way conducted in each neighborhood. The accuracy of some GIS data, such as the location and condition of bus stops, was also verified on the ground as part of the windshield survey. The presence of sidewalks and curb ramps was recorded with the use of aerial imagery.

- **GIS Data**
To supplement and inform the windshield survey, publicly available Pima County GIS data for flood zones, areas of contamination, Air Hazard zones, and other important neighborhood overlays were also acquired and used for analysis.

- **Third Party Sources**
Drachman Institute also collected data from third party sources such as the Center for Neighborhood Technology, The City of Tucson, the U.S. Census, and Environmental Systems Research Institute (Community Analyst Service). The final products of Drachman’s data gathering and analyses are shown in detail by neighborhood in the following chapters.

**Neighborhood Selection**
In 2010, Pima County staff selected five study neighborhoods from within the NSP2 target area and one control/comparison neighborhood outside the target area: Elvira, Julia Keen, Rose, Santa Cruz Southwest, Cardinal/Valencia area, and Stella Mann (control). Volume I in this series of reports presents the findings from these six neighborhoods.

In 2012, Pima County staff selected an additional six neighborhoods for assessment: Bravo Park Lane, Wakefield area, A-Mountain, Fairgrounds, Sunset Villa, and Los Niños area (see Figure 2.1). The following Volume II report presents the findings for these six neighborhoods.
Figure 2.1: Pima County NSP2 Study Neighborhoods
The neighborhoods selected from within the NSP2 Target Area (solid blue outline) for evaluation and community planning efforts with Drachman Institute are shown above. Dark shaded neighborhoods/areas are the subject of this Volume II report. Light shaded neighborhoods/areas are the subject of Volume I.
Data Sheet
In order to assess baseline neighborhood conditions, Drachman Institute conducted a visual “Windshield Survey” by parcel. Drachman Institute used data sheets designed to measure:

- Right-of-way Conditions
- Physical Conditions of Properties
- Condition of Landscapes
- Litter and Graffiti
- Land Use
- Vacancy
- Trees and Vegetation
- Water Harvesting

The data sheets were edited three times at the beginning of the process as a result of practice sessions and in-the-field observations. The data collection sheets were also shared with Pima County NSP2 staff for comments or changes. See Appendix A for an example of the data sheet.

Training
Training sessions familiarized each team with the information they were to gather, demonstrated the best method by which to gather it, and helped standardize their assessments.

Teams filled out data sheets for parcels on a sample block of residential and office structures. Each team member did their own independent analysis of structures, landscapes, and right-of-way areas.

After completion, team members reported their assessments and any discrepancies in assessment were discussed. Questions regarding the definition of each category were brought up and clarified.

In order to further improve the reliability of the data collected, two parcel control groups were established in A-Mountain Neighborhood. Each team independently assessed these parcels and then discussed their assessments as a group to clarify any discrepancies.

Data Collection
Windshield survey work for Volume II began in May 2011 in Bravo Park Lane and Wakefield area. Windshield survey work in A-Mountain, Fairgrounds, Los Niños area, and Sunset Villa was completed in July 2012. Windshield surveys were conducted in teams of two in varying shifts between the hours of 8 a.m. and 6 p.m. every day. Windshield evaluations were performed primarily from the vehicle’s passenger side window, but as needed the surveyor would exit the vehicle and walk to assess properties.

All data collection occurred from the street or public right-of-way, or from commercial areas open to the public such as parking lots. Parcels located along private roads, or which were otherwise difficult to evaluate from public areas were labeled as “visually unavailable” and were not assessed.

The survey staff also used a digital camera to help capture examples of neighborhood character such as representative structures, salient features, traffic patterns and street profiles, outdoor space design, and community gathering spaces.

At the conclusion of each neighborhood evaluation, team members submitted a short summary of their impressions of each neighborhood they had surveyed. These summaries captured the interactions and observations of the survey team that were not included on the data sheet, and contribute to a fuller understanding of neighborhood character.

Data Entry
The paper data sheets used for data collection in the field were used to enter the data into Excel spreadsheets.

The Excel spreadsheet format allows for easy conversion into a GIS-compatible data set for mapping and spatial analysis in the ArcMap format.

All data entry for Volume II was completed by August 31, 2012.
Neighborhood Introduction

Introduction
Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood is located south of Interstate 10 and east of Interstate 19 in Tucson and is bounded by Benson Highway and Campbell Avenue to the east, Irvington Road to the south, Ajo Way to the north, and Park Avenue to the west. Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood is in Pima County Supervisor District 2. The Drachman windshield survey team was active in the Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood during July 2011.

Surrounding Context
The Pima County Rodeo Grounds are located west of the neighborhood along Irvington Road. The land to the south of Bravo Park Lane is primarily residential with two schools, Rivera Elementary and Alta Vista High School, located just south of Irvington Road. Much of the area to the east of Bravo Park Lane between Benson Highway and Interstate 10 is vacant.

Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood
Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood consists of approximately 911 parcels. A visit to the neighborhood shows that the neighborhood is split into two major areas with no access between them. To the north of Fair Street the area is

Figure 3.1: Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood Location
Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood (dark purple) is located in the heart of the NSP2 Target Area (within solid outline).
industrial with office buildings and warehouses. The area is bordered by walls or fencing so that it is blocked to pedestrians or cars. Access to this northern section is along Park Avenue, Ajo Way, and Benson Highway. South of Fair Street is primarily residential with the exception of businesses along Park Avenue, Irvington, and S. Campbell Avenue.

In the center of Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood lies the neighborhood park (Bravo Park) which features a playground area with a climbing structure, swings, and slides, picnic tables, open green space, and a lighted basketball area. Access to the northern industrial section of Bravo Park Lane is blocked by walls along Fair Street.

**Figure 3.2: Development Surrounding the Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood**

Much of the land within Bravo Park Lane (purple) has been developed. Land in the surrounding areas (orange) is mostly developed as well. There are a few pockets of vacant land, with the majority of it near the I-10 Freeway.
Photographs

1. Park Avenue Christian Church

2. Bravo Park includes amenities such as a children’s play area, basketball court, and walking path.

3. A locally-owned business in Bravo Park Lane

4. Pima County Sheriff’s office

5. Apartment complex in Bravo Park Lane

6. Desert Shadows Wash runs alongside Bravo Park and bisects the neighborhood.
Apartments are predominant in the southeastern corner of the neighborhood.

Gas station on the perimeter of the neighborhood.

Apartments are predominant in the southeastern corner of the neighborhood.
Demographics

Census Tract Location
The Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood is located within Census Tract 22.00 (Figure 3.4).

Demographics
The population of Bravo Park Neighborhood is fairly young, with a median age of 31.2 and almost 30 percent of the neighborhood under the age of eighteen. The proportion of residents over age 65 is also lower than the city average at 8.2 percent (Table 3.1). According to the 2010 U.S. Census, 43.4 percent of households in Bravo Park Lane have children and 11.4 percent of households are multi-generational.

In terms of income, the median household income in Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood is slightly below the Tucson median income ($33,047 compared to $35,499 for the City of Tucson).

Bravo Park Lane has a large Hispanic population (83.1 percent compared to 41.6 percent for the City of Tucson).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1: Bravo Park Lane Demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bravo Park Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Under 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Over 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent High School Graduate or Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Bachelor's Degree or Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent in Poverty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All statistics are from the 2010 Census (provided by ESRI), with the exception of Percent High School Graduate or Higher, Percent Bachelor’s Degree or Higher, and Percent Households in Poverty in Last Year, which come from the American Community Survey 2005-2009 5-year estimates, provided by ESRI.
Housing Characteristics
Compared to the City of Tucson, Bravo Park Lane residents are more likely to be homeowners, have higher average household sizes, and have lower median home values (see Table 3.2). Figure 3.5 demonstrates that over half of Bravo Park Lane residents own their home (13.7 percent own their home without a mortgage).

According to the 2005-2009 American Community Survey, a significant proportion of residents have lived in Bravo Park Lane for a considerable length of time. In fact, approximately 48.6 percent of householders have lived in the area for ten years or more.

The majority of the housing stock in Bravo Park Lane is single family (attached or detached) with a median home value of $129,167.

![Figure 3.5: Bravo Park Lane Households by Tenure and Mortgage Status](2010 Census (ESRI))

Table 3.2: Bravo Park Lane Housing Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Values</th>
<th>Bravo Park Lane</th>
<th>Tract 22</th>
<th>Tucson</th>
<th>Pima County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(owner-occupied units)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0-99,999</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-149,999</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150-199,999</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000+</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>$129,167</td>
<td>$117,600</td>
<td>$169,900</td>
<td>$196,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Year Householder Moved into Unit</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Owner-Occupied</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Units</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey 2005-2009 5-year estimates, ESRI.
Zoning

The Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood includes eight City of Tucson zoning classifications as shown below in Figure 3.6.¹

The majority of the parcels in the southern half of the neighborhood south of Fair Street are zoned for residential uses under the Single Family Residential (R-1), Medium Density Residential (R-2), or High Density Residential (R-3) classifications. Under new construction the R-1 zoning allows for up to 2 residences per acre (RAC), a minimum lot area of 7,000 square feet, and a maximum structure height of twenty-five feet. North of Fair Street the neighborhood is primarily industrial, office, and retail.

¹ See Appendix C for a complete list of City of Tucson Zoning Classifications and summary descriptions.

Figure 3.6: Zoning Classifications in Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood
See Appendix C for City of Tucson Zoning Classifications by Symbol
Land Use

Land use in Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood corresponds closely with the zoning specifications.

Two large apartment complexes are located in the southeastern corner of the neighborhood zoned for high density residential. The parcels zoned for R-1 or R-2 uses have been developed with lower density, single-story, single-family residences.

Table 3.3: Land Use in Bravo Park Lane by Parcel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Number of Parcels</th>
<th>Percentage of Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residence (SFR)</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residence (MFR)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Lot</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to Observe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aIncludes schools, parks, private streets, and uses not otherwise classified.
Development Patterns

All existing structures and roads in Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood are shown in Figure 3.8. Residential development in Bravo Park Lane began in the 1950s in the area just south of Fair Street and east of Park Avenue. The residential area south of Fair Street was almost fully built out by 1979.

Development in the industrial area north of Fair Street occurred primarily in the 1980s. The pattern of development by parcel and decade is shown in Figure 3.9.
Figure 3.9: Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood Development Over Time by Parcel
Source: Pima County GIS, 2010
Density

The southern portion of Bravo Park Lane has a density of people per square mile of 12,442.\(^2\) This is well above the Tucson average of 2,294, and largely due to the medium-high residential zoning (R2-R3) in the southeastern corner of the neighborhood (see Figure 3.10).

The lower density in the northern portion of the neighborhood is due primarily to land zoned for industrial, retail, or office use.

\(^2\) 2010 Census, provided by Pima County GIS

Figure 3.10: Population Density in Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood by Block Group

Numbers indicate people per square mile based on the 2010 U.S. Census. Dotted lines indicate Block Group Boundaries. Data from Pima County GIS.

The majority of parcels in the neighborhood contain single family homes.

Bravo Park provides open green space in the center of the neighborhood.

The Southeastern corner of the neighborhood is zoned for High Density Residential (R3).
Rivers and Washes
A wide cement diversion channel divides the northern industrial section of Bravo Park Lane, making pedestrian and automobile access from one section to the other impossible.

The residential section south of Fair Street contains one major wash system (Desert Shadows Wash) that travels south through the neighborhood (Figure 3.11).

This wash can be the source of flooding where it crosses neighborhood streets as well as a site for dumping and debris.
Bicycles

Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood has very few improved bike routes inside the neighborhood boundaries (Figure 3.12). There are striped bicycle lanes along the perimeter of the neighborhood on major streets, as well as two unimproved bike routes on residential streets.

Connectivity for residents moving in the east-west direction through the neighborhood is on a designated bike route along Fair Road. This bike route eventually leads to the Santa Cruz River and passes by Bravo Park.

There are very few improved bike routes in Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood.

Figure 3.12: Bicycle Routes in Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood

The map above shows the existing and planned bike routes in and around the neighborhood. The designated bike route through the neighborhood is along Fair St.
Pedestrians
The Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood has a Walk Score\textsuperscript{3} of 54 out of 100 and is therefore considered “Somewhat Walkable.”\textsuperscript{4} There are multiple businesses and services at the corner of E. Irvington Road and S. Campbell Avenue that are within walking distance for residents in the southeastern quadrant of the neighborhood.

The Drachman windshield survey teams also noted the presence of sidewalks and street trees in the neighborhood. Compared to many

\textsuperscript{3} www.walkscore.com

Transportation and Circulation (cont.)

neighborhoods in Tucson, Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood has sidewalks in a large portion of the neighborhood (see Figure 3.13).

Street trees are a key component of good walking routes. Trees grow in the right-of-way of fewer than twelve percent of parcels in Bravo Park Lane (Table 3.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trees in Right-of-Way</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Street trees exist in the right-of-way on fewer than twelve percent of parcels.

Vehicles

The average number of vehicle miles traveled per household per year in Tucson is 14,562. In Bravo Park Neighborhood this number is higher, averaging over 16,000 miles per year (Figure 3.14).\(^5\)

This number is fairly high considering that Bravo Park Lane is considered “somewhat walkable” due to its close proximity to services along major roads. It is also well connected by public transit (see the following section).

\(^5\) See Appendix G for source and methods.

A pedestrian crosses the street in Bravo Park Lane.

Figure 3.14: Average Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled per Household per Year in the Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood
Image and data provided by the Center for Neighborhood Technology, 2012
Public Transit
Three city bus routes serve Bravo Park Lane and connect to either the Laos Transit Center at Irvington Road and 6th Avenue or the Ronstadt Transit Center downtown (Figure 3.15). 6

Due to proximity to the Laos Transit Center these bus routes have fairly high ridership (Table 7.3). Route 11, north of Bravo Park Lane on Ajo Way, is ranked third highest out of forty routes based on the number of passengers per hour.

Table 3.5: Bus Ridership in Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>City-Wide Ridership/ Month</th>
<th>Passengers per hour</th>
<th>Ranking*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26,921</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>104,513</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>98,669</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ranking is from 1-40 bus routes, with #1 having the most passengers per hour. (Data for June 2012).

Figure 3.15: Bus Routes and Stops in Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood
Lines show existing city bus routes in and around the neighborhood. White dots indicate the location of un-sheltered bus stops; black dots the location of sheltered stops.

---

6 SunTran, 2012.
There are three major bus routes serving Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood.

One of many sheltered bus stops along the neighborhood perimeter.

Figure 3.16: Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood Connectivity by Public Transit
Housing Affordability

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) defines affordable housing as housing that costs thirty percent or less of total household income. According to this criteria, Bravo Park Lane housing costs are considered affordable (Figure 3.17).7

Housing + Transportation Affordability

The Housing+Transportation Affordability Index was developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) to show the importance of transportation costs to overall housing affordability. In this calculation, anything above 45 percent of income spent on housing plus transportation is considered to be unaffordable.

Despite the affordability of housing, Bravo Park Lane residents spend on average 49.7-60.4 percent of their income on the combined costs of housing plus transportation (Figure 3.18). This is well above the affordable limit. Residents in this area are spending more on transportation than they are on housing.

---

7 See Appendix G for source and methods.

---

Figure 3.17: Average Housing Cost as a Percentage of Household Income in Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood

Spending over 30 percent of income on housing is considered unaffordable.

Image and data provided by the Center for Neighborhood Technology, 2012.

---

Figure 3.18: Average Housing + Transportation Cost as Percentage of Household Income in Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood

Spending over 45 percent of income on housing plus transportation is considered unaffordable.

Image and data provided by the Center for Neighborhood Technology, 2012.
**Lighting**

Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood is very dark at night. There is very little street lighting along the major routes, none on internal neighborhood streets, and a few lights in the neighborhood park (Figure 3.19). The only public lighting is located along S. Campbell Avenue and Ajo Way.

- A lighted intersection on the perimeter of Bravo Park
- Dark streets discourage pedestrian use in the evening.
- The interior of the neighborhood lacks street lighting.
- The Pima County Sheriff’s office is well-lit in the evenings.
- Lighted basketball courts in Bravo Park
With the exception of Bravo Park, there are no street lights in the interior of Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood.

**Figure 3.19: Street Lighting in Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood**

With the exception of Bravo Park, there are no street lights in the interior of Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood.
Assessment of Structures

Building Conditions
The vast majority (92.5 percent) of structures in Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood are either in “Good” or “Excellent” condition (Figure 3.20). Approximately 7.5 percent are in “Fair” condition requiring between $5000 and $15,000 in repairs.

The majority of structures are in good or excellent condition in Bravo Park Lane.

A typical home in Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood.

The overall condition of structures in Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood (May, 2011)

All Single-Family Residential Structures
(Out of 737 assessable SFR structures)

All Multi-Family Residential Structures
(Out of 73 assessable MFR structures)

Figure 3.20: Condition of Structures in Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood (May, 2011)
Landscape Conditions
A majority of the landscapes in Bravo Park Lane are considered ‘Average’ (Figure 3.21). This means that landscape is either intentional or maintained. Less than a quarter of landscapes are “Poor,” where landscape is neither intentional nor maintained.

The windshield survey also recorded the presence of litter and graffiti on each parcel, and trees in the adjoining right-of-way (Table 3.6). One-third of parcels in the neighborhood had litter at the time of the windshield survey, and almost five percent had graffiti.

Table 3.6: Bravo Park Lane Condition of Landscapes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcels with Street Trees in Right of Way</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels with Litter</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels with Graffiti</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Out of 906 assessable parcels)

“Excellent” landscape is both intentional and maintained.

Overall Condition of Landscapes
(Out of 906 assessable parcels)

All Single-Family Residential Landscapes
(Out of 738 assessable SFR parcels)

All Multi-Family Residential Landscapes
(Out of 73 assessable MFR parcels)

Figure 3.21: Condition of Landscapes in Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood (May, 2011)
Vacant Structures and Land

Due to conflicting definitions of vacancy, only structures with boarded windows and doors were labeled “vacant.” Using this definition, in Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood none of the parcels contained vacant structures as of July 2011. This vacancy rate is contrary to 2010 U.S. Census data which has a broader definition of vacancy.

The Census definition incorporates all vacant housing units including those for rent or for sale, those vacant properties that are vacant due to seasonal, recreational, or occasional use, and "other vacant" which may be recent foreclosures or units that owners or renters have walked away from (see Table 3.7). According to the 2010 U.S. Census, the total vacancy rate in Bravo Park Lane is 8.5 percent.

Structures with ‘For Sale’ or ‘For Rent’ signs were also noted by the windshield survey teams. Some 2.3 percent of the neighborhood parcels had “for sale” signs, and 2.2 percent had “for rent” signs in July 2011 (Table 3.8). Structures with ‘For Sale’ of ‘For Rent’ signs, even ones that appeared uninhabited, are not classified as ‘Vacant’ unless windows and doors were either missing or boarded up.

Foreclosures

The Drachman windshield survey team was unable to visually determine the number of foreclosures in each neighborhood. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) determines an estimated foreclosure abandonment risk score by census block group. This score is on a scale from 0-10, with 10 being the highest risk. According to HUD, the estimated foreclosure abandonment risk score for Bravo Park Neighborhood is 10, and the neighborhood has an estimated foreclosure rate of 9.0 percent.

Vacant and Undeveloped Land

Seven out of 911 parcels (0.8 percent) in Bravo Park Lane are vacant (see Figure 3.22). Litter is a problem on vacant land as all seven vacant parcels had litter as of July 2011.

Table 3.7: Housing Units by Vacancy Status in Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vacant Units</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Rent</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented, not occupied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sale</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold, not occupied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Vacant**</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For seasonal/ recreational/ occasional use</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Migrant Workers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Vacant Units</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census 2010 Summary File 1 (ESRI)
** Includes recent foreclosures or units that owners have walked away from. See text for more information.

Table 3.8: Observed Available Properties in Bravo Park Lane by Signage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Percent of Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Sale</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Rent</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.22: Vacant Land in the Bravo Park Area
Dark shaded parcels indicate vacant land identified by the Drachman windshield survey.
Services and Amenities

Services
As indicated previously, the northern half of the neighborhood is predominantly industrial, office, and warehouses. A large business park is located along Park Avenue in the northeast section of the neighborhood.

The Pima County Sheriff’s complex takes up a large portion of land along Benson Highway, and the Tucson Police Department also has a large building on the corner of Park Avenue and Fair Street.

Residents in the southeast portion of the neighborhood are served by multiple businesses, including a Fry’s grocery store and Walgreens, at the corner of Irvington and S. Campbell Avenue.

There is one small alternative high school (PPEP Tec) in the neighborhood along Benson Highway, the only school in the immediate neighborhood.

Fast food options along Irvington Road
Tucson Business Park on Park Ave
Locally-owned business on Irvington Road
Fry’s grocery store on S. Campbell Avenue and Irvington
Figure 3.23: Services and Amenities around the Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood

Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Type</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>△</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Cash</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Store</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Food</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Improvement</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Private</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Public</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Institution</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter School</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Station</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Public</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary School</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Neighborhood Summary

The northern half of the neighborhood consists of primarily industrial and office buildings.

Apartments on the corner of Irvington and S. Campbell Avenue

Bravo Park is located in the heart of Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood.
Location and Geography
Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood is located south of Interstate 10 and east of Interstate 19 in Tucson and is bounded by Benson Highway and Campbell Avenue to the east, Irvington Road to the south, Ajo Way to the north, and Park Avenue to the west. A visit to the neighborhood shows that the neighborhood is split into two major areas: industrial to the north of Fair Street and residential to the south of Fair Street. The neighborhood was developed primarily in the 1970s.

Demographics and Housing Characteristics
The population of Bravo Park Neighborhood is fairly young, with a median age of 31.2 and almost 30 percent of the neighborhood under the age of eighteen.

Bravo Park Lane has a large Hispanic population (83.1 percent compared to 41.6 percent for the City of Tucson).

Compared to the City of Tucson, Bravo Park Lane residents are more likely to be homeowners, have higher average household sizes, and have lower median home values. The majority of the housing stock in Bravo Park Lane is single family (attached or detached) with a median home value of $129,167.

Walkability, Transportation, and Accessibility
In terms of walkability, compared to many neighborhoods in Tucson, Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood has sidewalks in a large portion of the neighborhood. Street trees are a key component of good walking routes. Trees grow in the right-of-way of fewer than twelve percent of parcels in Bravo Park Lane. There is no interior neighborhood street lighting which limits pedestrian activity at night.

Three city bus routes serve Bravo Park Lane and connect to either the Laos Transit Center at Irvington Road and 6th Avenue or the Ronstadt Transit Center downtown.

Housing and Transportation Affordability
Comparing the price of housing in the neighborhood to income shows housing stock to be affordable in Bravo Park Lane. Despite this, the combined cost of housing plus transportation is quite unaffordable. Area residents are spending approximately 50 to 60 percent of their income on housing plus transportation. This is well above the 45 percent considered affordable.

Assessment of Structures and Landscapes
The vast majority (92.5 percent) of structures in Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood are either in “Good” or “Excellent” condition. Approximately 7.5 percent are in “Fair” condition requiring between $5000 and $15,000 in repairs.

A majority of the landscapes in Bravo Park Lane are considered ‘Average.’ This means that landscape is either intentional or maintained. Less than a quarter of landscapes are “Poor,” where landscape is neither intentional nor maintained.

Vacancy and Foreclosure Risk
In Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood, none of the parcels contained structures with boarded windows or doors as of July 2011. However, according to the 2010 U.S. Census, the total vacancy rate in Bravo Park Lane is 8.5 percent.

According to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, the estimated foreclosure abandonment risk score for Bravo Park Lane Neighborhood is 10, and the neighborhood has an estimated foreclosure rate of 9.0 percent.

Seven out of 911 parcels (0.8 percent) in Bravo Park Lane are vacant. Litter is a problem on vacant land as all seven vacant parcels had litter as of July 2011.

Services and Amenities
Residents in the southeast section of the neighborhood are served by multiple businesses, including a Fry’s grocery store and Walgreens at the corner of Irvington and S. Campbell Avenue.

The northern half of the neighborhood is predominantly warehouses and office buildings.
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Area Introduction

Location
The Wakefield area includes that previously recognized City of Tucson neighborhood. The area studied by Drachman Institute is bounded by West 40th Street/Interstate 10 to the north, South 6th Avenue to the east, South 10th/12th Avenue to the west, and extends beyond the previous neighborhood boundary to Irvington Road on the south (Figure 4.1). The neighborhood is located in Pima County Supervisor Districts 2 and 5.

The Drachman windshield survey team was active in the Wakefield area during May 2011. The Wakefield study area consists of approximately 2,127 parcels. Residents in both the north and south parts of the area have access to many services and amenities.

The majority of the area consists of relatively dense single story, single-family homes. The area streets are full of traffic-calming measures (roundabouts at many intersections and speed tables throughout the area). Many of the roundabouts have been planted with trees and require a full vehicle stop before proceeding.

Figure 4.1: Wakefield Area Location
Wakefield Area (dark purple) is located near the northwest quadrant of the NSP2 Target Area (dark outline).
Area Development

Previously, Wakefield was an officially recognized City of Tucson neighborhood with a southern boundary of W. Michigan Drive (see Figure 4.2). The neighborhood and surrounding area was well-developed by 1950.

Businesses and services on the border of Wakefield area and through the center on Ajo Way are numerous, providing a traffic-heavy and active climate.

The tan areas in Figure 4.2 indicate development surrounding the study area.

Figure 4.2 Development Surrounding Wakefield Area

The Wakefield study area is in close proximity to both Interstates 10 and 19. The dotted line represents the southern boundary of what was once Wakefield Neighborhood.
Photographs

1. Liberty Avenue Bikeway runs from 44th Street to the Roy Laos Transit Center.

2. Wakefield Middle School is located in the northern section of the area.

3. St. John's United Methodist Church is located on Veterans Boulevard.

4. Rodeo Wash runs through a small park.

5. City of Tucson property

6. The Rodeo Wash is a source of flooding through the area.
Figure 4.3: Wakefield Location of Photographs
Demographics

**Census Tract Location**
The Wakefield area is located within two census tracts: Tract 24 and Tract 38.01 (see Figure 4.4).

**Demographics**
The population in Wakefield is fairly young, with a median age of 30.4. More than one-third of residents are under age 18. According to the 2010 U.S. Census, 45.3 percent of households in Wakefield include children, and 13.5 percent of households are multi-generational.

Of adults over the age of 25 in the Wakefield area, approximately 52.4 percent have completed an education level of high school graduate or above (Table 4.1). This proportion is significantly below the citywide average of 83.1 percent.

One of the most striking characteristics of the Wakefield area is the ethnic make-up. According to 2010 U.S. Census data, 90.3 percent of the residents in Wakefield identify as Hispanic. This is well above the proportion for the City of Tucson, where 41.6 percent identify as Hispanic.

**Table 4.1: Wakefield Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wakefield</th>
<th>Tract 24</th>
<th>Tract 38.01</th>
<th>Tucson</th>
<th>Pima County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Under 18</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Over 65</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>$25,652</td>
<td>$23,806</td>
<td>$26,326</td>
<td>$35,499</td>
<td>$42,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Hispanic</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent High School</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or Higher</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Bachelor's</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree or Higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All statistics are from the 2010 Census (provided by ESRI), with the exception of Percent High School Graduate or Higher, Percent Bachelor's Degree or Higher, and Percent Households in Poverty in Last Year, which come from the American Community Survey 2005-2009 5-year estimates, provided by ESRI.
Housing Characteristics

The Wakefield area is almost evenly split between homeowners and renters (see Figure 4.5). Approximately 19.5 percent of residents own their home without a mortgage.

According to housing statistics from the 2005-2009 American Community Survey, approximately 45.0 percent of householders in the Wakefield area have lived there ten years or more.

The majority of the housing units in the Wakefield area are single-family, and the median home value ($95,917) is well below the average for the City of Tucson (see Table 4.2).

Table 4.2: Wakefield Housing Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wakefield</th>
<th>Tract 24</th>
<th>Tract 38.01</th>
<th>Tucson</th>
<th>Pima County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Values</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(owner-occupied units)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0-99,999</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-149,999</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150-199,999</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000+</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>$95,917</td>
<td>$102,900</td>
<td>$95,300</td>
<td>$169,900</td>
<td>$196,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Year Householder Moved into Unit*</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Owner-Occupied**</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size**</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Units*</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*American Community Survey 2005-2009 5-year estimates, ESRI.
**2010 Census Summary File, ESRI

Figure 4.5: Wakefield Households by Tenure and Mortgage Status
U.S. Census 2010 (ESRI)
Zoning

The Wakefield area includes five zoning classifications¹ as shown below in Figure 4.6.

The vast majority of the parcels in the area are zoned as ‘Residential’ with medium densities appropriate under the R-2 classification. There are high density R-3 classifications on the east and south borders of the neighborhood, allowing for the development of large apartment complexes.

Commercial zoning (C-1 and C-2) is located along the perimeter of the area and along Ajo Way.

¹ See Appendix B for a complete list of zoning classifications and summary descriptions.

The majority of parcels in Wakefield are single family residences.

Figure 4.6: Zoning Classifications in Wakefield Area
See Appendix C for City of Tucson Zoning Classifications by Symbol
**Land Use**

While zoning allows for the majority of parcels to be developed with greater density under R-2, most (73.1 percent) of the parcels in the area are used for single family residences as shown in Table 4.3.

Slightly less than eight percent of parcels have multi-family residences, and another six percent are retail establishments.

**Table 4.3: Land Use in Wakefield by Parcel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Number of Parcels</th>
<th>Percentage of Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residence(SFR)</td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residence (MFR)</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Lot</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2127</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes schools, parks, private streets, and uses not otherwise classified.

Six parcels in Wakefield have mobile homes.
Development Patterns
The Wakefield area was fairly well-developed by 1950, but the majority of area development occurred between 1950 and 1970. Development patterns largely honor the established grid system of the City of Tucson, yet include a variety of block widths and lengths.

The Rodeo Wash cuts through the southern section of the area. All existing structures and roads are shown in Figure 4.8.

The pattern of development by parcel and decade is shown in Figure 4.8.

Figure 4.8: Current Build-Out in Wakefield Area
Structures (black), and roads (grey) in the Wakefield Area
Figure 4.9: The Wakefield Area Development Over Time
Source: Pima County GIS, 2012
Density

The Wakefield area has a population density ranging from 6,513 to 10,215 people per square mile as shown in Figure 4.10.2 The average for the entire area is approximately 8,404, significantly higher than the City of Tucson average of 2,294. Higher densities exist south of Ajo Way.

2 Based on 2010 U.S. Census Block Groups, data provided by Pima County GIS.

The Wakefield area is the densest in the center.

While the majority of units in Wakefield are single-family residences, 166 parcels contain multi-family units.
**Rivers & Washes**

Rodeo Wash flows east to west through the neighborhood and drains into the Santa Cruz River (see Figure 4.11).

Flooding can be particularly problematic at the intersection of Lundy Avenue and Pennsylvania Drive where Rodeo Wash flows over the street.

The Tucson Diversion Channel separates the residential section of the area from an industrial section at the north end. Along the south side of the concrete channel is a paved, multi-use pedestrian path that leads to the Julian Wash Archaeological Park.

---

**Figure 4.11: Hydrology and Drainage in Wakefield Area**

There are several wash systems (blue lines) that run through and around the neighborhood. Striped areas indicate the FEMA 100-yr flood plain. Dotted areas indicate riparian habitats.
A pedestrian bridge crosses Rodeo Wash.

A park in the area is named after Rodeo Wash.

Litter and graffiti is a problem in Rodeo Wash.

Rodeo Wash flows over several streets, resulting in potential flooding.

Rodeo Wash runs through the interior of Wakefield.

The Tucson Diversion Channel
Bicycles

Wakefield has several bicycle paths in and around the area. Striped bicycle lanes are currently found along South 6th Avenue, on Irvington east of Liberty Boulevard, and planned for Ajo Way (Figure 4.12). Those riders preferring 'lower stress' routes on residential streets have east/west travel options on President Street, Michigan Street, Veterans Boulevard, and 44th Street. The major north/south travel option is Liberty Avenue Bike Boulevard. This bike route spans the neighborhood and includes traffic calming measures such as roundabouts and speed humps. The Liberty Bicycle Boulevard has been awarded a federal Transportation Enhancement grant and will eventually extend seven miles from downtown Tucson south to Los Reales Road.

Figure 4.12: Bicycle Routes in Wakefield Area

The map above shows the existing and planned bike routes in and around the area. The designated bike route is along S Liberty Ave and Michigan Dr.
Pedestrians
Wakefield area has a Walk Score\(^3\) of 47 out of 100 and is considered ‘Car Dependent.’\(^4\)

For pedestrians, trees grow in the right-of-way of fewer than 12 percent of parcels in the neighborhood (see Table 4.4). Furthermore, from Ajo Way south to W. Michigan Avenue there are no sidewalks in the interior of the neighborhood (see Figure 4.13).

\(^{3}\) www.walkscore.com


### Table 4.4: Wakefield Street Tree Coverage*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trees in Right-of-Way</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2127</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Drachman windshield survey

**Figure 4.13: Wakefield Sidewalks and Street Trees**
The map above shows existing sidewalks (in red) and parcels with at least one street tree in the right-of-way (green outline).
Pedestrians on South 6th Avenue

Pedestrians and traffic in front of Pueblo Magnet High School.

Students walking home from school in the Wakefield area.

**Vehicles**

The average number of vehicle miles traveled per household per year in Tucson is 18,069. In Wakefield, the vehicle miles traveled are lower than the city-wide average, with residents traveling between 15,513 and 16,209 miles per household per year.

5 Based on Regional Moderate values; see Appendix G for source and methods.

---

**Figure 3.14: Average Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled per Household per Year in the Wakefield Area**

Image and data provided by the Center for Neighborhood Technology, 2012
Public Transit
With its proximity to the Roy Laos Transit Center, the Wakefield area is well connected to all of Tucson by the city bus system. Sheltered and unsheltered bus stops along the perimeter of the neighborhood serve the residents (Figure 4.14). In fact, two of the bus routes serving Wakefield have the second and third highest ridership in the city, with 104,513-246,291 passengers per month (Table 4.5).

Table 4.5: Bus Ridership in Wakefield*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>City-Wide Ridership/ Month</th>
<th>Passengers per hour</th>
<th>Ranking**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>246,291</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>104,513</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>149,709</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>9,748</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Suntran, 2012
*Additional bus routes are located on Irvington Road.
**Ranking is from 1-40 bus routes, with #1 having the most passengers per hour. (Data for June 2012)

Figure 4.14: Bus Routes and Stops in the Wakefield Area
Lines show existing city bus routes in and around the area. White dots indicate the location of un-sheltered bus stops; black dots indicate the location of sheltered stops.
Figure 4.15: Wakefield Area Connectivity by Public Transit

The Wakefield area is served by multiple bus routes. A sheltered bus stop in Wakefield.
Housing Affordability
The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) defines affordable housing as housing that costs thirty percent or less of total household income. Housing costs\(^6\) in the Wakefield area vary between 24 and 34 percent, thus some areas of the neighborhood are not affordable by this measure (Figure 4.16).

Housing + Transportation Affordability
The Housing+Transportation Affordability Index was developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) to show the importance of transportation costs to overall housing affordability. In this calculation, anything above 45 percent of income spent on housing plus transportation is deemed to be unaffordable. Wakefield greatly exceeds the affordable limit when considering the combined cost of housing plus transportation.

Annually, Wakefield residents spend between 60 and 71 percent of their income on housing and transportation costs, with many residents spending more on transportation than they do on housing (see Figure 4.17).

---

\(\text{See Appendix G for sources and methods.}\)
Lighting
Compared to other neighborhoods in this study, Wakefield has good street lighting in and around the area (Figure 4.18). Irvington Road, 6th Avenue, 12th Avenue, and Ajo Way are filled with retail and service establishments that are active and open at night.

In addition, the interior of Wakefield has street lighting at every intersection, making it conducive to pedestrian activity in the evenings.

Wakefield is well lit at night compared to many Tucson neighborhoods.

Figure 4.18: Street Lighting in the Wakefield Area
All interior streets are well-lit in Wakefield.
Assessment of Structures

Building Conditions
The majority of parcels (79.5 percent) in Wakefield have structures that are in either “Good” or “Excellent” condition (Figure 4.19). Approximately 17.4 percent are in ‘Fair’ condition requiring between $5,000 and $15,000 in repairs to bring them to “excellent” condition. Fifty-four parcels have structures in “Poor” condition, indicating a need for repairs ranging from $15,000 to $50,000.

Six structures are assessed as “Replacement,” with the cost to repair exceeding the cost to demolish and rebuild. These include one mobile home park and five residential single-family units.

![The windshield survey teams assessed structures based on the estimated costs to repair or replace.](image1)

![Multi-family units were assessed as one structure.](image2)

![Two-story structures are a rare sight in Wakefield.](image3)

![A typical streetscape in Wakefield](image4)

**Figure 4.19: Overall Condition of Structures in the Wakefield Area (May, 2011)**
(Out of 1910 parcels with assessable structures)
**Figure 4.20: Condition of Single Family Residential Structures in Wakefield (May, 2011)**  
(Out of 1541 parcels with assessable SFR structures)

**Figure 4.21: Condition of Multi-Family Residential Structures in Wakefield (May, 2011)**  
(Out of 166 parcels with assessable MFR structures)

**Figure 4.22: Condition of Retail Structures in Wakefield (May, 2011)**  
(Out of 128 parcels with assessable Retail structures)
Assessment of Landscapes

Landscape Conditions

Almost 82 percent of landscapes in Wakefield are in “Average” or “Excellent” condition. This means that on over three-quarters of the parcels in the neighborhood some effort has been made to create or maintain a landscape (see Figure 4.23).

As noted in Figures 4.24-4.26, the majority of parcels with single or multi-family homes have landscapes in average or excellent condition. In contrast, 58.5 percent of the vacant parcels in the area have landscapes in poor condition.

The windshield survey also recorded the presence of litter and graffiti on each parcel and trees in the adjoining right-of-way (see Table 4.5). Litter levels are fairly high, especially on vacant lots in the neighborhood. The windshield survey teams recorded litter on 83.3 percent of vacant parcels.

Table 4.5: Wakefield Condition of Landscapes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number*</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcels with Street Trees in Right of Way</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels with Litter</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels with Graffiti</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Out of 2127 assessable parcels

Figure 4.23: Overall Condition of Landscapes in the Wakefield Area (May, 2011) (Out of 2127 parcels)

One vacant parcel in Wakefield appears to be used as a homeless camp.

Over half of the parcels with vacant land are in poor condition in Wakefield.

Landscapes were recorded as “Excellent” if both intentional and maintained.


Figure 4.24: Condition of Single Family Residential Landscapes in Wakefield (May, 2011)
(Out of 1554 SFR parcels)

Figure 4.25: Condition of Multi-Family Residential Landscapes in Wakefield (May, 2011)
(Out of 166 MFR parcels)

Figure 4.26: Condition of Vacant Land in Wakefield (May, 2011)
(Out of 106 vacant parcels)
Vacant and Unoccupied Structures
Due to conflicting definitions of vacancy, only structures with boarded windows and doors are labeled “vacant.” Using this definition, according to the Drachman windshield survey in the Wakefield area 27 of the 2019 parcels with structures (1.3 percent) were vacant as of December 2010. This vacancy rate is relatively low compared to 2010 U.S. Census data which has a broader definition of vacancy.

The Census definition incorporates all vacant housing units including those for rent or for sale, those vacant properties that are vacant due to seasonal, recreational, or occasional use, and “other vacant” which may be recent foreclosures or units that owners or renters have walked away from (see Table 4.6). According to the 2010 U.S. Census, the total vacancy rate in Wakefield is 12.6 percent.

Structures with ‘For Sale’ or ‘For Rent’ signs were also noted by the windshield survey teams. Some 3.3 percent of parcels in the area were either for sale or for rent in December 2010 (Table 4.7). Structures with ‘For Sale’ or ‘For Rent’ signs, even those that appeared uninhabited, were not classified as ‘Vacant’ unless windows and doors were either missing or boarded.

Foreclosures
The Drachman windshield survey team was unable to visually determine the number of foreclosures in each neighborhood. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) determines an estimated foreclosure abandonment risk score by census block group. This score is on a scale from 0-10, with 10 being the highest risk. According to HUD, the estimated foreclosure abandonment risk score for Wakefield is 10, and the area has an estimated foreclosure rate of 10.1-11.2 percent.

Table 4.6: Housing Units by Vacancy Status in the Wakefield Area*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vacant Units</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Rent</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented, not occupied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sale</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold, not occupied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Vacant**</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For seasonal/ recreational/ occasional use</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Migrant Workers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Vacant Units</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>2432</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: U.S. Census 2010 Summary File 1 (ESRI)
** Includes recent foreclosures or units that owners have walked away from. See text for more information.

Table 4.7: Observed Available Properties in Wakefield Neighborhood by Signage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Percent of Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Sale</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Rent</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Visually Accessible Parcels = 2,127

This structure in Wakefield is recorded as “vacant” due to boarded windows.
**Vacant and Undeveloped Land**

Out of 2127 parcels in Wakefield, 108 of them are vacant lots (5.1 percent). These vacant lots are located throughout the area, with the highest concentrations being just south of Interstate 10 and around the Rodeo Wash (Figure 4.23).

Undeveloped lots in Wakefield have been observed to be the targets of illegal dumping.

*Approximately five percent of parcels in Wakefield are vacant lots.*

*A vacant lot in Wakefield*

*Figure 4.23: Vacant Land in the Wakefield Area*

Dark shaded parcels indicate vacant land identified by the Drachman windshield survey.
Services and Amenities

Location of Commercial Services
The majority of commercial services available within walking distance to residents of the Wakefield area are on 6th Avenue, 12th Avenue, Ajo Way and Irvington Road. These businesses provide many of the services needed by residents and are within a half mile of most housing (Figure 4.24).

Available Services and Amenities
Wakefield has several schools within and just outside of the area including Hollinger Elementary school on Ajo Way, Wakefield Middle School on 44th Street, and Pueblo Magnet High School just west of the Wakefield area on 12th Avenue. In addition to schools, there are a number of churches located along Wakefield’s perimeter.

An auto-related business in Wakefield
A locally-owned business in the Wakefield area

One of many services located on Ajo Way
There are multiple dining options in and around Wakefield.

Auto dealerships and auto-related services are numerous in the Wakefield area.
Figure 3.23: Services and Amenities Around the Wakefield Area

Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Type</th>
<th>Icon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty</td>
<td>☆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Cash</td>
<td>△</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>◊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Store</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Food</td>
<td>▽</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Improvement</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>▽</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Priv.</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Institution</td>
<td>▽</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Station</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter School</td>
<td>▽</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Public</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary School</td>
<td>▽</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Wakefield
Area Summary

Shrines can be seen throughout the Wakefield area.

A local business in Wakefield

Hollinger Elementary School

Murals add to the character of the Wakefield area.

One of several churches in Wakefield

A small park in Wakefield
Location
The Wakefield study area is located just south of I-10 and is bounded by West 40th Street/Interstate 10 to the north, South 6th Avenue to the east, South 10th/12th Avenue to the west, and Irvington Road to the south. Ajo Way, a major commercial transit corridor, cuts the area in half. Previously, Wakefield was an officially recognized City of Tucson neighborhood with a southern boundary of West Michigan Drive.

Demographics and Housing Characteristics
According to 2010 U.S. Census data, 90.3 percent of the residents in Wakefield identify as Hispanic. This is well above the proportion for the City of Tucson, where 41.6 percent identify as Hispanic.

Wakefield area is almost evenly split between homeowners and renters and approximately 45.0 percent of householders in Wakefield area have lived there ten years or more.

The majority of the housing units in Wakefield area are single-family residences, and the median home value ($95,917) is well below the average for the City of Tucson.

Walkability, Transportation, and Accessibility
Wakefield area has a Walk Score\(^7\) of 47 out of 100 and is considered ‘Car Dependent.’\(^8\) Although many services are located within a reasonable walking distance, few shaded sidewalks or walking routes exist. In fact, trees grow in the right-of-way of fewer than 12 percent of parcels in the neighborhood.

The Laos Transit Center is adjacent to the Wakefield area; thus residents are well-connected to the city by public transit. Most residents live within a quarter-mile of a bus stop.

Affordability
Comparing the price of housing in the neighborhoods to median income shows that housing stock is affordable to residents in the eastern section of the neighborhood but not for those in the northwestern section. However, when transportation costs are factored into this affordability assessment, Wakefield area costs exceed the affordable threshold by 15 percent or more.

Assessment of Structures and Landscapes
The vast majority of parcels have structures in ‘good’ or ‘excellent’ condition. Only six structures are deemed to be in “replacement” condition.

Less than one-quarter of parcels have landscapes considered to be in “Poor” condition. Almost sixty percent of vacant land parcels are in poor condition.

Vacancy and Foreclosure Risk
According to the 2010 U.S. Census, the total vacancy rate in Wakefield area is 12.6 percent. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) determines an estimated foreclosure abandonment risk score from 0-10, with 10 being the highest risk. According to HUD, the estimated foreclosure abandonment risk score for Wakefield is 10, and the area has an estimated foreclosure rate of 10.1-11.2 percent.

Services and Amenities
Wakefield has a large number and variety of services and amenities within close proximity including restaurants, convenience stores, and fast food establishments.

A public elementary, public middle, and public high school are within walking distance of all residents, as well as various churches.

---

\(^7\) [www.walkscore.com](http://www.walkscore.com)
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Neighborhood Introduction

Location
A-Mountain Neighborhood is located at the northwest corner of the NSP2 target area and is bounded by Starr Pass Boulevard to the north, South Mission Road to the east, South La Cholla Boulevard to the west, and West 36th Street to the south (Figure 5.1). The neighborhood is located in Pima County Supervisor District 5. The Drachman windshield survey team was active in A-Mountain Neighborhood during July 2012.

Surrounding Context
A-Mountain Neighborhood is primarily surrounded by residential properties and open space. The open space is made up of A-Mountain preserve (State and University owned), Pima County land, and park land owned by either the City of Tucson, Pima County, or a federal agency. The rest of the open space is undeveloped private land predominantly on the eastern border of the neighborhood (see Figure 5.2).

Cholla High School takes up considerable space in the northwest corner of the neighborhood and two other schools (Osama Elementary School and Cape Detention School) lie just outside the neighborhood.

The eastern border of A-Mountain Neighborhood is close to the Santa Cruz River and its associated river parks. Most of its southern border is platted subdivision that has not been built out and this lends to the rural character of the area.

Figure 5.1: A-Mountain Neighborhood Location
A-Mountain (dark purple) is located at the Northwest boundary of the NSP2 Target Area (dark outline).
A-Mountain Neighborhood includes a mix of one- and two-story homes.

Figure 5.2: Development Surrounding A-Mountain Neighborhood

A typical street in A-Mountain Neighborhood
A-Mountain Neighborhood has obvious boundaries.

Illegal dumping is a problem on vacant land in the neighborhood.

A-Mountain has a rural character due to abundant vacant land.

The neighborhood has topography that provides views of the valley and the Catalina Mountains.

Un-sheltered bus stop

Overhead utilities are prominent in A-Mountain.
Cholla High School

Park land borders residential properties.
Demographics

A-Mountain Neighborhood is located within one census tract: Tract 44.07 (see Figure 5.4).

The population of A-Mountain is young, with a median age of 25.9. In fact, almost 33 percent of the neighborhood is 18 years or younger, compared to 23.3 percent for the City of Tucson. The proportion of residents over age 65 is also lower than the City average (see Table 5.1). According to 2010 U.S. Census data, 48.7 percent of the households in A-Mountain have children living in them, and 10.3 percent of households are multi-generational.

The A-Mountain Neighborhood is racially and ethnically diverse, with 9.5 percent identifying as African American, 6.7 percent identifying as American Indian, and 73.8 percent identifying as Hispanic (compared to 5.0 percent African American, 2.7 percent American Indian, and 41.6 percent Hispanic for the City of Tucson).

The median household income for A-Mountain Neighborhood is lower than the City of Tucson median income, and the overall poverty rate for the neighborhood is 18.6 percent compared to 17.8 percent for the City of Tucson.

Table 5.1: A-Mountain Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A-Mountain</th>
<th>Tract 44.07</th>
<th>Tucson</th>
<th>Pima County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Under 18</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Over 65</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>$27,398</td>
<td>$29,670</td>
<td>$35,499</td>
<td>$42,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Hispanic</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent High School Graduate or Higher</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Bachelor's Degree or Higher</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent in Poverty</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All statistics are from the 2010 Census (provided by ESRI), with the exception of Percent High School Graduate or Higher, Percent Bachelor's Degree or Higher, and Percent Households in Poverty in Last Year which come from the American Community Survey 2005-2009 5-year estimates, provided by ESRI.
Housing Characteristics

Compared to the City of Tucson, A-Mountain residents are less likely to be homeowners, have higher average household sizes, and have lower median home values (see Table 5.2). Figure 5.5 demonstrates that more than half of A-Mountain residents rent their home.

According to the 2005-2009 American Community Survey, more than half of A-Mountain residents moved into the area in 2005 or later. Approximately 28.8 percent of residents have lived in the area for ten years or more.

More than half of the housing stock in A-Mountain is single family (attached or detached) with a median home value of $148,011.

Table 5.2: A-Mountain Housing Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Values* (owner-occupied units)</th>
<th>A-Mountain</th>
<th>Tract 44.07</th>
<th>Tucson</th>
<th>Pima County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-99,999</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-149,999</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150-199,999</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000+</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>$148,011</td>
<td>$137,400</td>
<td>$169,900</td>
<td>$196,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Year Householder Moved into Unit*</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Owner-Occupied**</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size**</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Units*</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*American Community Survey 2005-2009 5-year estimates, ESRI.
**2010 Census Summary File, ESRI
Zoning

A-Mountain Neighborhood includes six City of Tucson zoning classifications as shown below in Figure 5.6.

The majority of the parcels in the neighborhood are zoned for residential use under the Single Family Residential Zone (R-1). Under new development the R-1 zoning allows up to two residences per acre (RAC), a minimum lot area of 7,000 square feet, and a maximum structure height of 25 feet. There are only small pockets of Medium Density Residential (R-2), and one High Density Residential (R-3) classification along the eastern border of the neighborhood. R-2 is one RAC, a minimum 5000 square foot lot size, and a maximum height of 25 feet. R-3 has no RAC limits, no minimum lot size and a maximum 40-foot building height.

There are only two small areas of C-1 commercial zoning and one small area of C-2 zoning on the eastern border along Mission Rd.

Figure 5.6: Zoning Classifications in A-Mountain Neighborhood
See Appendix C for City of Tucson Zoning Classifications by Symbol.
Land Use

Land use in A-Mountain closely reflects the zoning classifications of the area, with very few parcels dedicated to commercial uses (0.3 percent) and twenty-seven parcels dedicated to multi-family residences.

Approximately 380 (33.5 percent) parcels are currently undeveloped or vacant (Figure 5.7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Number of Parcels</th>
<th>Percentage of Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residence(SFR)</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residence (MFR)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Lot</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to Observe</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes schools, parks, private streets, and uses not otherwise classified.

Figure 5.7: Land Use in A-Mountain Neighborhood
Development

Development Patterns
A-Mountain has a variety of street development patterns due to the area being built-out over time by different actors. The area was first settled in the 1930s and 1940s by African American homesteaders. Development patterns largely honor the established grid system of the City of Tucson, yet include a variety of block widths and lengths, and include more than fifteen cul-de-sacs.

All existing structures and roads are shown in Figure 5.8. The southwest section of A-Mountain is not developed. According to Pima County staff, this area would be expensive to develop due to existing soil conditions.

The majority of the area was developed between 1960 and 1970, with another growth period of new development during the 1990s. The pattern of development by parcel and decade is shown in Figure 5.9.

Figure 5.8: Current Neighborhood Build-Out in A-Mountain
Structures (black), and roads (grey) in the A-Mountain Neighborhood.
Figure 5.9: A-Mountain Neighborhood Development Over Time
Source: Pima County GIS
Density

A-Mountain has a density per square mile of approximately 3,788 (see Figure 5.10).\(^1\) For comparison purposes, the City of Tucson average was 2,294.2 in 2010.

As previously noted, the central and north sections of A-Mountain are significantly more dense than the southwestern and far western sections where there are approximately 380 vacant parcels.

\(^1\) 2010 Census, provided by Pima County GIS

Thirteen parcels in A-Mountain are zoned for mobile home units.

Vacant land lowers the overall density of A-Mountain Neighborhood.

A multi-family apartment complex in the southeast corner of the neighborhood contributes to higher density in that area.

Figure 5.10: Population Density by Block Group in A-Mountain Neighborhood

Numbers indicate people per square mile based on the 2010 U.S. Census. Data provided by Pima County GIS
Rivers and Washes
A-Mountain Neighborhood is located adjacent to the Santa Cruz River, and numerous washes flow through the area. Cholla Wash and San Juan Wash are both in the FEMA 100-Year Flood Plain. Flooding issues can be severe during and after summer monsoons.

The washes create xeroriparian pockets in and around the neighborhood. Xeroriparian habitats are areas of naturally-occurring vegetated communities supported by intermittent or ephemeral stream flows. These areas often serve as important habitat for native flora and fauna.

Flooding is a problem during summer monsoons.

Figure 5.11: Hydrology and Drainage in A-Mountain Neighborhood
There are several wash systems (blue lines) that run through and around the neighborhood. Striped areas indicate the FEMA 100-yr flood plain. Dotted areas indicate riparian habitats.
Hydrology and Drainage (photos)

- A drainage area at San Antonio and San Ricardo
- Wash at San Felipe and San Ricardo
- Road erosion partially due to monsoon flooding
- Drainage runoff from A-Mountain
- Drainage area off A-Mountain
- Channelized water flow at North San Antonio Drive
Bicycles
A-Mountain has striped bicycle lanes along the major vehicular routes of Mission Road, Starr Pass Boulevard, West 36th Street, and La Cholla Boulevard. These lanes provide riders with easy-to-follow routes around the neighborhood, but riders must be comfortable riding with high speed, high volume traffic.

Those riders preferring ‘lower stress’ routes on residential streets have some options as well. San Antonio and San Juan are residential streets identified by the City of Tucson as bicycle routes, but with few or no existing improvements to serve bicyclists (see Figure 5.12). A designated bicycle route on San Marcos connects to the route on La Cholla and then continues on Ocelot/Coati, eventually leading to a shared multi-use path on Greasewood.
Pedestrians
A-Mountain has a Walk Score\(^2\) of 19 out of 100 and is considered ‘Very Car Dependent.’\(^3\) This is largely due to the fact that distances are large between residences and services/amenities.

Most of the sidewalks in A-Mountain are found along residential streets in the northern half of the neighborhood (Figure 5.13).

\(^2\) www.walkscore.com


Figure 5.13: A-Mountain Sidewalks and Street Trees
The map above shows existing sidewalks (red) and street trees (green).
Many of the pedestrian routes also lack shade. Street trees are a key component to pleasant walking routes. There are street trees in the right-of-way of fewer than ten percent of parcels in the neighborhood (Table 5.4).

### Table 5.4: A-Mountain Street Tree Coverage*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trees in Right-of-Way</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Drachman windshield survey

There are street trees in the right of way of less than ten percent of parcels in A-Mountain.

#### Vehicles

The average number of vehicle miles traveled per household per year in Tucson is 18,069. In A-Mountain, the vehicle miles traveled are slightly lower at approximately 17,880 per year (see Figure 5.14).

4 See Appendix G for source and methods.

---

San Juan Park

The historic Juan Bautista de Anza Trail Auto Route on Mission Road and San Juan

![Figure 5.14: Average Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled per Household per Year in the A-Mountain Neighborhood](image-url)

Source: Center for Neighborhood Technology
Public Transit
A-Mountain Neighborhood is served by one main bus route (Table 5.5 and Figure 5.15). Route 23 passes through the neighborhood on San Marcos Boulevard, or south of the neighborhood on W. 36th Street. This route extends to the Ronstadt Transit Center downtown and to the Roy Laos Transit Center on Irvington, providing residents with good connections to the city as a whole (Figure 5.16).

Table 5.5: Bus Ridership in A-Mountain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>City-Wide Ridership/ Month</th>
<th>Passengers per hour</th>
<th>Ranking*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>39,856</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ranking is from 1-40, with #1 having the most passengers per hour. (Data for June 2012)

Figure 5.15: A-Mountain Bus Routes and Stops
Lines show existing city bus routes in and around the neighborhood. White dots indicate the location of un-sheltered bus stops; black dots the location of sheltered bus stops.

5. A-Mountain

Figure 5.16: A-Mountain Connectivity by Public Transit

The A-Mountain Center serves as a Park & Ride Sun Tran station.

One of four sheltered bus stops in A-Mountain.
Housing Affordability
The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) defines affordable housing as housing that costs thirty percent or less of total household income. According to this criteria, A-Mountain Neighborhood housing costs are affordable (see Figure 5.17).

Housing + Transportation Affordability
However, housing and transportation costs together make up the two largest expenses for most households. The Housing+Transportation Affordability Index was developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) to show the importance of transportation costs to overall housing affordability.6 In this calculation, anything above 45 percent of income spent on housing plus transportation is deemed to be unaffordable. According to this measure, A-Mountain is unaffordable, with residents spending on average over 60 percent of their income on housing plus transportation (Figure 5.18)

6 See Appendix G for sources and methods
Lighting
A-Mountain has significant street lighting along its eastern border of Mission Road, a highly traveled automobile corridor (Figure 5.19). The interior of the neighborhood, however, has street lights that are dim and spaced fairly far apart, making the neighborhood not conducive to nighttime pedestrian activity. Furthermore, large areas of vacant land in the southern and eastern sections of the neighborhood make the area feel quite rural.

Figure 5.19: Street Lighting in A-Mountain Neighborhood
Mission Boulevard and development from the sixties boast more street lights than the recent development in the northeast.
Assessment of Structures

Building Conditions
The majority (76.4 percent) of structures in A-Mountain are in either ‘Good’ or ‘Excellent’ condition (see Figures 5.20 and 5.21). Approximately 19.4 percent of parcels contain structures in ‘Fair’ condition requiring between $5000 and $15,000 in repairs. Twenty-one structures are in ‘Poor’ condition, indicating a need for repairs on the order of $15,000 to $50,000.

Nine parcels contain structures assessed as ‘Replacement,’ meaning they present a threat to the health, safety, and welfare of the community, and that the cost to repair them would exceed the cost to tear down and rebuild. Of the nine parcels, six are single-family homes.

Out of the twenty-seven parcels with multi-family structures, more than half are assessed as fair or poor condition (55.6 percent).

Thirteen parcels have mobile homes. When parcels have multiple units, the windshield survey teams averaged the condition of all structures on the parcel. Of the thirteen parcels with mobile homes, ten are assessed as either fair, poor, or replacement condition.

A-Mountain includes a mix of housing styles.

Nine parcels contain structures assessed as “replacement.”

Graffiti is a problem on vacant structures.

Multi-family units are assessed as one structure.
Figure 5.20: Overall Condition of Structures in A-Mountain Neighborhood (July, 2012)
(Out of 720 parcels with assessable structures)

Figure 5.21: Condition of Residential Single Family Structures in A-Mountain (July, 2012)
(Out of 664 parcels with assessable structures)
Assessment of Landscapes

**Landscape Conditions**
Almost half of the parcels in A-Mountain have landscapes assessed as ‘poor.’ This means that landscape is neither intentional nor maintained (see Figure 5.22). In large part, this high number is derived from the condition of vacant properties in the area. As noted in Figure 5.23, three quarters of the parcels with single family homes have landscapes in excellent or average condition. In contrast, 98 percent of the vacant parcels in the area have landscapes in poor condition (Figure 5.24).

The windshield survey also recorded the presence of litter and graffiti on each parcel, and trees in the adjoining right-of-way (Table 5.5). Notably, while 17.4 percent of all parcels had litter at the time of the windshield survey, one-third of those parcels with litter are vacant lots.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.5: A-Mountain Condition of Landscapes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcels with Street Trees in Right of Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels with Litter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels with Graffiti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Out of 1108 assessable parcels)
Figure 5.22: Overall Condition of Landscapes in A-Mountain Neighborhood (July, 2012)
(Out of 1107 assessable parcels)

- Excellent: 22.0% (n=243)
- Average: 28.5% (n=315)
- Poor: 49.5% (n=549)

Figure 5.23: Condition of Single-Family Residential Landscapes in A-Mountain Neighborhood (July, 2012)
(Out of 667 assessable parcels)

- Excellent: 34.6% (n=231)
- Average: 43.0% (n=287)
- Poor: 22.4% (n=149)

Figure 5.24: Condition of Vacant Lot Landscapes in A-Mountain Neighborhood (July, 2012)
(Out of 380 vacant parcels)

- Excellent: 0.5% (n=2)
- Average: 1.5% (n=6)
- Poor: 98.0% (n=372)
Vacant Structures and Land

Vacant and Unoccupied Structures
Due to conflicting definitions of vacancy, only structures with boarded up windows and doors are labeled “vacant.” Using this definition, in A-Mountain Neighborhood, 12 of the 753 parcels (1.6 percent) had vacant structures as of July 2012. This vacancy rate is relatively low compared to 2010 U.S. Census data which has a broader definition of vacancy.

The Census definition incorporates all vacant housing units including those for rent or for sale, those vacant properties that are vacant due to seasonal, recreational, or occasional use, and “other vacant” which may be recent foreclosures or units that owners or renters have walked away from (see Table 5.6). According to the 2010 U.S. Census, the total vacancy rate in A-Mountain is 8.8 percent.

Structures with ‘For Sale’ or ‘For Rent’ signs are also noted by the windshield survey teams. Some 1.6 percent of neighborhood parcels were either for sale or for rent in July 2012 (Table 5.7). Structures with ‘For Sale’ or ‘For Rent’ signs, even ones that appeared uninhabited, are not classified as ‘Vacant’ unless windows and doors are either missing or boarded up. Twenty-seven parcels are visually inaccessible from public areas and could not be surveyed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Percent of Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Sale</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Rent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7: Observed Available Properties in A-Mountain Neighborhood by Signage

Total Number of Visually Accessible Parcels = 1,108

Foreclosures
The Drachman windshield survey team was unable to visually determine the number of foreclosures in each neighborhood. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) determines an estimated foreclosure abandonment risk score by census block group. This score is on a scale from 0-10, with 10 being the highest risk. According to HUD, the estimated foreclosure abandonment risk score for A-Mountain is 10, and the neighborhood has an estimated foreclosure rate of 8.4 percent.

Vacant and Undeveloped Land
383 out of 1135 parcels (33.7 percent) in A-Mountain are vacant lots. According to Pima County staff, the large undeveloped section in the southwest section would be expensive to develop due to existing soil conditions.

Table 5.6: Housing Units by Vacancy Status in A-Mountain Neighborhood*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vacant Units</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Rent</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented, not occupied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sale</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold, not occupied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Vacant**</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For seasonal/ recreational/ occasional use</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Migrant Workers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Vacant Units</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census 2010 Summary File 1 (ESRI)
** Includes recent foreclosures or units that owners have walked away from. See text for more information.

Undeveloped lots in A-Mountain are the target of dumping and graffiti.
5. A-Mountain

Structures with boarded windows are defined as “vacant” by the windshield survey teams.

Figure 5.25: Vacant Land in A-Mountain Neighborhood
Brown shaded parcels indicate vacant land identified by the windshield survey.

Eighteen parcels had “for sale” or “for rent” signs at the time of the windshield survey.
Services and Amenities

Location of Commercial Services
There are very few services and amenities in A-Mountain Neighborhood. The neighborhood includes one public high school, a fire station, and numerous houses of worship. Most commercial units are located along Mission Road, and further south of the neighborhood on Ajo Way.

The Fred Archer Neighborhood Center is located on La Cholla Boulevard south of the high school. It is run by the City of Tucson Parks and Recreation Department and includes workout facilities, an outdoor swimming pool, basketball courts, and programs for youth and teens.

One of several religious institutions in A-Mountain

A convenience store in A-Mountain Neighborhood

The Fred Archer Neighborhood Center

San Juan Park

A locally owned business in A-Mountain Neighborhood
Figure 5.26: Services and Amenities in A-Mountain Neighborhood

There are few services and amenities in A-Mountain Neighborhood. Many of the services are religious institutions.

Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Type</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Cash</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Store</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Food</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Improvement</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Private</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Public</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Institution</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Station</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter School</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Public</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary School</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Neighborhood Summary

A-Mountain Neighborhood is served by Fire Station 15.

Approximately one-third of the parcels in A-Mountain are vacant land.

A-Mountain has a rural character.

Heritage Faith Ministries

San Juan Park

A-Mountain Neighborhood has a mix of single- and multi-family homes.
Location and Geography
A-Mountain Neighborhood is located at the northwest corner of the NSP2 target area and is bounded by Starr Pass Boulevard to the north, South Mission Road to the east, South La Cholla Boulevard to the west, and West 36th Street to the south.

The eastern border of A-Mountain Neighborhood is close to the Santa Cruz River and its associated river parks. Most of its southern border is platted subdivision that has not been built out and this lends to the rural character of the area.

Demographics and Housing Characteristics
The population of A-Mountain is young, with a median age of 25.9. The A-Mountain neighborhood is racially and ethnically diverse, with 9.5 percent identifying as African American, 6.7 percent identifying as American Indian, and 73.8 percent identifying as Hispanic.

Compared to the City of Tucson, A-Mountain residents are less likely to be homeowners, have higher average household sizes, and have lower median home values. More than half of A-Mountain residents rent their home. More than half of the housing stock in A-Mountain is single family (attached or detached) with a median home value of $148,011.

Rivers and Washes
A-Mountain Neighborhood is located adjacent to the Santa Cruz River, and numerous washes flow through the area. Cholla Wash and San Juan Wash are both in the FEMA 100-Year Flood Plain. Flooding issues can be severe during and after summer monsoons.

Walkability, Transportation, and Accessibility
A-Mountain has a Walk Score\(^7\) of 19 out of 100 and is considered ‘Very Car Dependent.’\(^8\) This is mainly due to the fact that distances are large between residences and services/amenities.

A-Mountain is served by one main bus route. This route extends to the Ronstadt Transit Center downtown and to the Roy Laos Transit Center on Irvington, providing residents with good connections to the city as a whole.

Affordability
Comparing the price of housing in the neighborhood to income shows that housing stock is affordable to residents. When transportation costs are factored into this affordability assessment, however, A-Mountain is unaffordable to residents.

Assessment of Structures and Landscapes
The majority (76.4 percent) of structures in A-Mountain are in either ‘Good’ or ‘Excellent’ condition. Twenty-one structures are in ‘Poor’ condition, indicating a need for repairs on the order of $15,000 to $50,000. Nine parcels have structures assessed as ‘Replacement.’

Almost half of the parcels in A-Mountain have landscapes assessed as ‘poor.’ This means that landscape is neither intentional nor maintained. There is a large amount of undeveloped land in the neighborhood, and these parcels are generally in poor condition due to dumping.

Vacant Structures
According to the 2010 U.S. Census, the total vacancy rate in A-Mountain is 8.8 percent. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) determines an estimated foreclosure abandonment risk score by census block group. This score is on a scale from 0-10, with 10 being the highest risk. According to HUD, the estimated foreclosure abandonment risk score for A-Mountain is 10, and the neighborhood has an estimated foreclosure rate of 8.4 percent.

Services and Amenities
There are very few services and amenities in A-Mountain Neighborhood. The neighborhood includes one public high school, a fire station, and numerous houses of worship.

The Fred Archer Neighborhood Center is run by the City of Tucson Parks and Recreation Department and includes workout facilities, an outdoor swimming pool, basketball courts, and programs for youth and teens.
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Neighborhood Introduction

Location
Fairgrounds Neighborhood is located southeast of the junction of Interstate 10 and Interstate 19 and is bounded by Ajo Way to the north, Park Avenue to the east, South 6th Avenue to the west, and Irvington Road to the south (Figures 6.1 and 6.2). It is located in Pima County Supervisor Districts 2 and 5.

The Drachman windshield survey team was active in the Fairgrounds Neighborhood during July 2012 and assessed approximately 696 parcels.

Surrounding Context
Just south of the neighborhood lies Rudy Garcia Park, El Pueblo Park, and El Pueblo Neighborhood Center. To the southwest of the neighborhood is the Roy Laos Transit Center.

Character
Fairgrounds Neighborhood is divided into three distinct areas: 1) The Union Pacific Nogales Spur railroad track divides the neighborhood down the middle with an industrial area and city buildings to the east; 2) the southwest corner of the neighborhood is dominated by the Tucson Rodeo Grounds; and 3) the northwest corner is primarily residential.

Figure 6.1: Fairgrounds Neighborhood Location
Fairgrounds Neighborhood (shaded) is located in the heart of the NSP2 target area (dark outline).
Fairgrounds Neighborhood is divided by the Union Pacific Nogales Spur railroad track and a channelized wash.

A typical streetscape in Fairgrounds Neighborhood.
Photographs

1. The eastern section of Fairgrounds is primarily industrial.
2. Van Buskirk Elementary school

3. Tucson Rodeo Grounds
4. Tucson Police Department Santa Cruz Substation

5. Fairgrounds park is located in the center of the neighborhood.
6. Graffiti in Fairgrounds Neighborhood
6. Fairgrounds

South 6th Avenue offers shops and restaurants.  
A vacant lot in Fairgrounds Neighborhood.
Demographics

Census Tract Location
Fairgrounds Neighborhood is located within two Census Tracts: Tract 22.00 and Tract 24.00 (Figure 6.4).

Demographics
The population of Fairgrounds is young with a median age of 32.4. In fact, almost one-third of the neighborhood is 18 years or younger, compared to 23.3 percent for the City of Tucson. The proportion of residents over age 65 is also lower than the city average (see Table 6.1). According to 2010 U.S. Census data, 45.6 percent of the households in Fairgrounds have children living in them, and 13.7 percent of households are multi-generational.

Fairgrounds Neighborhood is racially and ethnically diverse, with 5.6 percent identifying as American Indian and 89.1 percent identifying as Hispanic (compared to 2.7 percent American Indian and 41.6 percent Hispanic for the City of Tucson).

The median household income for Fairgrounds Neighborhood is lower than the City of Tucson median income, and the overall poverty rate for the neighborhood is 24.2 percent compared to 17.8 percent for the city of Tucson.

Table 6.1: Fairgrounds Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fairgrounds</th>
<th>Tract 22</th>
<th>Tract 24</th>
<th>Tucson</th>
<th>Pima County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Under 18</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Over 65</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>$22,799</td>
<td>$31,228</td>
<td>$23,806</td>
<td>$35,499</td>
<td>$42,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Hispanic</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent High School Graduate or Higher</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Bachelor's Degree or Higher</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent in Poverty</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All statistics are from the 2010 Census (provided by ESRI), with the exception of Percent High School Graduate or Higher, Percent Bachelor’s Degree or Higher, and Percent Households in Poverty in Last Year which come from the American Community Survey 2005-2009 5-year estimates, provided by ESRI.
Housing Characteristics

Approximately half of Fairgrounds residents are homeowners, with 18.8 percent owning their home without a mortgage (Figure 6.5).

According to the 2005-2009 American Community Survey, a significant portion of Fairgrounds residents have lived in Fairgrounds at least ten years or more. Out of both homeowners and renters, 53.2 percent moved into Fairgrounds in 1999 or earlier. In fact, approximately 20 percent of residents have lived in Fairgrounds for twenty years or more.

The majority of the housing stock in Fairgrounds (77.4 percent) is detached or attached single-family, with a median home value of $97,167 (Table 6.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.2: Fairgrounds Housing Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Values (owner-occupied units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0-99,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-149,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150-199,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Year Householder Moved into Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Owner-Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey 2005-2009 5-year estimates, ESRI.
*2010 Census Summary File, ESRI
Zoning

Fairgrounds Neighborhood includes five separate City of Tucson zoning classifications as shown below in Figure 6.61.

The majority of the parcels in the neighborhood are zoned as ‘Residential’ (medium density under the R-2 classification). One area of more dense R-3 exists in the west area of the neighborhood.

The remaining parcels in Fairgrounds are either Commercial or Industrial, located primarily along the perimeter of the neighborhood.

1 See Appendix C for a complete list of City of Tucson Zoning Classifications and summary descriptions.

Large parcels are zoned Industrial in Fairgrounds.

Figure 6.6: Zoning Classifications in Fairgrounds Neighborhood
See Appendix C for City of Tucson Zoning Classifications by Symbol
Land Use
The windshield survey found that although a large part of the neighborhood is zoned for higher density residential (R-2 or R-3), Fairgrounds is developed more like R-1 (lower density) with very few multi-family units (Table 6.3). Owner-occupants should be aware that the R-2 and R-3 zoning could allow for greatly increased development throughout their neighborhood.

Approximately 4.7 percent of neighborhood parcels are currently undeveloped or vacant (Figure 6.7).

Table 6.3: Land Use in Fairgrounds by Parcel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Number of Parcels</th>
<th>Percentage of Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residence(SFR)</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residence (MFR)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Lot</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to Observe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>696</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes schools, parks, private streets, and uses not otherwise classified.

Figure 6.7: Land Use in Fairgrounds Neighborhood
Development

Development Patterns
Development in Fairgrounds Neighborhood began in the residential section of the neighborhood prior to 1950. The residential section was almost completely developed by 1960. Development of the industrial sections of the neighborhood, including the area east of the Union Pacific Nogales Spur, followed in the 1960s.

The Tucson Rodeo Parade Museum, located in the southwest corner of the neighborhood, was originally the first city airport hangar built in 1918 (called the Mayse Airport). The Tucson Rodeo moved to this abandoned municipal airport and held their first rodeo in 1932 with seating for 3,000 and parking for 59 cars. The arena now seats 11,000 spectators.

All existing structures and roads are shown in Figure 6.8. The pattern of development by parcel and decade is shown in Figure 6.9.

Figure 6.8: Current Neighborhood Build-Out in Fairgrounds
Structures and roads in the Fairgrounds Neighborhood.
Figure 6.9: Fairgrounds Neighborhood Development Over Time
Source: Pima County GIS
Density

Fairgrounds has a density per square mile that ranges from approximately 940 to just over 8,600 (see Figure 6.10). For comparison purposes, the City of Tucson average was 2,294.2 in 2010.

The northwest section of Fairgrounds is significantly more dense than the southern and eastern sections. The industrial section in the eastern part of the neighborhood, separated by the Union Pacific Nogales Rail Spur, extends northeast of the neighborhood boundary giving this block group a low density of 940 people per square mile.

The residence section of Fairgrounds Neighborhood is higher in density than the City of Tucson.

The Tucson Rodeo Grounds takes up a large amount of land in the neighborhood.

The industrial eastern portion of the neighborhood contributes to lower overall density.

Figure 6.10: Population Density by Block Group in Fairgrounds Neighborhood
Numbers indicate people per square mile based on the 2010 U.S. Census. Data provided by Pima County GIS.
Hydrology and Drainage

**Rivers and Washes**
The residential section of Fairgrounds Neighborhood is separated from the Tucson Rodeo Grounds by Rodeo Wash. Rodeo Wash eventually leads to the Santa Cruz River and has been known to have flooding problems during monsoon season.

The residential section of Fairgrounds Neighborhood is also separated from the eastern industrial section by a concrete arm of the Tucson Diversion Channel and the Union Pacific Nogales Spur railroad tracks. This limits pedestrian access to Van Buskirk Elementary School on Fair Street.

![Channelized arm of the Tucson Diversion Channel along the railroad tracks on Fair Ave.](image)

*Figure 6.11: Hydrology and Drainage in Fairgrounds Neighborhood*
Rodeo Wash separates residents from the Tucson Rodeo Grounds.
Contamination

The Thomas O. Price Service Center, located in the northeast corner of Fairgrounds Neighborhood at 4004 South Park Avenue, has been a primary fueling facility for the City of Tucson since 1972. The facility maintains underground storage tanks (USTs) for gasoline and diesel.\(^3\)

In June of 1989, fuel leakage was discovered in the soil below the fueling tanks and the City of Tucson began subsurface and groundwater investigations. They discovered that gasoline had permeated the soil to a clay layer 90 feet below the site which is in the upper groundwater zone.

The tanks were emptied and removed in the early 1990s. The Arizona Department of Environmental Quality initiated a schedule for the City of Tucson to create and implement soil and groundwater corrective action plans.

Today, the City operates 67 shallow and lower groundwater monitoring and remediation wells to detect gasoline in the upper groundwater zone. They also operate two soil vapor extraction systems to remove any contamination in the soil. The site is considered an active clean-up site and costs approximately $95,000 per year in maintenance.

Although groundwater contamination has been detected, there are no Tucson Water drinking wells nearby. See Figure 6.12 for information on groundwater contamination risk.

---

\(^3\) Information for this section taken from http://dot.tucsonaz.gov.

---

Figure 6.12: Groundwater Contamination Potential

Numbers 1-5 represent the risk from low (1) to high (5) for groundwater contamination.

Source: Environmental Protection Agency, 2012
Bicycles
Fairgrounds Neighborhood has striped bicycle lanes along the major perimeter streets of Ajo Way, 6th Avenue, Park Avenue, and Irvington. These lanes provide riders with easy-to-follow routes but riders must be comfortable riding with high speed, high volume traffic.

Those riders preferring ‘lower stress’ routes on residential streets have other options. Michigan Street is identified by the City of Tucson as a bicycle route that crosses the railroad tracks at Fair Street and extends west to a shared use path along the Santa Cruz River and east to Benson Highway (see Figure 6.13). This bike route also connects to the Liberty Avenue Bicycle Boulevard. The Liberty Avenue Bicycle Boulevard has received a federal Transportation Enhancement grant and will eventually extend seven miles from downtown Tucson south Los Reales Road.

There is also a bicycle route identified with street signage along 2nd Avenue and President Street.

Figure 6.13: Bicycle Routes in Fairgrounds Neighborhood
Source: Pima County GIS
Pedestrians
Fairgrounds has a Walk Score of 66 out of 100 and is considered ‘Somewhat Walkable’. This rating reflects the amenities available in and around the neighborhood, however, many of the pedestrian routes lack shade and the distances are often large between residences and services and amenities.

Most of the sidewalks in Fairgrounds are found along the perimeter and along the residential streets of Michigan Street (east-west) and 2nd

---

Figure 6.14: Fairgrounds Sidewalks and Street Trees
The map above shows existing sidewalks (red) and street trees (green) in Fairgrounds.
Avenue (north-south) (Figure 6.14). Michigan Street (which turns into Fair Street at the railroad crossing) is the only interior street that connects to the eastern half of the neighborhood and the only way to reach Van Buskirk Elementary school due to the presence of the active Union Pacific Nogales Rail Spur.

Street trees provide shade, reduce temperatures, calm traffic and help provide better air quality. As such, street trees are a key component to pleasant walking routes. There are street trees in the right-of-way of fewer than twelve percent of parcels in the neighborhood (Table 6.4).

### Table 6.4: Fairgrounds Street Tree Coverage*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trees in Right-of-Way</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Drachman windshield survey

### Vehicles

The average number of vehicle miles traveled per household per year in Tucson is 18,069. In Fairgrounds, the vehicle miles traveled are lower averaging 16,302 per year (see Figure 6.15).

6 See Appendix G for source and methods.
Public Transit

Fairgrounds Neighborhood is served by multiple bus routes along the perimeter of the neighborhood (Figure 6.16 and Table 6.5). The Roy Laos Transit Center provides good connectivity to the city as a whole, but Fairgrounds residents (north of the Rodeo Grounds) must travel a considerable distance on South 6th Avenue in order to reach the transit center (Figure 6.17).

Figure 6.16: Fairgrounds Bus Routes and Stops

Lines show existing city bus routes in and around the neighborhood. White dots indicate the location of un-sheltered bus stops; black dots the location of sheltered stops.
Table 6.5: Bus Ridership in Fairgrounds*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>City-Wide Ridership/ Month</th>
<th>Passengers per hour</th>
<th>Ranking**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>246,291</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>104,513</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>149,709</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>98,669</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26,921</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30,259</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>9,748</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Suntran, 2012

*Additional bus routes are located on Irvington Road.

**Ranking is from 1-40, with #1 having the most passengers per hour. (Data for June 2012)
**Housing Affordability**
The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) defines affordable housing as housing that costs thirty percent or less of total household income. According to this criteria, in most of the Fairgrounds Neighborhood housing costs are affordable (see Figure 6.18).

**Housing + Transportation Affordability**
However, housing and transportation costs make up the two largest expenses for most households. The Housing+Transportation Affordability Index was developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) to show the importance of transportation costs to overall housing affordability. In this calculation, anything above 45 percent of income spent on housing plus transportation is deemed to be unaffordable.

According to this measure, Fairgrounds is unaffordable, with residents spending on average more than 50 percent of their income on housing plus transportation (Figure 6.19).

---

7 See Appendix G for source and methods
**Lighting**

In Fairgrounds Neighborhood the majority of street lighting is located along Ajo Way and South 6th Avenue. With the exception of 2nd Avenue and Michigan Streets, the residential section of the neighborhood has street lighting only at each intersection but these are spaced far apart and leave the area dark. The industrial sections of the neighborhood do not have street lighting (Figure 6.20).

![Residential street lights in Fairgrounds Neighborhood](image)

*Figure 6.20: Fairgrounds Street Lighting*

*South 6th Avenue and Ajo Way are well-lit in the evenings.*
Assessment of Structures

Building Conditions
While none of the structures in Fairgrounds Neighborhood are rated as ‘Excellent,’ the majority (89.5 percent) of structures are in either ‘Good’ or ‘Fair’ condition (see Figure 6.21). Good condition means they need no more than $5000 worth of improvement to be in excellent condition. Approximately 34.3 percent are in ‘Fair’ condition requiring between $5000 and $15,000 in repairs. Fifty-nine structures are in ‘Poor’ condition, indicating a need for repairs on the order of $15,000 to $50,000.

Seven structures are assessed as ‘Replacement,’ meaning they present a threat to the health, safety, and welfare of the community, and that the cost to repair them would exceed the cost to tear down and rebuild.

In general, the majority of parcels with structures in poor condition are single family homes (41). Five parcels with multi-family structures are in poor condition (see Figure 6.22) Overall, retail and industrial structures are in good or fair condition. Eight parcels have retail structures in poor condition and four parcels have industrial structures in poor condition.

Figure 6.21: Overall Condition of Structures in Fairgrounds Neighborhood (July, 2012) (Out of 627 parcels with assessable structures)

The majority of single-family residential structures are in “good” or “fair” condition in Fairgrounds.

Over half of all structures in Fairgrounds are in “good” structural condition.

Structures were assessed based on cost estimates to repair or replace any problems.
Figure 6.22: Condition of Structures by Property Type in Fairgrounds (July, 2012)
Assessment of Landscapes

Landscape Conditions
Approximately 25.4 percent of all landscapes in Fairgrounds are considered in ‘poor’ condition. This means that on a quarter of the properties in the neighborhood, landscape is neither intentional nor maintained (Figure 6.23). In large part, this high number is derived from the condition of vacant properties in the area. As noted in Figure 6.23, more than three-quarters of the parcels with single family homes have landscapes in excellent or average condition. In contrast, 87.9 percent of the vacant parcels in the area have landscapes in poor condition (Figure 6.24).

The windshield survey teams also recorded the presence of litter and graffiti on each parcel, and trees in the adjoining right-of-way (Table 6.5). The presence of litter and graffiti in Fairgrounds Neighborhood is an issue with 80.9 percent of parcels having litter and 20.0 percent having graffiti at the time of the survey.

Table 6.5: Fairgrounds Condition of All Landscapes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcels with Street Trees in Right of Way</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels with Litter</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels with Graffiti</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Out of 697 assessable parcels)

More than one-third of parcels with single-family homes have landscapes in “excellent” condition.

Almost 81 percent of parcels in Fairgrounds had litter at the time of the windshield survey.

Twenty percent of parcels in Fairgrounds had graffiti at the time of the windshield survey.
Figure 6.24: Condition of Landscape by Property Type in Fairgrounds Neighborhood (July, 2012)
Vacant and Unoccupied Structures
Due to conflicting definitions of vacancy, only structures with boarded up windows and doors were labeled “vacant.” Using this definition, in Fairgrounds Neighborhood, 13 of the 697 parcels with structures (1.9 percent) were vacant as of July 2012. This vacancy rate is relatively low compared to 2010 U.S. Census data which has a broader definition of vacancy.

The Census definition incorporates all vacant housing units including those for rent or for sale, those vacant properties that are vacant due to seasonal, recreational, or occasional use, and “other vacant” which may be recent foreclosures or units that owners or renters have walked away from (see Table 6.6). According to the 2010 U.S. Census, the total vacancy rate in Fairgrounds is 11.2 percent.

Structures with ‘For Sale’ or ‘For Rent’ signs were also noted by the windshield survey teams. Some 2.9 percent of neighborhood parcels were either for sale or for rent in July 2012 (Table 6.7). Structures with ‘For Sale’ or ‘For Rent’ signs, even ones that appeared uninhabited, are not classified as ‘Vacant’ unless windows and doors are either missing or boarded up.

Table 6.6: Housing Units by Vacancy Status in Fairgrounds Neighborhood*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vacant Units</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Rent</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented, not occupied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sale</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold, not occupied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Vacant**</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For seasonal/ recreational/ occasional use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Migrant Workers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Vacant Units</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census 2010 Summary File 1 (ESRI)
**Includes recent foreclosures or units that owners have walked away from. See text for more information.

Foreclosures
The Drachman windshield survey team was unable to visually determine the number of foreclosures in each neighborhood. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) determines an estimated foreclosure abandonment risk score by census block group. This score is on a scale from 0-10, with 10 being the highest risk. According to HUD, the estimated foreclosure abandonment risk score for Fairgrounds Neighborhood is 10, and the neighborhood has an estimated foreclosure rate of 9.0-10.1 percent.

Vacant and Undeveloped Land
Thirty-three out of 697 parcels (4.7 percent) in Fairgrounds are vacant lots (see Figure 6.25). Litter and graffiti are a problem on vacant land in Fairgrounds Neighborhood: 32 out of 33 vacant parcels have litter and 11 out of 33 have graffiti.

Two large vacant parcels are located in the southeast industrial section of the neighborhood. All other vacant parcels are scattered throughout the western residential area of the neighborhood.

Table 6.7: Observed Available Properties in Fairgrounds Neighborhood by Signage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Percent of Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Sale</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Rent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Visually Accessible Parcels = 697

The windshield survey assessed structures as vacant if doors or windows are boarded up.
Thirty-three parcels in Fairgrounds are vacant lots. Dumping is an issue on vacant land.

Figure 6.25: Vacant Land in Fairgrounds Neighborhood

Dark brown shaded parcels indicate vacant land identified by the windshield survey.
Services and Amenities

The majority of the commercial services available to residents of the Fairgrounds Neighborhood are found on South 6th Avenue on the western edge of the neighborhood boundary (see Figure 6.26).

In terms of open green space, Fairgrounds Neighborhood has one school with fields (Van Buskirk Elementary School), and a park with a playground and ramada. Accessibility to the elementary school is limited for pedestrians, however, due to its location on the east side of a channelized wash and railroad tracks.

Fairgrounds neighborhood also includes the Tucson Police Department Santa Cruz Substation, the Tucson City Council Ward 5 office, and Concentra Medical Center.

The industrial section of the neighborhood includes warehouses and showrooms such as Davis Kitchens and ACS International (Arizona Cultured Stone).
Figure 6.26: Services and Amenities around the Fairgrounds Neighborhood

Legend
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Neighborhood Summary

Life in Christ Community Church

Fairgrounds Park

Railroad crossing at Fair St.

Traffic is heavy along the perimeter of the neighborhood.

Tucson Police Department

Vacant lot
Location and Geography
Fairgrounds Neighborhood is located southeast of the junction of Interstate 10 and Interstate 19 and is bounded by Ajo Way to the north, Park Avenue to the east, South 6th Avenue to the west, and Irvington Road to the south.

Fairgrounds Neighborhood is divided into three distinct areas: industrial; residential; and Rodeo grounds. The neighborhood is divided east-west by the very active Union Pacific Nogales Spur railroad.

Demographics and Housing Characteristics
Compared to the City of Tucson, residents of Fairgrounds Neighborhood are more racially and ethnically diverse, have lower median incomes, and have higher poverty rates.

Approximately half of Fairgrounds residents are homeowners, with 18.8 percent owning their home without a mortgage. The majority of the housing stock in Fairgrounds (77.4 percent) is detached or attached single-family, with a median home value of $97,167.

Density
Fairgrounds has a density per square mile that ranges from approximately 940 in the eastern half of the neighborhood to just over 8,600 in the residential section of the neighborhood. For comparison purposes, the City of Tucson average was 2,294.2 in 2010.

Walkability, Transportation, and Accessibility
Fairgrounds has a Walk Score of 66 out of 100 and is considered ‘Somewhat Walkable.’ This rating reflects the amenities available in and around the neighborhood; however, many of the pedestrian routes lack shade and sidewalks, and the distances are often large between residences and services and amenities.

Michigan Street (which turns into Fair Street at the rail crossing) is the only interior street that connects to the eastern half of the neighborhood and is the only way to reach Van Buskirk Elementary school through the interior of the neighborhood.

Affordability
Comparing the price of housing in the neighborhood to income shows that housing stock is affordable to residents. When transportation costs are factored into this affordability assessment, however, Fairgrounds is unaffordable to residents. In fact, residents spend, on average, more on transportation than on housing.

Assessment of Structures and Landscapes
The majority of all structures are in ‘good’ or ‘fair’ condition. Out of 627 parcels, seven structures are assessed as “replacement” condition.

Approximately one-quarter of all landscapes in Fairgrounds are considered ‘poor’ (i.e. landscape is neither intentional nor maintained). In large part, this high number is derived from the condition of vacant properties in the area.

Services and Amenities
The majority of services are found along South 6th Avenue.

The neighborhood has one elementary school and a small neighborhood park with a playground and ramada. Fairgrounds Neighborhood also includes the Tucson Police Department Santa Cruz Substation and the Tucson City Council Ward 5 office.

---
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Neighborhood Introduction

Location
The Los Niños area is outside City of Tucson limits and is not officially recognized as a neighborhood. It is in an unincorporated area of development located south of Davis-Monthan Air Force Base. It is bounded by I-10 to the north, E. Benson Highway to the south, S. Alvernon to the west, and S. Belvedere Avenue to the east. The neighborhood is located in Pima County Supervisor District 2. The Drachman windshield survey team was active in the Los Niños area in July 2012.

Surrounding Context
The Los Niños area is impacted by close proximity to the I-10 freeway and a large industrial area to the north. Large areas of vacant land and Julian Wash, also to the north, make the area feel somewhat rural. To the west of the area is Mortimore Neighborhood. Within the Los Niños area there is an elementary school, public park and pool, and a fire station. The Los Niños area is in Pima County Supervisor District 2.

The area studied by the windshield survey team consists of approximately 827 parcels. A visit to the neighborhood gives the impression of a relatively undeveloped area of Tucson. There are very few amenities in the area, making the Los Niños area extremely car dependent.

Figure 7.1 Los Niños Area Location
Los Niños Area (dark purple) is located outside City of Tucson limits but within the NSP2 target area (dark outline).
The Los Niños area is primarily residential.

The Los Niños area is adjacent to Interstate 10.

Figure 7.2: Development Surrounding Los Niños Area
Los Niños area is adjacent to Interstate 10 and Julian Wash.
Photographs

1. The Julian Wash on the north side of the Los Niños Area is often used as a place to discard trash.

2. Many lots on the southeast side of the area are property of the Ray Water Company.

3. The Los Niños area has winding streets that preserve its quiet neighborhood feeling.

4. The median on S. Columbus Boulevard is one of the few shaded streets in the area.

5. The Augie Acuna Los Niños Park is a great asset for the residents of the area.

6. The Los Niños Elementary School is a public school serving the area.
The windshield survey teams recorded the conditions of both structures and landscapes.

Cars or vehicles parked in the right of way were noted by the windshield survey teams.
Demographics

Census Tract Location
The Los Niños area is located within Census Tract 41.12 (see Figure 7.4).

Demographics
In terms of median age, median income, and percent of households in poverty, the residents of the Los Niños area are very similar to the City of Tucson as a whole (Table 7.1). The population has a median age of 34.7, and census data reveal that 43.4 percent of households include children.

The majority of residents in the area identify as Hispanic (70.5 percent compared to 41.6 percent for the City of Tucson).

The median household income for the area is slightly lower than the City of Tucson median income, and residents are less likely to have a bachelor’s degree or higher (4.7 percent compared to 24.8 percent for the City of Tucson).

Table 7.1: Los Niños Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Los Niños</th>
<th>Tract 41.12</th>
<th>Tucson</th>
<th>Pima County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Under 18</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Over 65</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>$34,063</td>
<td>$32,389</td>
<td>$35,499</td>
<td>$42,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Hispanic</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent High School Graduate or Higher</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Bachelor's Degree or Higher</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent in Poverty</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All statistics are from the 2010 Census (provided by ESRI), with the exception of Percent High School Graduate or Higher, Percent Bachelor's Degree or Higher, and Percent Households in Poverty in Last Year which come from the American Community Survey 2005-2009 5-year estimates, provided by ESRI.
Housing Characteristics

Compared to the City of Tucson, Los Niños residents are more likely to be homeowners, have higher average household sizes, and have lower median home values (see Table 7.2). Figure 7.5 demonstrates that over half of Los Niños residents own their home with a mortgage, and another 20.3 percent own their home without a mortgage.

According to the 2005-2009 American Community Survey, over half of Los Niños area residents have lived there at least ten years or more (55.6 percent). Of both homeowners and renters, 19.6 percent moved into the Los Niños area in 2005 or later.

The majority of the housing stock in the Los Niños area (81.5 percent) is detached or attached single-family, with a median home value of $141,736.

Table 7.2: Los Niños Housing Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Los Niños</th>
<th>Tract 41.12</th>
<th>Tucson</th>
<th>Pima County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Values</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(owner-occupied units)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0-99,000</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-149,000</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150-199,000</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000+</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>$141,736</td>
<td>$141,200</td>
<td>$169,900</td>
<td>$196,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Year Householder Moved into Unit*</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Owner-Occupied**</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Size**</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family*</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*American Community Survey 2005-2009 5-year estimates, ESRI.
**2010 Census Summary File, ESRI
Zoning

The Los Niños area consists of four separate Pima County zoning classifications as shown below in Figure 7.6.

The vast majority of the parcels in the neighborhood are zoned as 'Residential' with lower densities appropriate under the CR-3 classification.

Parcels along Benson Highway are zoned for CB-2, which includes general commercial uses that serve the community and region.

North of the area is zoned CI-1, which includes light industrial uses that do not have offensive characteristics.

---

1 See Appendix C for a complete list of city and county zoning classifications and summary descriptions.
Land Use

Land use in the Los Niños area closely reflects the zoning classifications of the area. The vast majority of parcels are used for single-family residences (90.1 percent), with just three parcels containing multi-family residences. Two large parcels include a park and school (included in the “other” category in Table 7.3). Figure 7.7 shows the location of the vacant lots in the area (5.3 percent of parcels).

Table 7.3: Land Use in Los Niños Area by Parcel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Number of Parcels</th>
<th>Percentage of Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residence(SFR)</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residence (MFR)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Lot</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to Observe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes schools, parks, private streets, and uses not otherwise classified.
Development

Development Patterns
The Los Niños area demonstrates a hybrid system of street grid patterns and cul-de-sacs. There is a variety of block widths and lengths that give a less uniform image to the area. The preexisting washes have certain parts that have been reinforced with concrete. All existing structures and roads are shown in Figure 7.8. It is clear that the southern edge of the area is less densely developed than the rest of the area.

The vast majority of the area was developed after 1970. The pattern of development by parcel and decade is shown in Figure 7.9. There is a combination of a linear grid system with cul-de-sac development patterns giving the area a residential character.

Figure 7.8: Current Neighborhood Build-Out in Los Niños Area
Structures (black), and roads (grey) in the Los Niños area.
Figure 7.9: Los Niños Area Development Over Time
Source: Pima County GIS, 2012
Density

The Los Niños area has a density per square mile that ranges from approximately 2,806 to 4,149 (see Figure 7.10). In comparison, the City of Tucson average was 2,294.2 in 2010.

The City of Tucson incorporated areas surrounding Los Niños show low density to the north (industrial zones) and west, and higher density to the south of the area.

2 2010 Census, provided by Pima County GIS

Figure 7.10: Population Density by Block Group in the Los Niños Area
Numbers indicate people per square mile based on the 2010 U.S. Census. Data provided by Pima County GIS.

Vacant land contributes to lower density along Benson Highway.

Over 90 percent of parcels contain single family units in the Los Niños area.

Multi-family units are rare in the Los Niños area.
Rivers and Washes
The Los Niños area is located adjacent to the Julian Wash, while a system of smaller washes and drainage areas cuts through the area. Most washes have concrete engineered reinforcements and some of them are dissected by streets.

The washes create xeroriparian pockets around the neighborhood. Xeroriparian habitats are areas of naturally-occurring vegetated communities supported by intermittent or ephemeral stream flows. These areas often serve as important habitat for native flora and fauna.

General drainage patterns move from east to west, with large sheet flows originating on the impervious surfaces of the I-10 Interstate. In the neighborhood itself, water drains primarily along Drexel Road and Market Street (see Figure 7.11).

Flooding issues can be noticed in the area during and after summer monsoon storms, particularly where the streets cut through washes.

Figure 7.11: Los Niños Area Hydrology and Drainage
There are several wash systems (blue lines) that run through and around the neighborhood. Striped areas indicate the FEMA 100-yr flood plain. Dotted areas indicate riparian habitats.
During the monsoon season some roads in the Los Niños area retain water.

Minor washes run throughout the Los Niños area.

Maintenance of the area washes is an issue in Los Niños.

The natural vegetation of Julian Wash acts as a buffer for noise on Interstate 10.

Water management through a bioretention basin with curb cuts at a commercial property on Alvernon & Drexel.

The Julian Wash south of I-10 is a major hydrological feature of the area.
**Bicycles**

The Los Niños area has major bike routes along Benson Highway and S. Alvernnon Way but riders must be comfortable riding with high speed, high volume traffic. The Benson Highway bike route runs between Valencia Road and Park Avenue. The Alvernnon bike route runs between Valencia Road and Ajo Way.

There is one planned bike route along Drexel that will connect with the existing route on Drexel between Tucson Boulevard and South 6th Avenue (Figure 7.12).

*Figure 7.12: Bicycle Routes in Los Niños Area*

*Source: Pima County GIS, 2012*
Pedestrians
The Los Niños area has a Walk Score\(^3\) of 48 out of 100 and is considered “Car Dependent.”\(^4\) This is largely due to the fact that there are very few amenities within walking distance.

To measure walkability, the windshield survey teams documented the existence of sidewalks and street trees in the area. As shown in Figure 7.13, the neighborhood is well covered with sidewalks, but there are street trees in the right-of-way of just 10.8 percent of parcels in the area (Table 7.4).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trees in Right-of-Way</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Street trees in the right of way and well maintained sidewalks can promote walkability in the area.

The area’s main interior road, Drexel Road, is not served entirely by sidewalks.

Most of the sidewalks in the Los Niños area do not provide shade for pedestrians.

Figure 7.13: Sidewalks and Street Trees in Los Niños Area
The map above shows existing sidewalks (in red) and street trees on parcels (green circle).
**Vehicles**

In Los Niños area, the vehicle miles traveled per household averages 17,375.55 per year (see Figure 7.16). It is evident from low bus ridership, and vehicle miles traveled that residents in this area are very car dependent.

*The Los Niños area is an auto-dependent and auto-dominated place.*

---

**Public Transit**

The Los Niños area is served by one main bus route. Route 26 can be accessed on Benson Highway or in the interior of the area on Drexel Road (Figure 7.14). Route 26 eventually leads to the Laos Transit Center on Irvington Road (Figure 7.15). Route 110 Express on I-10 to downtown is not accessible from the Los Niños area. See Appendix E for the complete existing transit system and Appendix F for Projected Transit routes.

---

5 Data Provided by Sun Tran, 2012.
Transportation and Circulation (cont.)

Figure 7.15: Los Niños Area Connectivity by Public Transit

Table 7.5: Bus Ridership in Los Niños Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>City-Wide Ridership/Month</th>
<th>Passengers per hour</th>
<th>Ranking*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26,921</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ranking is from 1-40 bus routes, with #1 having the most passengers per hour. (Data for June 2012)

Most of the bus stops in the Los Niños area have no bench or shade provided.

There are a few bus stops in the area that are sheltered.
Housing Affordability

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) defines affordable housing as housing that costs thirty percent or less of total household income. According to this criteria, Los Niños housing costs are not affordable (see Figure 7.16).6

Housing + Transportation Affordability

The Housing+Transportation Affordability Index was developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) to show the impact of transportation costs on overall housing affordability. In this calculation, anything above 45 percent of income spent on housing plus transportation is deemed to be unaffordable.

According to this measure, Los Niños residents are spending far above 45 percent and thus the area is not affordable (Figure 7.17). It is clear from the figures that some residents are spending more on transportation than they are on housing.

---

6 See Appendix G for source and methods
**Airport Zones**

**Airport Influence**
The Los Niños area is located near the Davis Monthan Air Force Base and the Tucson International Airport.

The area is just outside the Airport 65 Day-Night Average Sound Level (Ldn) Zone (Figure 7.18) and bordered by the Airport Height Overlay Zone 3 of Davis Monthan Air Force Base. In Zone 3 the maximum allowable height for development is 55 feet (Figure 7.19).

These zones can impact proposed and existing residential development due to limits on density, requirements for sound proofing and other structural changes, limits on structure heights, and other possible restrictions placed on development and redevelopment in the area.

*Source: Davis Monthan Air Force Base

*Source: University of Arizona

---

**Figure 7.18: DMAFB Noise Zone in Los Niños Area**

Los Niños is located south of the noise zone of Davis Monthan Air Force Base.

**Figure 7.19: DMAFB and TIA Height Overlay Zone in Los Niños Area**

Los Niños borders the Height Overlay Zone of TIA (green shaded) and the Height Overlay Zone of Davis Monthan Air Force Base (blue shaded).
**Lighting**

The Los Niños area has virtually no street lighting in its interior. Recall that Suntran bus Route 26 travels through the middle of the neighborhood with four unsheltered bus stops on Drexel Road. This route currently operates until approximately 11:00 p.m. on weekdays. Because this street is devoid of street lighting, nighttime bus ridership is less appealing to residents.

All available street lights are along Benson Highway and S. Alvernon Way (see Figure 7.20).

*Figure 7.20: Los Niños Area Street Lighting*

There is virtually no street lighting in the interior Los Niños area, with a very small number of lights along Alvernon Way and Benson Highway.
Assessment of Structures

Building Conditions
The vast majority (80.6 percent) of structures in Los Niños are in either ‘Good’ or ‘Excellent’ condition (see Figure 7.19). Approximately 18.9 percent are in ‘Fair’ condition requiring between $5000 and $15,000 in repairs. Only four structures are in ‘Poor’ condition, indicating a need for repairs on the order of $15,000 to $50,000. None of the structures in Los Niños are assessed as ‘Replacement,’ meaning they present a threat to the health, safety, and welfare of the community, and that the cost to repair them would exceed the cost to tear down and rebuild.

Figure 7.19: Overall Condition of Structures in Los Niños Area (July, 2012)
(out of 766 assessable parcels with structures)

Almost 80 percent of parcels contain structures in good condition.

The vast majority of structures are in “good” or “excellent condition” in Los Niños area.

None of the structures in Los Niños are assessed as “replacement.”

The windshield survey teams assessed structures based on the estimated costs to repair any problems.
Landscape Conditions
Approximately 20 percent of landscapes in Los Niños are considered ‘poor’ (Figure 7.20). This means that landscape is neither intentional nor maintained. In large part, this number is derived from the condition of vacant properties in the area, as 98 percent of the vacant parcels in the area have landscapes in poor condition.

The windshield survey teams also recorded the presence of litter and graffiti on each parcel, and trees in the adjoining right-of-way (Table 7.5). Litter levels are quite high: 72.8 percent of parcels contained litter at the time of the windshield survey. Again, this number is inflated by the presence of litter on vacant parcels (100 percent contained litter at the time of the survey).

Table 7.5: Los Niños Area Condition of Landscapes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcels with Street</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees in Right of Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels with Litter</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels with Graffiti</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Out of 827 assessable parcels)

Poor landscapes are neither intentional nor maintained.

Over one-quarter of landscapes are assessed as “excellent.”

Excellent landscapes are both intentional and well-maintained.
Vacant and Unoccupied Structures
Due to conflicting definitions of vacancy, only structures with boarded up windows and doors are labeled “vacant.” Using this definition, in Los Niños area 18 of the 827 parcels (2.2 percent) contained vacant structures as of July 2012. This vacancy rate is relatively low compared to 2010 U.S. Census data which has a broader definition of vacancy.

The Census definition incorporates all vacant housing units including those for rent or for sale, those vacant properties that are vacant due to seasonal, recreational, or occasional use, and “other vacant” which may be recent foreclosures or units that owners or renters have walked away from (see Table 7.6). According to the 2010 U.S. Census, the total vacancy rate in Los Niños is 6.3 percent.

Structures with ‘For Sale’ or ‘For Rent’ signs are also noted by the windshield survey teams. Some 1.9 percent of neighborhood parcels were either for sale or for rent in July 2012 (Table 7.7). Structures with ‘For Sale’ or ‘For Rent’ signs, even ones that appeared uninhabited, are not classified as ‘Vacant’ unless windows and doors are either missing or boarded up.

Table 7.6: Housing Units by Vacancy Status in Los Niños Area*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vacant Units</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Rent</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented, not occupied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sale</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold, not occupied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Vacant**</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For seasonal/recreational/occasional use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Migrant Workers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Vacant Units</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census 2010 Summary File 1 (ESRI)
** Includes recent foreclosures or units that owners have walked away from. See text for more information.

Foreclosures
The Drachman windshield survey team was unable to visually determine the number of foreclosures in each neighborhood. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) determines an estimated foreclosure abandonment risk score by census block group. This score is on a scale from 0-10, with 10 being the highest risk. According to HUD, the estimated foreclosure abandonment risk score for Los Niños is 10, and the neighborhood has an estimated foreclosure rate of 8.5 percent.

Vacant and Undeveloped Land
58 out of 827 parcels (7.0 percent) in Los Niños are vacant lots. These lots are generally large, however, so a significant area in the neighborhood is vacant or undeveloped. Large undeveloped lots in Los Niños have been the targets of illegal dumping.

Table 7.7: Observed Available Properties in Los Niños Area by Signage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Percent of Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Sale</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Rent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dumping on vacant land is common in the Los Niños area.
There are many abandoned items on the vacant lands of the area located close to Benson Highway.

Only 2.2 percent of parcels in the Los Niños area contain structures that are boarded up.

Figure 7.21: Vacant Land in the Los Niños Area
Dark shaded parcels indicate vacant land identified by the Drachman windshield survey. The green shaded parcel is the Augie Acuña Los Niños Park.
Services and Amenities

Location of Commercial Services
One of the reasons that the Los Niños area is so car dependent is the lack of services and amenities in the area. Located between major roads with high speed traffic, it’s no surprise that the majority of the services in the area are automobile-related. Los Niños is also bordered on the east and north by manufacturing and industrial activities that are not directly serving the area.

The major location of nearby shopping for the residents is the Dollar General on the intersection of Benson and Drexel. It is notable that there are no restaurants or cafes in the area, contributing to the lack of pedestrian activity. There is, however, potential for future commercial development along Alvernon Way and Benson Highway given the volume of vacant land.

The Augie Acuña Los Niños Park provides some facilities including a swimming pool, basketball and baseball courts, picnic areas and playgrounds.

Other services in the area include Fire Station 71, Los Niños Elementary School, and two religious institutions.

There are also a small number of local businesses including a karate learning center and tax advisory office.
Figure 7.22: Los Niños Area Services and Amenities

The majority of services are located along Alvernon and Benson Highway, with some manufacturing and retail activity concentrated on Belvedere Avenue.

Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Type</th>
<th>Auto</th>
<th>Bank</th>
<th>Bar</th>
<th>Beauty</th>
<th>Check Cash</th>
<th>Convenience</th>
<th>Drug Store</th>
<th>Fast Food</th>
<th>Gas</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Grocery</th>
<th>Home Improvement</th>
<th>Lodging</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Child Care</th>
<th>Medical</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Recreation Private</th>
<th>Recreation Public</th>
<th>Restaurant</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Religious Institution</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Post Office</th>
<th>Police Station</th>
<th>Fire Station</th>
<th>Hospital</th>
<th>Charter School</th>
<th>Private School</th>
<th>Elementary School</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Other Public</th>
<th>Postsecondary School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Augie Acuña Los Niños Park
Neighborhood Summary

The Los Niños area is predominantly single-family housing.

In various places, the Los Niños area is formed around washes.

The median on Columbus creates a void in the pavement and an opportunity for vegetation to grow.

The lack of benches, shade and lighting discourages the use of public transit.

The swimming pool at Augie Acuna Los Niños Park
Location and Geography
The Los Niños area is adjacent to the I-10 freeway with a large industrial area to the north and in close proximity to the Davis Monthan Air Force Base. Large areas of vacant land and the Julian Wash, also to the north, make the area feel relatively undeveloped. Smaller washes and drainage ways cutting through the area result in flooding during summer monsoon storms.

Household Characteristics and Tenure
The majority of residents in Los Niños identify as Hispanic. Household sizes are higher than the City of Tucson, with almost half of them including children. The area is over 78 percent owner-occupied and over half of the residents have lived in the area for more than ten years.

Development Patterns
The vast majority of the Los Niños area was developed between 1970 and 1980. There is a combination of a linear grid system with cul-de-sac development street patterns. There are large vacant parcels in the south section of the area suitable for future development.

Walkability, Transportation, and Accessibility
The Los Niños area has only a few services within walking distance and therefore is a car-dependent area. Sidewalks are available in most parts of the area but there is a substantial lack of street trees in the right-of-way.

Affordability
Comparing the price of housing in the neighborhood to income shows that housing stock is not affordable to residents (most residents are spending more than 30 percent of their income on housing). The area is even more unaffordable when factoring in transportation costs. According to the Center for Neighborhood Technology, Los Niños residents spend 66 - 75 percent of their income on housing and transportation combined (over 45 percent is considered unaffordable).

Assessment of Structures and Landscapes
The vast majority of structures in Los Niños are in ‘good’ or ‘excellent’ condition. Out of almost 766 assessable parcels with structures, only four structures are deemed to be in “poor” condition. On the other hand, a fifth of properties have landscapes considered to be in “poor” condition. There is a large amount of undeveloped land in and around the neighborhood, and these parcels are generally in poor condition due to dumping.

Vacancy and Foreclosure Risk
According to the 2010 U.S. Census, the total vacancy rate in Los Niños is 6.3 percent. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) determines an estimated foreclosure abandonment risk score from 0-10, with 10 being the highest risk. According to HUD, the estimated foreclosure abandonment risk score for Los Niños is 10, and the neighborhood has an estimated foreclosure rate of 8.5 percent.

Services and Amenities
The majority of services in Los Niños are found along Alvernon Way and Benson Highway, and are mostly auto-related. Los Niños is an example of a car-dependent area as there is a significant lack of commercial activity. There are no grocery stores, restaurants or cafes, and the area is only served by the Dollar General store. There are certain amenities such as the Los Niños Elementary School and Fire Station 71, with the Augie Acuña Los Niños Park being the major recreational and social asset of the area.
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Neighborhood Introduction

**Location**
Sunset Villa Neighborhood is located south of the junction of Interstate 19 and Interstate 10 (Figure 8.1). The neighborhood is bounded by 40th Street to the north, Interstate 19 to the west, 12th Avenue/10th Avenue to the east, and Ajo Way to the south (Figure 8.2). Sunset Villa Neighborhood is located in Pima County Supervisor Districts 2 and 5.

The Drachman windshield survey team was active in Sunset Villa Neighborhood in July 2012, assessing approximately 344 parcels.

**Surrounding Context**
Access to Sunset Villa Neighborhood is limited from the west by Interstate 19, and limited from the north by Interstate 10 as well as a concrete diversion channel. On the other side of the diversion channel lies the Julian Wash Archaeological Park.

Just west of Interstate 19 is the Santa Cruz River Park, which runs along the Santa Cruz River and is part of a National Trail system.

![Figure 8.1: Sunset Villa Neighborhood Location](image)
Sunset Villa Neighborhood (dark purple) is located in the northwest portion of the NSP2 target area (dark blue outline).
A typical street in Sunset Villa Neighborhood

Figure 8.2: Sunset Villa Neighborhood Boundaries
Sunset Villa neighborhood is adjacent to Interstates 19 and 10.
Photographs

1. Carmelita Castro Children’s Park

2. Overhead utilities are common in Sunset Villa.

3. St John the Evangelist Catholic Church is modeled after the first Tucson church built in 1775.

4. Santa Cruz Apartment Complex

5. There are a variety of stores and amenities in the southwest corner of the neighborhood.

6. The Marshall Home for Men is a non-profit facility for elderly men with limited means.
Figure 8.3: Sunset Villa Neighborhood: Location of Photographs

Vacant land adjacent to I-19

Pueblo Magnet High School
Demographics

The Sunset Villa Neighborhood is located within two Census Tracts: 24 and 25.01 (see Figure 8.4).

The population of Sunset Villa is fairly young, with a median age of 34.7. In fact, 28 percent of the neighborhood is 18 years or younger, compared to 23.3 percent for the City of Tucson (see Table 8.1) According to 2010 U.S. Census data, 41.2 percent of the households in Sunset Villa have children living in them, and 11.2 percent of households are multi-generational.

The Sunset Villa neighborhood is racially and ethnically diverse, with 5.8 percent identifying as American Indian and 80.9 percent identifying as Hispanic (compared to 2.7 percent American Indian and 41.6 percent Hispanic for the City of Tucson).

The median household income for Sunset Villa Neighborhood is lower than the City of Tucson median income, and the overall poverty rate for the neighborhood is significantly higher (40.5 percent compared to 17.8 percent for the city of Tucson).

Table 8.1: Sunset Villa Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sunset Villa</th>
<th>Tract 24</th>
<th>Tract 25.01</th>
<th>Tucson</th>
<th>Pima County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Under 18</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Over 65</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>$23,086</td>
<td>$23,806</td>
<td>$28,015</td>
<td>$35,499</td>
<td>$42,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Hispanic</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent High School</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or Higher</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Bachelor’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree or Higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent in Poverty</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All statistics are from the 2010 Census (provided by ESRI), with the exception of Percent High School Graduate or Higher, Percent Bachelor’s Degree or Higher, and Percent Households in Poverty in Last Year which come from the American Community Survey 2005-2009 5-year estimates, provided by ESRI.
Housing Characteristics

Compared to the City of Tucson, Sunset Villa residents are less likely to be homeowners, have higher average household sizes, and have lower median home values (see Table 8.2). Figure 8.5 demonstrates that over half of Sunset Villa residents rent their current residence.

According to the 2005-2009 American Community Survey, a significant portion of Sunset Villa householders have lived in Sunset Villa at least ten years or more. This is especially true among homeowners, as 73.7 percent of homeowners moved into Sunset Villa prior to 1999.

The majority of the housing stock in Sunset Villa (68.7 percent) is detached or attached single-family, with a median home value of $135,491.

Table 8.2: Sunset Villa Housing Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Values* (owner-occupied units)</th>
<th>Sunset Villa</th>
<th>Tract 24</th>
<th>Tract 25.01</th>
<th>Tucson</th>
<th>Pima County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-99,000</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-149,000</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150-199,000</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000+</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>$135,491</td>
<td>$102,900</td>
<td>$118,500</td>
<td>$169,900</td>
<td>$196,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Median Year Householder Moved into Unit* | 2001 | 2000 | 1997 | 2003 | 2002 |
| Percent Owner-Occupied**                | 48.0% | 49.9% | 59.6% | 51.9% | 64.1% |
| Household Size**                        | 2.91  | 3.15  | 2.83  | 2.43  | 2.46 |
| Single-Family*                          | 88.7% | 75.2% | 77.3% | 59.5% | 66.0% |

*American Community Survey 2005-2009 5-year estimates, ESRI.
**2010 Census Summary File, ESRI
Zoning

Sunset Villa Neighborhood includes nine City of Tucson zoning classifications as shown below in Figure 8.6.

The vast majority of the parcels in the neighborhood are zoned as 'Residential' with medium densities appropriate under the R-2 classification. One small area of more dense R-3 exists on 16th Avenue, where there is a large 132-unit apartment complex.

The southwest section of the neighborhood is zoned for commercial uses and includes a grocery store as well as other retail establishments.

The large area north of this commercial section is zoned for low to medium density mobile home structures, but is primarily vacant.

---

Figure 8.6: Zoning Classifications in Sunset Villa Neighborhood
See Appendix C for City of Tucson Zoning Classifications by Symbol
Land Use
The majority of the parcels in the neighborhood are single family residences, and very few are multi-family (Table 8.3). Most of these residences are in the north section of the neighborhood, as Pueblo Magnet High school takes up a large section of land in the middle of the neighborhood and the southern end of the neighborhood is mainly commercial (see Figure 8.7). The southeast corner of the neighborhood is occupied by a church and religious private school (St. John the Evangelist Catholic school).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Number of Parcels</th>
<th>Percentage of Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residence (SFR)</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residence (MFR)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Lot</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to Observe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>344</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes schools, parks, private streets, and uses not otherwise classified.

Figure 8.7: Land Use in Sunset Villa Neighborhood
**Development Patterns**

Sunset Villa developed around Pueblo Magnet High School, which was built in 1956 to ease the overcrowding of Tucson High School. All existing structures and roads are shown in Figure 8.8. The neighborhood has large areas of vacant land, especially adjacent to Interstate 19. Development patterns largely honor the established grid system of the City of Tucson, yet include a variety of block widths and lengths.

The residential sections of the neighborhood were developed prior to 1960, whereas the southwest commercial section developed in the 1980s. The pattern of development by parcel and decade is shown in Figure 8.9.

*Figure 8.8: Current Neighborhood Build-Out in Sunset Villa*

Structures (black), and roads (grey) in the Sunset Villa Neighborhood.
Figure 8.9: Sunset Villa Neighborhood Development Over Time
Source: Pima County GIS, 2012
Density

Sunset Villa has a density per square mile that ranges from approximately 811 in the southern section of the neighborhood to just over 3,000 in the residential northern section (see Figure 8.10). For comparison purposes, the City of Tucson average was 2,294.2 in 2010.

The western-most block group is comprised of a large amount of land along the Santa Cruz River, which does not include residential units, thus contributing to the overall lower density in Sunset Villa.

2 2010 Census, provided by Pima County GIS

Figure 8.10: Population Density by Block Group in Sunset Villa Neighborhood
Numbers indicate people per square mile based on the 2010 U.S. Census. Data provided by Pima County GIS.
Rivers and Washes
Sunset Villa Neighborhood is located near the Santa Cruz River, and washes that pre-dated development of the area originally drained into this main system. Several small washes flow into a large riparian habitat that runs adjacent to I-19.

The Tucson Diversion Channel separates the neighborhood from the Julian Wash Archaeological Park to the north. Along the south side of this concrete channel is a paved, multi-use pedestrian path that circles around the Archaeological Park.

The land north of Veterans Boulevard and west of South 12th Avenue is considered an Archaeological Sensitivity Zone, which means that it is an area of suspected archaeological resources. This area extends to the west bank of the Santa Cruz river and north to Silverlake Road/29th Street.

Figure 8.11: Sunset Villa Hydrology and Drainage
There are several wash systems (blue lines) that run through and around the neighborhood. Diagonally striped areas indicate the FEMA 100-yr flood plain. Dotted areas indicate riparian habitats. The horizontal hatch shows an archaeological sensitive area.
During the monsoon season, drainage areas often provide lush vegetation.

Several washes pass through Sunset Villa Neighborhood.

Drainage area in front of Chase Bank on South 16th Avenue

The Tucson Diversion Channel lies north of Sunset Villa Neighborhood.
**Bicycles**

Sunset Villa does not have designated bike routes in the interior of the neighborhood, but does have bike routes with a striped shoulder along Ajo Way, some parts of 12th Avenue, and 10th Avenue. Riders must be comfortable riding with high speed, high volume traffic on these roads.

The 10th Avenue bike route connects to the Liberty Bicycle Boulevard. This bicycle boulevard has received a federal Transportation Enhancement grant and will eventually span seven miles between downtown Tucson and Los Reales Road.

*Figure 8.12: Bicycle Routes in Sunset Villa Neighborhood
Source: Pima County GIS, 2012*
**Pedestrians**

Sunset Villa has a Walk Score\(^3\) of 44 out of 100 and is considered ‘Car Dependent.’\(^4\) Many of the pedestrian routes lack shade, and the distances are often large between residences and services and amenities. Sidewalks are present on many of the residential streets in the neighborhood, but often end abruptly (Figure 8.13).

\(^3\) www.walkscore.com


### Table 8.4: Sunset Villa Street Tree Coverage*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trees in Right-of-Way</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Drachman windshield survey
Street trees are a key component to pleasant walking routes. There are street trees in the right-of-way of 14 percent of parcels in the neighborhood (Table 8.4 and Figure 8.13).

Vehicles

The average number of vehicle miles traveled per household per year in Tucson is 18,069. In Sunset Villa, the vehicle miles traveled\(^5\) average between 15,513 and 17,960 per year (Figure 8.14).

\(^5\) See Appendix G for source and methods.

Figure 8.14: Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled per Household per Year in the Sunset Villa Neighborhood

Source: Center for Neighborhood Technology, 2012

Some areas in Sunset Villa have well-maintained sidewalks.

Many of the streets in Sunset Villa contain traffic calming measures such as speed humps.
Public Transit
Sunset Villa Neighborhood is served by two main bus routes (50 and 16), with two other popular routes within one-half mile of the neighborhood\(^6\) (Figure 8.15 and Table 8.5). The current bus routes serving Sunset Villa have good connectivity to the city as a whole (see Figure 8.16). Route 16 leads to the downtown Ronstadt Transit Center and Route 50 leads to the Roy Laos Transit Center, giving residents connections to numerous destinations.

\(^6\) Suntran, 2012.
Table 8.5: Bus Ridership in Sunset Villa Neighborhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>City-Wide Ridership/ Month</th>
<th>Passengers per hour</th>
<th>Ranking*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>246,291</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>104,513</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>149,709</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>9,748</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Ranking is from 1-40 with #1 having the most passengers per hour. (Data for June 2012)
Housing Affordability

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) defines affordable housing as housing that costs thirty percent or less of total household income. According to this criteria, Sunset Villa Neighborhood housing costs are affordable (see Figure 8.17).

Housing + Transportation Affordability

However, housing and transportation costs are the two largest expenses for most households. The Housing+Transportation Affordability Index was developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) to show the importance of transportation costs to overall housing affordability.7 In this calculation, anything above 45 percent of income spent on housing plus transportation is deemed to be unaffordable.

According to this measure, Sunset Villa becomes unaffordable, with residents spending on average more than 50 percent of their income on housing plus transportation (Figure 8.18).

7 See Appendix G for sources and methods.

Figure 8.17: Housing Cost as a Percentage of Income, Sunset Villa Neighborhood
Source: Center for Neighborhood Technology, 2012

Figure 8.18: Housing and Transportation Cost as a Percentage of Income, Sunset Villa Neighborhood
Source: Center for Neighborhood Technology, 2012
Lighting
The center of Sunset Villa Neighborhood is dedicated to Pueblo Magnet High School, and the areas immediately surrounding the school are dark and inaccessible at night. The surrounding residential areas have street lights at each intersection, but large areas of vacant land to the west are dark at night.

Figure 8.18: Street Lighting in Sunset Villa Neighborhood
To the east of Sunset Villa there are numerous street lights.
Assessment of Structures

Building Conditions
The majority (68.4 percent) of structures in Sunset Villa are in either ‘Good’ or ‘Excellent’ condition (see Figure 8.19). Approximately 28.6 percent are in ‘Fair’ condition requiring between $5000 and $15,000 in repairs. Eight structures are in ‘Poor’ condition, indicating a need for repairs on the order of $15,000 to $50,000.

One structure is assessed as ‘Replacement,’ meaning it presents a threat to the health, safety, and welfare of the community, and that the cost to repair it would exceed the cost to tear down and rebuild.

Figure 8.19: Overall Condition of Structures in Sunset Villa Neighborhood (July, 2012)
(Out of 301 assessable parcels with structures)

Multi-family units are assessed as one structure.

344 parcels are assessable from the public right of way.

Homes are assessed based on the estimated cost to repair any noticeable problems.

Homes in “excellent” condition do not require any repairs.
Landscape Conditions

Almost 38 percent of landscapes in Sunset Villa are considered ‘poor’ (Figure 8.20). This means that on over a third of the properties in the neighborhood landscape is neither intentional nor maintained.

Of note is the condition of vacant land in the neighborhood. Twenty-two of the thirty-two vacant parcels in the area have landscapes in poor condition.

The windshield survey also recorded the presence of litter and graffiti on each parcel, and trees in the adjoining right-of-way (Table 8.5). At the time of the windshield survey litter levels in the neighborhood were quite high with 43.9 percent of parcels containing litter.

Table 8.5: Sunset Villa Condition of Landscapes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcels with Street Trees in Right of Way</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels with Litter</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels with Graffiti</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Out of 344 assessable parcels)

Figure 8.20: Overall Condition of Landscapes in Sunset Villa Neighborhood (July, 2012)
(Out of 339 assessable parcels)

Overgrown landscapes are common during the summer monsoons.

“Excellent” landscaping is both intentional and well-maintained.

Sunset Villa Neighborhood has a mix of excellent, poor, and average landscape conditions.
Vacant Structures and Land

Vacant and Unoccupied Structures
Due to conflicting definitions of vacancy, only structures with boarded up windows and doors are labeled “vacant” in this report. Using this definition, in Sunset Villa Neighborhood two of the 304 assessable parcels with structures (0.7 percent) had vacant structures as of July 2012. This vacancy rate is low compared to 2010 U.S. Census data which has a broader definition of vacancy.

The Census definition incorporates all vacant housing units including those for rent or for sale, those vacant properties that are vacant due to seasonal, recreational, or occasional use, and “other vacant” which may be recent foreclosures or units that owners or renters have walked away from (see Table 8.6). According to the 2010 U.S. Census, the total vacancy rate in Sunset Villa is 9.8 percent.

Structures with ‘For Sale’ or ‘For Rent’ signs are also noted by the windshield survey teams. Some 0.7 percent of neighborhood parcels were either for sale or for rent in July 2012 (Table 8.7). Structures with ‘For Sale’ or ‘For Rent’ signs, even ones that appeared uninhabited, are not classified as ‘Vacant’ unless windows and doors are either missing or boarded up.

| Table 8.6: Housing Units by Vacancy Status in Sunset Villa Neighborhood* |
|-----------------------|--------|--------|
| Vacant Units          | Units  | Percent |
| For Rent              | 26     | 5.8%    |
| Rented, not occupied  | 3      | 0.7%    |
| For Sale              | 3      | 0.7%    |
| Sold, not occupied    | 0      | 0.0%    |
| Other Vacant**        | 9      | 2.0%    |
| For seasonal/         | 3      | 0.7%    |
| recreational/         |        |         |
| occasional use        |        |         |
| For Migrant Workers   | 0      | 0.0%    |
| Total Vacant Units    | 44     | 9.8%    |
| Total Housing Units   | 447    | 100%    |

*Source: U.S. Census 2010 Summary File 1 (ESRI)
** Includes recent foreclosures or units that owners have walked away from. See text for more information.

Foreclosures
The Drachman windshield survey team was unable to visually determine the number of foreclosures in each neighborhood. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) determines an estimated foreclosure abandonment risk score by census block group. This score is on a scale from 0-10, with 10 being the highest risk. According to HUD, the estimated foreclosure abandonment risk score for Sunset Villa is 10, and the neighborhood has an estimated foreclosure rate of 9.1-10.1 percent.

Vacant and Undeveloped Land
Thirty-one out of 344 parcels (9.0 percent) in Sunset Villa are vacant lots. The majority of these are small lots scattered throughout the northern residential section of the neighborhood (see Figure 8.21). The largest section of vacant land is just north of the commercial section adjacent to I-19.

| Table 8.7: Observed Available Properties in Sunset Villa Neighborhood by Signage |
|-----------------|--------|--------|
| Sign            | Parcels| Percent of Neighborhood |
| For Sale        | 1      | 0.3%   |
| For Rent        | 3      | 0.4%   |

Total Visually Accessible Parcels = 344

A small vacant lot in the interior of Sunset Villa Neighborhood
Vacant lots are often the target of illegal dumping.

A vacant structure in Sunset Villa Neighborhood

Figure 8.21: Vacant Land in the Sunset Villa Neighborhood
Brown shaded parcels indicate vacant land identified by the Drachman windshield survey.
Services and Amenities

**Location of Commercial Services**

Commercial services available to the residents of Sunset Villa Neighborhood are found on West Ajo Way and South 12th Avenue. The area is served by Fry’s grocery store, Chase Bank, and a variety of restaurants and retail stores. For residents in the northern section of the neighborhood, access to this commercial area is limited to South 16th Avenue.

For recreation and entertainment, residents can enjoy Santa Cruz Bowling Lanes and the Carmelin Castro Itom Usim Children’s Park. A multi-use path runs adjacent to the Tucson Diversion Channel and passes through the children’s park.

Sunset Villa residents have access to multiple schools. Within the neighborhood boundaries are two schools: Pueblo Magnet High School and St. John the Evangelist Catholic School. Just outside the neighborhood are two more public schools: Hollinger Elementary School and Wakefield Middle School.
Figure 8.22: Services and Amenities in Sunset Villa Neighborhood
The majority of services and amenities in Sunset Villa Neighborhood are found along Ajo Way and 12th Ave.
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Figure 8.22: Services and Amenities in Sunset Villa Neighborhood
The majority of services and amenities in Sunset Villa Neighborhood are found along Ajo Way and 12th Ave.
Neighborhood Summary

President Street and Ajo Way

Pueblo Magnet High School is located in the center of the neighborhood.

Vacant lots are scattered within the Sunset Villa Neighborhood.

A typical home in Sunset Villa Neighborhood

Litter and graffiti can be seen on the vacant parcels along Interstate 19.

The majority of services are located on commercial parcels on Ajo Way.
Location
Sunset Villa Neighborhood is located just south of the junction of Interstate 19 and Interstate 10. The neighborhood is bounded by 40th Street to the north, Interstate 19 to the west, 12th Avenue/10th Avenue to the east, and Ajo Way to the south.

Household Characteristics and Tenure
Sunset Villa Neighborhood is racially and ethnically diverse, with 5.8 percent identifying as American Indian and 80.9 percent identifying as Hispanic. The overall poverty rate for the neighborhood is high at 40.5 percent.

The majority of the housing stock in Sunset Villa (68.7 percent) is detached or attached single-family, with a median home value of $135,491. Approximately 52 percent of Sunset Villa residents rent their home.

Development Patterns and Density
Sunset Villa developed around Pueblo Magnet High School, which was built in 1956 to ease the overcrowding of Tucson High School. Sunset Villa has a density per square mile that ranges from approximately 811 in the southern section of the neighborhood to just over 3,000 in the residential northern section.

Walkability, Transportation, and Accessibility
Sunset Villa has a Walk Score of 44 out of 100 and is considered ‘Car Dependent.’ Many of the pedestrian routes lack shade, and the distances are often large between residences and services and amenities.

Sunset Villa Neighborhood is served by two main bus routes (50 and 16), with two other popular routes one-half mile outside the neighborhood. The current bus routes serving Sunset Villa have good connectivity to the city as a whole.

Affordability
Comparing the price of housing in the neighborhood to income shows that housing stock is affordable to residents. When transportation costs are factored into this affordability assessment, however, Sunset Villa is unaffordable to residents.

Assessment of Structures and Landscapes
The vast majority (68.4 percent) of structures in Sunset Villa are in either ‘Good’ or ‘Excellent’ condition. Approximately 28.6 percent are in ‘Fair’ condition requiring between $5000 and $15,000 in repairs. Eight structures are in ‘Poor’ condition, indicating a need for repairs on the order of $15,000 to $50,000.

Almost 38 percent of landscapes in Sunset Villa are considered ‘poor.’ This means that on over a third of the properties in the neighborhood landscape is neither intentional nor maintained.

Of note is the condition of vacant land in the neighborhood. Twenty-two of the thirty-two vacant parcels in the area have landscapes in poor condition.

Vacancy and Foreclosure Risk
According to the 2010 U.S. Census, the total vacancy rate in Sunset Villa is 9.8 percent. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) determines an estimated foreclosure abandonment risk score from 0-10, with 10 being the highest risk. According to HUD, the estimated foreclosure abandonment risk score for Sunset Villa is 10, and the neighborhood has an estimated foreclosure rate of 9.1-10.1 percent.

Services and Amenities
The majority of commercial services are found along Ajo Way and South 12th Avenue, and include a grocery store, bank, and a variety of restaurants and retail options. For residents in the northern section of the neighborhood, access to this commercial area is limited to South 16th Avenue.
Neighborhood Data Summary
Assessment of Structures

The general condition of structures in the neighborhoods studied is good, with the majority of structures in each neighborhood assessed to be in “Good” or “Excellent” condition (Tables 9.1-9.4). Structures rated “poor” or “replacement” range from none in Bravo Park Lane to 10.5 percent in Fairgrounds.

The windshield survey teams also recorded all structures with posted “For Sale” or “For Rent” signs in each neighborhood (see Table 9.4). “For Sale” signs range from 0.3 percent in Sunset Villa to 2.3 percent in Bravo Park Lane. “For Rent” signs range from 0.2 percent in Los Niños to 2.2 percent in Bravo Park Lane.

Vacancy of structures is difficult to determine by a windshield survey. The Survey Team consulted Pima County definitions of “vacancy,” and in accordance with this definition marked as vacant only those structures that were either missing doors and windows entirely, or had boarded up doors and windows. As such, the vacancy rates noted here are relatively low compared to 2010 U.S. Census data (see Table 9.5).

The visual windshield assessment found that Los Niños area has the largest vacancy percentage (2.2 percent of all parcels assessed have structures that are missing doors, windows, or are boarded up). In comparison, according to the 2010 U.S. Census, Wakefield area has the highest vacancy rate at 12.6 percent. The Census definition incorporates all vacant housing units including those for rent or for sale, those vacant properties that are vacant due to seasonal, recreational, or occasional use, and “other vacant” which may be recent foreclosures or units that owners or renters have walked away from. The Census also counts individual units of multi-family structures while our survey counts by parcel only. Wakefield area has the highest number and percentage of “other vacant” units as well as the highest estimated foreclosure rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bravo Park Lane</th>
<th>Wakefield</th>
<th>A-Mountain</th>
<th>Fairgrounds</th>
<th>Los Niños</th>
<th>Sunset Villa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excellent</strong></td>
<td>244 (27.5%)</td>
<td>423 (22.2%)</td>
<td>28 (3.9%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (0.7%)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good</strong></td>
<td>578 (65.0%)</td>
<td>1094 (57.3%)</td>
<td>522 (72.5%)</td>
<td>346 (55.2%)</td>
<td>612 (79.9%)</td>
<td>205 (68.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fair</strong></td>
<td>67 (7.5%)</td>
<td>333 (17.4%)</td>
<td>140 (19.4%)</td>
<td>215 (34.3%)</td>
<td>145 (18.9%)</td>
<td>86 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poor</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54 (2.8%)</td>
<td>21 (2.9%)</td>
<td>59 (9.4%)</td>
<td>4 (0.5%)</td>
<td>8 (2.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Replacement</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (0.3%)</td>
<td>9 (1.3%)</td>
<td>7 (1.1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Parcels</strong></td>
<td>889</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In the following tables, the assessments are based on Drachman windshield surveys in 2011 (Bravo Park Lane and Wakefield area) and 2012 (A-Mountain, Fairgrounds, Los Ninos, Sunset Villa).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bravo Park Lane</th>
<th>Wakefield</th>
<th>A-Mountain</th>
<th>Fairgrounds</th>
<th>Los Niños</th>
<th>Sunset Villa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excellent</strong></td>
<td>200 (27.1%)</td>
<td>388 (23.9%)</td>
<td>27 (4.1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (0.7%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good</strong></td>
<td>479 (65.0%)</td>
<td>875 (56.8%)</td>
<td>499 (75.1%)</td>
<td>289 (56.7%)</td>
<td>593 (80.0%)</td>
<td>180 (69.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fair</strong></td>
<td>58 (7.9%)</td>
<td>249 (16.2%)</td>
<td>116 (17.5%)</td>
<td>174 (34.1%)</td>
<td>140 (18.9%)</td>
<td>70 (27.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poor</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44 (2.8%)</td>
<td>16 (2.4%)</td>
<td>41 (8%)</td>
<td>3 (0.4%)</td>
<td>7 (2.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Replacement</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (0.3%)</td>
<td>6 (0.9%)</td>
<td>6 (1.2%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Parcels</strong></td>
<td>737</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9.3: Assessment of All Multi-Family Structures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bravo Park Lane</th>
<th>Wakefield</th>
<th>A-Mountain</th>
<th>Fairgrounds</th>
<th>Los Niños</th>
<th>Sunset Villa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>8 (11.0%)</td>
<td>25 (15.1%)</td>
<td>1 (3.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>57 (78.0%)</td>
<td>93 (56.0%)</td>
<td>13 (48.2%)</td>
<td>19 (46.3%)</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>10 (55.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>8 (11.0%)</td>
<td>44 (26.5%)</td>
<td>11 (40.7%)</td>
<td>17 (41.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (38.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>2 (7.4%)</td>
<td>5 (12.2%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (5.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Parcels</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes retail, office, industrial, school, and other non-residential parcels.

### Table 9.4: Assessment of All Non-Residential Structures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bravo Park Lane</th>
<th>Wakefield</th>
<th>A-Mountain</th>
<th>Fairgrounds</th>
<th>Los Niños</th>
<th>Sunset Villa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>36 (45.5%)</td>
<td>30 (15.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>42 (53.2%)</td>
<td>122 (63.2%)</td>
<td>9 (64.3%)</td>
<td>38 (52.1%)</td>
<td>15 (88.2%)</td>
<td>15 (68.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td>37 (19.2%)</td>
<td>4 (28.6%)</td>
<td>22 (30.1%)</td>
<td>1 (6.9%)</td>
<td>7 (31.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (2.1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13 (17.8%)</td>
<td>1 (8.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (7.1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Parcels</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes retail, office, industrial, school, and other non-residential parcels.

### Table 9.5: Vacancy Summary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bravo Park Lane</th>
<th>Wakefield</th>
<th>A-Mountain</th>
<th>Fairgrounds</th>
<th>Los Niños</th>
<th>Sunset Villa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcels Unable to Observe</td>
<td>5 (0.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31 (2.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.1%)</td>
<td>3 (0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels With No Structure</td>
<td>7 (0.8%)</td>
<td>108 (5.1%)</td>
<td>383 (33.7%)</td>
<td>33 (4.7%)</td>
<td>58 (7.0%)</td>
<td>31 (9.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels With For Sale Sign</td>
<td>21 (2.3%)</td>
<td>28 (1.3%)</td>
<td>12 (1.1%)</td>
<td>6 (0.9%)</td>
<td>14 (1.7%)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels With For Rent Sign</td>
<td>20 (2.2%)</td>
<td>43 (2.0%)</td>
<td>6 (0.5%)</td>
<td>14 (2.0%)</td>
<td>2 (0.2%)</td>
<td>3 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels with Vacant Unit (per Windshield Survey*)</td>
<td>0 (1.3%)</td>
<td>27 (1.6%)</td>
<td>12 (1.6%)</td>
<td>13 (1.9%)</td>
<td>13 (2.2%)</td>
<td>2 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Units (not parcels) per U.S. Census 2010, ESRI</td>
<td>95 (8.5%)</td>
<td>306 (12.6%)</td>
<td>103 (8.8%)</td>
<td>83 (11.2%)</td>
<td>52 (6.3%)</td>
<td>44 (9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Other Vacant” Units**</td>
<td>16 (1.4%)</td>
<td>132 (5.4%)</td>
<td>23 (2.0%)</td>
<td>34 (4.6%)</td>
<td>16 (1.9%)</td>
<td>9 (2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Foreclosure Rate***</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>10.1-11.2%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>9.0-10.1%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>9.1-10.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Structure has boarded doors or windows

**2010 U.S. Census, Summary File 1 (ESRI). “Other Vacant” includes recent foreclosures or units that owners or renters have walked away from.

In Bravo Park Lane 92.5 percent of parcels have structures that are in either “Good” or “Excellent” condition. Approximately 7.5 percent of parcels have structures that are in “Fair” condition, requiring between $5,000 and $15,000 in repairs. There are no structures assessed as “Poor” or “Replacement” (Figure 9.1).

**Figure 9.1: Structures in Fair, Poor, and Replacement Condition, Bravo Park Lane**

In Bravo Park Lane 92.5 percent of parcels have structures that are in either “Good” or “Excellent” condition. Approximately 7.5 percent of parcels have structures that are in “Fair” condition, requiring between $5,000 and $15,000 in repairs. There are no structures assessed as “Poor” or “Replacement” (Figure 9.1).
In Wakefield area almost 80 percent of parcels have structures that are in either “Good” or “Excellent” condition. Figure 9.1 shows the clustering of structures assessed as “Fair” (17.4 percent); “Poor” (2.8 percent), and “Replacement” (0.3 percent).

**Figure 9.2: Structures in Fair, Poor, and Replacement Condition, Wakefield Area**

In Wakefield area almost 80 percent of parcels have structures that are in either “Good” or “Excellent” condition. Figure 9.1 shows the clustering of structures assessed as “Fair” (17.4 percent); “Poor” (2.8 percent), and “Replacement” (0.3 percent).
In A-Mountain Neighborhood 76.4 percent of parcels have structures in either “Good” or “Excellent” condition. Approximately 19.4 percent of parcels have structures in “Fair” condition, requiring between $5,000 and $15,000 in repairs. Twenty-one structures are in “Poor” condition, and nine parcels contain structures assessed as “Replacement” (Figure 9.3).

**Figure 9.3: Structures in Fair, Poor, and Replacement Condition, A-Mountain**

In A-Mountain Neighborhood 76.4 percent of parcels have structures in either “Good” or “Excellent” condition. Approximately 19.4 percent of parcels have structures in “Fair” condition, requiring between $5,000 and $15,000 in repairs. Twenty-one structures are in “Poor” condition, and nine parcels contain structures assessed as “Replacement” (Figure 9.3).
While none of the structures in Fairgrounds Neighborhood are rated as “Excellent,” over half are in “Good” condition (55.2 percent). Figure 9.4 shows the clustering of structures in “Fair” (34.3 percent), “Poor” (9.4 percent), and “Replacement” (1.1 percent) condition.

**Figure 9.4: Structures in Fair, Poor, and Replacement Condition, Fairgrounds**
More than 80 percent of parcels have structures in “Good” or “Excellent” condition in the Los Niños area. Figure 9.5 shows the clustering of parcels with structures in “Fair” (18.9 percent) or “Poor” (0.5 percent) condition. There are no parcels with structures assessed as “Replacement” in the area.

Figure 9.5: Structures in Fair, Poor, and Replacement Condition, Los Niños
The majority of structures in Sunset Villa Neighborhood are in “Good” or “Excellent” condition (68.4 percent). Figure 9.6 shows the clustering of parcels with structures in “Fair” (28.6 percent), “Poor” (2.7 percent), and “Replacement” (0.3 percent) condition.

**Figure 9.6: Structures in Fair, Poor, and Replacement Condition, Sunset Villa**

The majority of structures in Sunset Villa Neighborhood are in “Good” or “Excellent” condition (68.4 percent). Figure 9.6 shows the clustering of parcels with structures in “Fair” (28.6 percent), “Poor” (2.7 percent), and “Replacement” (0.3 percent) condition.
Assessment of Landscapes

The assessment of landscapes was included in the survey to capture “neighborhood pride” or “pride of ownership.” Landscapes assessed as “Excellent” are both intentional and well-maintained. Landscapes assessed as “Poor” are neither intentional nor well-maintained. With the exception of A-Mountain and Sunset Villa, the general condition of landscapes in the neighborhoods is “Average” (see Table 9.6). In A-Mountain, almost half of all landscapes are assessed as “poor.” In Sunset Villa, the area is split fairly equally between the three categories.

The high percentage of parcels with poor landscaping is partially explained by the condition of vacant lots in these neighborhoods (Table 9.7). In A-Mountain, 97.6 percent of the vacant parcels are in poor condition. In Los Niños, 98.3 percent of vacant parcels are in poor condition; all of them had litter and almost half had graffiti at the time of the windshield survey.

Taking vacant land out of the equation, the percentage of parcels in poor condition drops for all neighborhoods (Tables 9.8 and 9.9).

Non-residential landscapes are generally in “average” condition in Bravo Park Lane, Wakefield area, and Fairgrounds. Sunset Villa has the highest proportion of non-residential landscapes in “excellent” condition, whereas Los Niños area has a higher proportion of non-residential landscapes in “poor” condition (Table 9.10).

The windshield survey also assessed other components of the landscape, such as the presence of trees on private property and in the right-of-way and the existence of water harvesting. A summary of these assessments is found in Table 9.11.

### Table 9.6: Overall Assessment of Landscapes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bravo Park Lane</th>
<th>Wakefield</th>
<th>A-Mountain</th>
<th>Fairgrounds</th>
<th>Los Niños</th>
<th>Sunset Villa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>188 (20.7%)</td>
<td>405 (19%)</td>
<td>243 (22%)</td>
<td>222 (32.6%)</td>
<td>230 (28.3%)</td>
<td>117 (34.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>529 (58.4%)</td>
<td>1336 (62.8%)</td>
<td>315 (28.5%)</td>
<td>286 (42.0%)</td>
<td>416 (51.2%)</td>
<td>96 (28.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>189 (20.9%)</td>
<td>386 (18.2%)</td>
<td>549 (49.5%)</td>
<td>173 (25.4%)</td>
<td>167 (20.5%)</td>
<td>126 (37.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Parcels</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>2127</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In the following tables, the assessments are based on Drachman windshield surveys in 2011 (Bravo Park Lane and Wakefield area) and 2012 (A-Mountain, Fairgrounds, Los Ninos, Sunset Villa).

### Table 9.7: Assessment of Vacant Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bravo Park Lane</th>
<th>Wakefield</th>
<th>A-Mountain</th>
<th>Fairgrounds</th>
<th>Los Niños</th>
<th>Sunset Villa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
<td>2 (1.9%)</td>
<td>3 (0.8%)</td>
<td>1 (3.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (12.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
<td>43 (39.8%)</td>
<td>6 (1.6%)</td>
<td>3 (9.1%)</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
<td>5 (16.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5 (71.4%)</td>
<td>63 (58.3%)</td>
<td>374 (97.6%)</td>
<td>29 (87.9%)</td>
<td>57 (98.3%)</td>
<td>22 (71.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter</td>
<td>7 (100%)</td>
<td>90 (83.3%)</td>
<td>62 (16.2%)</td>
<td>32 (97.0%)</td>
<td>58 (100.0%)</td>
<td>16 (51.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>2 (28.6%)</td>
<td>28 (23.1%)</td>
<td>10 (2.6%)</td>
<td>11 (33.3%)</td>
<td>28 (43.1%)</td>
<td>3 (9.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Vacant Parcels</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9.8: Assessment of All Single-Family Residential Landscapes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bravo Park Lane</th>
<th>Wakefield</th>
<th>A-Mountain</th>
<th>Fairgrounds</th>
<th>Los Niños</th>
<th>Sunset Villa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>167 (22.6%)</td>
<td>319 (20.5%)</td>
<td>231 (34.6%)</td>
<td>181 (35.3%)</td>
<td>221 (30.2%)</td>
<td>94 (36.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>420 (56.9%)</td>
<td>969 (62.4%)</td>
<td>287 (43.0%)</td>
<td>228 (44.4%)</td>
<td>404 (55.3%)</td>
<td>78 (30.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>151 (20.5%)</td>
<td>266 (17.1%)</td>
<td>149 (22.4%)</td>
<td>104 (20.3%)</td>
<td>106 (14.5%)</td>
<td>88 (33.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Parcels</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes retail, office, industrial, park, parking lot, school, and other non-residential parcels. Category does NOT include vacant land.

### Table 9.9: Assessment of All Multi-Family Residential Landscapes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bravo Park Lane</th>
<th>Wakefield</th>
<th>A-Mountain</th>
<th>Fairgrounds</th>
<th>Los Niños</th>
<th>Sunset Villa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>6 (8.2%)</td>
<td>18 (10.8%)</td>
<td>3 (11.1%)</td>
<td>7 (17.0%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>3 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>46 (63.0%)</td>
<td>112 (67.5%)</td>
<td>18 (66.7%)</td>
<td>17 (41.5%)</td>
<td>2 (66.7%)</td>
<td>3 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>21 (28.8%)</td>
<td>36 (21.7%)</td>
<td>6 (22.2%)</td>
<td>17 (41.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12 (66.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Parcels</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9.10: Assessment of All Non-Residential* Landscapes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bravo Park Lane</th>
<th>Wakefield</th>
<th>A-Mountain</th>
<th>Fairgrounds</th>
<th>Los Niños</th>
<th>Sunset Villa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>15 (17.9%)</td>
<td>68 (22.9%)</td>
<td>6 (35.3%)</td>
<td>33 (35.5%)</td>
<td>8 (25.0%)</td>
<td>16 (57.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>60 (71.4%)</td>
<td>210 (70.7%)</td>
<td>4 (23.5%)</td>
<td>38 (40.9%)</td>
<td>7 (21.9%)</td>
<td>9 (32.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>9 (10.7%)</td>
<td>19 (6.4%)</td>
<td>7 (41.2%)</td>
<td>22 (23.6%)</td>
<td>17 (53.1%)</td>
<td>3 (10.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Parcels</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes retail, office, industrial, park, parking lot, school, and other non-residential parcels. Category does NOT include vacant land.

### Table 9.11: Windshield Assessment Summary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bravo Park Lane</th>
<th>Wakefield</th>
<th>A-Mountain</th>
<th>Fairgrounds</th>
<th>Los Niños</th>
<th>Sunset Villa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>44 (4.9%)</td>
<td>284 (13.4%)</td>
<td>40 (3.6%)</td>
<td>139 (20.0%)</td>
<td>111 (13.4%)</td>
<td>35 (10.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter</td>
<td>311 (34.3%)</td>
<td>1164 (54.7%)</td>
<td>193 (17.4%)</td>
<td>564 (80.9%)</td>
<td>602 (72.8%)</td>
<td>151 (43.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Trees in ROW*</td>
<td>106 (11.7%)</td>
<td>237 (11.1%)</td>
<td>109 (9.8%)</td>
<td>83 (11.9%)</td>
<td>89 (10.8%)</td>
<td>48 (14.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees on Property</td>
<td>664 (73.3%)</td>
<td>1529 (71.9%)</td>
<td>631 (57.0%)</td>
<td>508 (72.8%)</td>
<td>709 (88.7%)</td>
<td>255 (74.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels with Water Harvesting**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Parcels**</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>2127</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ROW= Right-of-way

**Water Harvesting refers to any clearly visible and intentional attempt at capturing rainfall on site. Examples include water harvesting cisterns, retention and detention basins, and curb cuts that harvest street run-off. See Appendix D.
### Table 9.12: Neighborhood Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bravo Park</th>
<th>Wakefield</th>
<th>A-Mountain</th>
<th>Fairgrounds</th>
<th>Los Niños</th>
<th>Sunset Villa</th>
<th>Tucson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Income</strong></td>
<td>$33,047</td>
<td>$25,652</td>
<td>$27,398</td>
<td>$22,799</td>
<td>$34,063</td>
<td>$23,086</td>
<td>$35,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent HH in Poverty</strong></td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent Hispanic</strong></td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Age</strong></td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population under 18</strong></td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population over 65</strong></td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Household Size</strong></td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Per Sq. Mile</strong></td>
<td>7,082</td>
<td>7,612</td>
<td>3,788</td>
<td>4,263</td>
<td>3,478</td>
<td>1,948</td>
<td>2,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent Owner-Occupied</strong></td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Home Value</strong></td>
<td>$129,167</td>
<td>$95,917</td>
<td>$148,011</td>
<td>$97,167</td>
<td>$141,736</td>
<td>$135,491</td>
<td>$169,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Foreclosure Rate (HUD)</strong></td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>10.1-11.2%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>9.0-10.1%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>9.1-10.1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average % of Income Spent on Housing (&lt;30%= affordable)</strong></td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average % of Income Spent on Housing Plus Transportation (&lt;45%= affordable)</strong></td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Vehicle Miles Traveled per Year</strong></td>
<td>16,131</td>
<td>15,879</td>
<td>17,880</td>
<td>15,989</td>
<td>17,376</td>
<td>16,737</td>
<td>18,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of Sheltered Bus Stops</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WalkScore</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parcels with Street Trees</strong></td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Park Within Neighborhood Boundary</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contamination Issues</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEMA 100-Year Flood Zone</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>partial</td>
<td>partial</td>
<td>partial</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographics and Housing Characteristics

Residents in Fairgrounds, Sunset Villa, and Wakefield area have both the lowest median incomes and the highest percentage of households under the federal poverty threshold.

All of the selected NSP2 neighborhoods have a high percentage of the population identifying as Hispanic (the lowest is 70.5 percent; significantly higher than the City of Tucson at 41.6 percent).

Of the selected neighborhoods, Sunset Villa has the highest proportion of elderly residents (12.5 percent are sixty-five years or older). In contrast, A-Mountain has the lowest proportion of elderly residents and the highest proportion of residents under age 18.

With the exception of the Los Niños area, the selected NSP2 neighborhoods are almost evenly split between homeowners and renters. In Los Niños, the majority of residents are homeowners rather than renters (78.3 percent). Los Niños also has the most long-term residents, with half of all residents moving into the neighborhood prior to 1998. All of the selected neighborhoods have median home values that are significantly lower than the median for the City of Tucson.

Walkability, Transportation and Affordability

Although WalkScore.com rates some of the neighborhoods as “Somewhat Walkable,” none of the neighborhoods can be considered pedestrian friendly due to a lack of trees in the right-of-way and lack of universally accessible, good quality walking paths or sidewalks. A-Mountain has the lowest walkscore of 19 and is considered “Very Car Dependent.”

According to data from the Center for Neighborhood Technology (2012), with the exception of Los Niños area, in the NSP2 selected neighborhoods housing costs constitute less than 30 percent of household income and are thus considered affordable. The housing costs in Los Niños are just over this figure at 34.2 percent. However, when transportation costs are considered, none of the selected neighborhoods is considered affordable (defined as housing + transportation costs constituting 45 percent or less of household income). A-Mountain Neighborhood stands out as the least affordable as residents are spending, on average, over 60 percent of their income on housing and transportation.

Because housing and transportation are the two largest expenses in most American household budgets, any programs aimed at housing affordability and neighborhood revitalization must consider ways to decrease household transportation costs by increasing transit choices and investing in healthy, safe, walkable neighborhoods.

*U.S. Census 2010, Summary File 1 (ESRI)
*American Community Survey 2005-2009, 5 Year Estimates (ESRI)
*Center for Neighborhood Technology, 2012
*Drachman Windshield Survey, 2010
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Appendix A: Sample Data Sheet:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Right-of-Way</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: all data entered is based on observations collected from the street or public right-of-way.

Drachman Institute 2010
NSP2 Windshield Survey
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Classification</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IR Institutional Reserve</td>
<td>Low-density residential; agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH Rural Homestead</td>
<td>Low-density residential; limited conditional commercial use; agricultural use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR-1 Rural Residential (April 1972)</td>
<td>Residential and agricultural; limited conditional commercial use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLZ Mount Lemmon Zone</td>
<td>Single family residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR Suburban Ranch</td>
<td>Single family residences; agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-2 Suburban Ranch Estate</td>
<td>Single family residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH Suburban Homestead</td>
<td>SR uses; manufactured homes (max. 2 per lot); duplexes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR-1 Single Residence</td>
<td>Single family residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR-2 Single Residence</td>
<td>Single family residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR-3 Single Residence</td>
<td>Single family residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR-4 Mixed Dwelling Type</td>
<td>Single family &amp; multi-family residences; duplexes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR-5 CR-4 uses</td>
<td>6,000 (5 acre min site Opt. D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR Transitional</td>
<td>CR-3, CR-4, CR-5 uses; offices; day care center; motel/ hotel; health care center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMH-1 Mobile Home 1</td>
<td>Manufactured or site built homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMH-2 Mobile Home 2</td>
<td>Manufactured or site built homes; mobile home park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH Trailer Homesite</td>
<td>Trailer (RV) park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU Multiple Use</td>
<td>Site-built or manufactured homes commercial or light industrial if MU use permit is obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR Major Resort</td>
<td>Major resort Minimum 20 acre site area. One guest room per 4,356 square foot site area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVC Rural Village Center</td>
<td>Retail Business Maximum 20 acre zoning district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-1 Local Business</td>
<td>Retail business, all TR uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-2 General Business</td>
<td>CB-1 uses; whole-sale; storage of equipment and household goods;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPI Campus Park Industrial</td>
<td>Manufacturing; research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI-1 Light/ Industrial Warehousing</td>
<td>Limited CI-2 and intensive industrial uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI-2 General Industrial</td>
<td>Limited CB-2, CI-1 uses; other industrial uses subject to conditions and performance stds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI-3 Heavy Industrial</td>
<td>Limited CI-2 and intensive industrial uses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more detailed descriptions see: [http://www.pimaxpress.com/Planning/plan4c.htm](http://www.pimaxpress.com/Planning/plan4c.htm)
Appendix C: Zoning Classifications (City of Tucson)

R1: Urban, low-density, single-family, residential development together with schools, parks, and other public services.

R2: Medium density, single-family and multifamily, residential development together with schools, parks, and other public services.

R3: High density, residential development and compatible uses.

NC: Low-intensity, small-scale, commercial and office uses that are compatible in size and design with adjacent residential uses. Residential and other related uses are permitted.

C1: Low-intensity, commercial and other uses that are compatible with adjacent residential uses. Residential and other related uses are permitted.

C2: General commercial uses that serve the community and region. Residential and other related uses are also permitted.

C3: Mid-rise development of general commercial uses that serve the community and region, located downtown or in other major activity center areas. Residential and other related uses are also permitted.

O1: Administrative and professional office uses that will complement the residential environment. Development within this zone typically consists of office conversions from existing residential uses fronting on major streets and new construction of small-scale office projects.

O2: Office, medical, civic, and other land uses which provide reasonable compatibility with adjoining residential uses. Typical development within this zone is two-story office or medical projects.

O3: Mid-rise office development and other land uses which provide reasonable compatibility with adjoining residential uses.

I1: Industrial uses, that do not have offensive characteristics, in addition to land uses allowed in more restrictive nonresidential zones.

I2: Industrial uses that are generally nuisances, making them incompatible with most other land use. These nuisances may be in the form of air pollutants; excessive noise, traffic, glare, or vibration; noxious odors; the use of hazardous materials; or unsightly appearance.

P1: Corporate business centers and for wholesaling and manufacturing activities that can be carried on in an unobtrusive, controlled manner.

MH1: Low to medium density, residential development primarily in mobile home structures on individual lots and within mobile home parks. Civic, educational, recreational, and religious uses are also permitted.
Appendix D: Explanation of Terms

Water Harvesting

**Active Rainwater Harvesting**
Cisterns capture rainwater from hard surfaces, usually roofs, and store the water for later use. This is referred to as active rainwater harvesting.

**Passive Rainwater Harvesting**
Berms, basins and other land sculpting can slow the flow of rain water and help retain it on site, allowing more water to percolate into the ground at a certain location. Land sculpting is called passive harvesting because the water is not saved for later use.

Active and Passive Rainwater Harvesting on a Residential Site
Cisterns and land sculpting can work together to help capture rain water and irrigate a landscape.
Curb Cuts
The term “curb cut” refers to making cuts into a standard raised curb. These cuts can be made to improve accessibility for people or vehicles, or to help capture rain water from street run-off. The most common applications of curb cuts seen in Tucson are shown below.

Accessibility Curb Cut
This curb cut with a non-slip ramp allows for universal accessibility to and from the sidewalk level.

Water Harvesting Curb Cut
The lateral curb cuts allow street flow to be captured and held in a small, vegetated detention basin.

Water Harvesting and Accessibility Curb Cuts
The lateral curb cuts allow water to flow into a small retention basin, flow under the sidewalk, and then overflow back out into the street. The orange area is an accessibility curb cut with a ramp and non-slip, highly visible tread.

Vehicular Curb Cut
This curb cut is meant to provide vehicular access to a driveway.
Appendix D: Explanation of Terms

Pedestrian Paths and Bus Stop Typologies

**Sheltered Bus Stop**
Sheltered bus stops provide a rain and sun proof cover, and often wind-dampening side panels and seating.

**Un-Sheltered Bus Stop**
Un-sheltered bus stops are locations where a bus will pick-up and drop-off passengers, but where no structure has been provided for those waiting.

**Pedestrian Walking Path**
Pedestrian walking paths can function like sidewalks by being placed within the back-of-curb area and providing a dedicated space for pedestrians. This kind of back-of-curb path is often not ADA accessible, however.

**Sidewalk**
Sidewalks are paved, level paths within the back-of-curb area that provide a dedicated space for pedestrians separate from motor vehicle and bicycle traffic.
Crossing Typologies

**Signed and Striped Pedestrian Crosswalk**
Provides greater visibility for a pedestrian crossing location.

**TOUCAN Crossing**
This crossing allows both bicyclists and pedestrians to cross. Both bike buttons and pedestrian signal buttons are usually provided. Toucans typically utilize a full signal (red, yellow, green).

**PELICAN Crossing**
This crossing is two phased, with a pedestrian refuge island in the median. The pelican can utilize a full signal (red, yellow, green) or a flashing red light.

**HAWK Crossing**
Signaled single phase pedest...
Appendix E: Existing Transit

Existing Sun Tran Bus Service and the NSP2 Selected Neighborhoods
The dark blue outlined area indicates the NSP2 Target Area.
Appendix F: Projected Transit

2040 RTP Proposed Plan
Source: Pima Association of Governments (PAG) 2010
Appendix G: Center for Neighborhood Technology

Center for Neighborhood Technology: Methods and Data
The Drachman Institute utilized data analyses by the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) to create housing and transportation affordability maps for each neighborhood.

The following information (taken from the CNT website) provides a brief explanation of their methods and data. For more detailed information on the Housing and Transportation Affordability Index, see http://htaindex.cnt.org/.

The Housing and Transportation Affordability Index (H&T Index) was constructed to estimate three dependent variables (auto ownership, auto use, and transit use) as functions of eleven independent variables (median income, per capita income, average household size, average commuters per household, residential density, gross density, average block size, intersection density, transit connectivity, transit access shed, and employment access). The H&T Index was constructed at the Census block group level using the 2009 American Community Survey 5-year estimates as the primary dataset.

VARIABLES

Dependent Variables: Transportation Costs
Three components of transportation behavior (auto ownership, auto use, and transit use) are combined to estimate the cost of transportation.

Independent Variables: Household Characteristics

- **HOUSEHOLD INCOME**
  Median household income is obtained from the 2009 American Community Survey, 5-Year Estimates. Per capita income is calculated as median household income divided by average household size.

- **AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE**
  Average household size is the “Total Population in Occupied Housing Units by Tenure” and “Tenure” to define the universe of occupied housing units.

- **AVERAGE COMMUTERS PER HOUSEHOLD**
  Average commuters per household is calculated using the total number of workers age sixteen and older who do not work at home and means of transportation to work.

Independent Variables: Neighborhood Characteristics

- **HOUSEHOLD DENSITY**
  Residential density represents household density of residential areas, in contrast to population density on land area. Gross density is calculated as total households divided by total land acres.

- **STREET CONNECTIVITY AND WALKABILITY**
  Street connectivity and walkability are calculated through average block size and intersection density.

- **TRANSIT ACCESS**
  Transit access is measured through General Transit Feed Specification (GTFS) data collected and created by the Center for Neighborhood Technology. As of February 2012, CNT has compiled station and stop data for bus, rail, and ferry service for more than 75 percent of all metropolitan and micropolitan areas in the United States.

- **EMPLOYMENT ACCESS**
  The Employment Access Index calculates both the quantity and distance to all employment destinations, relative to any given block group.

REGIONAL TYPICAL, REGIONAL MODERATE, AND NATIONAL TYPICAL

Regional Typical
The Regional Typical Household assumes a household income that is the median income for the region, the average household size for the region, and the average commuters per household for the region. An important aspect of the H+T Index is that transportation costs are modeled for the “typical” household in a region, or the household represented by these three values.
By fixing income, household size, and commuters, the model controls for the impact of these variables on transportation costs. Differences in transportation costs are therefore a result of neighborhood characteristics and variation in the built environment. When variables are shown as a percent of income, this median income value is used. Therefore, the variable can be interpreted as the cost impact of a given location on the average household in the region.

**Regional Moderate and National Typical**

CNT has modeled data for three typical households, each with a different income level. The first is the Regional Typical Household, with its assumptions described above. Second is the Regional Moderate Household, which assumes a household income of 80 percent of the regional median, the regional average household size, and the regional average commuters per household. Third, the National Typical Household assumes a household income of $51,425 (the national median household income), a national average household size of 2.6, and a national average number of commuters per household of 1.15.

**Application To Selected NSP2 Neighborhoods**

Given the recommendations provided by CNT, the selected NSP2 neighborhoods utilized the Regional Moderate model. Based on CNT’s calculations, the Regional Typical income is $45,885, while the Regional Moderate Income is $36,708. The median income in all selected neighborhoods is less than 80 percent of the regional median income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Neighborhood Median Income</th>
<th>Model Utilized*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bravo Park Lane</td>
<td>$33,047</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>$25,652</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Mountain</td>
<td>$27,398</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairgrounds</td>
<td>$22,799</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Niños</td>
<td>$34,063</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Villa</td>
<td>$23,086</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 10.1: Neighborhood Designation as Regional Moderate or Regional Typical**

*Model Utilized is designated based off of a comparison of the Neighborhood Median Income to the Regional Typical or Regional Moderate Household income levels.