

MINUTES

SPECIAL WORK SESSION
MONDAY, MAY 20, 2013
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
211 WEST ASPEN AVENUE
4:00 P.M.

1. Call to Order.

Mayor Nabours called the Flagstaff Special Work Session of May 20, 2013, to order at 4:02 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Councilmembers present:

MAYOR NABOURS
VICE MAYOR EVANS
COUNCILMEMBER BAROTZ
COUNCILMEMBER BREWSTER
COUNCILMEMBER ORAVITS
COUNCILMEMBER OVERTON
COUNCILMEMBER WOODSON

Councilmembers absent:

NONE

Others present: City Manager Kevin Burke; Interim City Attorney Michelle D'Andrea; Community Development Director Mark Landsiedel; Zoning Code Administrator Roger Eastman; Nat White, Flagstaff resident and former City councilor; Marilynn Weismann, Friends of Flagstaff's Future; Richard Bowen, ECONA; Julie Pastrick, Flagstaff Chamber of Commerce; Tad Riggs, Northern Arizona Builders Association and Northern Arizona Association of Realtors; David Carpenter, Chairman of Planning and Zoning Commission; Maury Herman, Flagstaff 40; Keri Sylvan, Attorney for Michael Manson.

3. Discussion/direction on the Zoning Map amendment (zone change) process, Division 10-20.50 of the Flagstaff Zoning Code.

Mayor Nabours explained that the last meeting concluded with the question of what degree of detail is acceptable to answer the certainty concern, at what time, and with what level of public input.

Zoning Code Administrator Roger Eastman presented a series of options that staff formulated for the group to review. The options could be combined to formulate a more acceptable solution. The options are as follows:

- 1) Do nothing
- 2) Redefine the requirements in the framework of what we do today.
- 3) Addition of new category for highly complex projects
- 4) Provide option of developer choice to go through expedited process or standard process based on level of detail provided.

- 5) Addition of an additional Planning and Zoning commission review after zone change.
- 6) Correctional zoning.

Nat White and Councilmember Barotz presented their idea of correctional zoning. The purpose of correctional zoning is to acknowledge that some properties are zoned wrong based on their location and neighboring parcels and offer a way to rezone quickly. The concept is an idea; staff would need to drill down the details on what the process would actually look like.

Mr. Eastman presented the idea of Concept Planning. With concept planning enough basic information would be necessary to assess impact without full blown design. At this stage the City can add conditions to the zoning to address any concerning impacts of extract possible uses not available. The City Council would have significant discretion at this stage. The burden is on the developer to offer as much detail as possible, the more the developer provides, the easier it is to get through the process but when there are a number of unknowns a concept plan may be all that is needed to move the process along.

There was concern expressed from the group about public participation and when that needs to occur. There has to be an appropriate balance for what the public needs to know and when. There is also concern about potentially lengthening the process with public participation; it has to be done in such a way that the discussion focuses on real concerns and not wished-for concerns.

A break was called from 5:47 p.m. to 5:55 p.m.

The following were the issues and concerns as defined by the group.

- Public Participation as part of zoning categories not just distance, also timing and how it is done.
- Can't go back if lessen restrictions, Prop 207 may not allow to reverse.
- No need for public input if no impact.
- Can require additional public input as a condition of rezoning.
 - After site plan approved by staff
 - Not hearing but informative public meeting
- Concept zoning plan may be too broad and untested.
- More definition to as needed
- Higher quality public participation.

At this time Mayor Nabours opened the floor for public participation.

Paul Moore, architect and Planning and Zoning member, addressed the group suggesting that it makes sense to think about doing work associated with the level to where the project is. Developers need to commit to an idea but not at the level of detail currently required. It is important to give the public a chance to see what is coming at a point that is appropriate.

Georgia Duncan, member of Friends of Flagstaff's Future and former Planning and Zoning Commission member, addressed the group offering that citizen participation is highly important.

David Monihan addressed the group and offered that he is attracted to the concept of correctional rezoning. Public input is necessary but should be done in a way that they understand.

After further discussion the group came to a consensus to direct staff to start looking at Option #4 with it stated that the City Council can require additional public meetings if Council names that as a condition. Additionally, look at Option #6 to see if it is even practical and how they might incorporate it into #4.

- Option 4 with 6 and public participation condition.
 - A factor to consider
 - Legal definition – keep it legal
 - Consistent with regional plan
 - Surrounded (define) by other use
 - Special consideration or problem
 - No use/user defined
 - Determine how correctional zoning could work
 - Master Plan/Highly Complex

The group also asked staff to compare Option 4 with the current process to see how it differs.

6. **Adjournment**

The Flagstaff City Council Special Work Session of May 20, 2013, adjourned at 6:48 p.m.

MAYOR

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK