

# MEETING MINUTES

## City of Flagstaff

### REGIONAL PLAN CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**3:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. June 2, 2011**

Northern Arizona Healthcare Educational Offices: 1000 N. Humphrey's Suite 241, Flagstaff, AZ;  
in the Fort Valley shopping center, south of the hospital.



In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact Bonita Sears at 928-779-7632, ext. 7294 (or 774-5281 TDD). Notification at least 48 hours in advance will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements.

*Draft Regional Plan Vision Statement:*

***The Greater Flagstaff community embraces the region's extraordinary cultural and ecological setting on the Colorado Plateau through active stewardship of the natural and built environments. Residents and visitors encourage and advance intellectual, environmental, social and economic vitality for today's citizens and future generations.***

#### **I. CALL TO ORDER**

#### **II. Roll Call**

##### **A. Committee Members:**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Paul Babbitt (Chairman)	<input type="checkbox"/> Michael Chaveas	<input type="checkbox"/> Maury Herman	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mike Nesbitt
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carol Bousquet (Vice Chairman)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alex Frawley	<input type="checkbox"/> Judy Louks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eva Putzova
<input type="checkbox"/> Ben Anderson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jean Griego	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> William Ring	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Susan Bean	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shaula Hedwall	<input type="checkbox"/> Devonna McLaughlin	<input type="checkbox"/> Nat White
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Richard Henn	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jerome Naleski	

##### **Alternate Members:**

Don Walters       Julie Leid       Trish Rensink

#### **III. APPROVAL of MINUTES for May 5, 2011 CAC Meetings**



RECOMMENDED ACTION: Recommend changes and approve 5/5/11 [Meeting Minutes](#).

County Superintendant Mandy Metzger from the Regional Plan Steering Committee was present and invited CAC to a Joint County Board of Supervisors / City Council meeting on June 20 and Picture Canyon on June 11, 10am.

Quorum present. Motion to approve minutes. Motion seconded. Vote to approve minutes.  
Minutes approved.

#### **IV. PUBLIC COMMENT**

*At this time, any member of the public may address the Committee on any subject within their jurisdiction that is not scheduled before the Commission on that day. Due to Open Meeting Laws, the Committee cannot discuss or act on items presented during this portion of the agenda. To address the Committee on an item that is on the agenda, please wait for the Chair to call for Public Comment at the time the item is heard. If time does not allow all comments to be heard, public comments may be posted to the Regional Plan blog: <http://flagregionalplan2012.wordpress.com/>*

#### **V. OLD BUSINESS** - Continued, postponed, and tabled agenda items.

##### **A. Development Scenarios**

*(est. 60 minutes)*

PURPOSE: CAC Sub-committee to present progress to date, proposed 'input' and 'output' measures, and upcoming Design Charrette schedule. Sandra Epstein from ASU Decision Theater in attendance to discuss proposed process to Development Scenarios.

FACILITATORS: Dave Wessel and CAC Sub-Committee

Sandy Epstein from ASU Decision Theatre Research explained how the models are integrated with various scenarios and 'what ifs'.

Facilitator gave overview since last meeting. Three scenarios have been presented 1) Trend Development 2) Current Regional Plan and 3) Urban Node. Handouts of schedule, working outline and progress report made available to group.

Facilitator reviewed each scenario and outputs associated with each. Definitions of Development Scenarios will be published to the web for everyone to review. A short video of how to use the Community VIS software was presented to the group. It was also explained that potential measurements are not absolute, but asking Committee at this meeting if they are on the right track going forward. Information will be posted on the web and Committee Members need to provide feedback.

Responses:

- Putzova: Why is water listed as an output measurement? Discussions ensued to explain this as an input and output item in scenarios.
- King: Are NAU plans factored into any of these scenarios? Sandy has suggestions on how to incorporate these (unknown) factors into the plans.
- It was mentioned that someone should try to find realistic (in writing) data from NAU so the information is factored.
- Putzova: Questions were raised if the economic level in Phoenix impacts this data. If no current information is available maybe we can use a 50-year history to create data.
- Possibly use Phoenix data in one scenario and universities data in one scenario to see impacts.
- Babbitt: do we have access to 2010 census info? It is being made available in 'pieces' via web ([www.census.gov](http://www.census.gov)) and this data will be used as it is made available.
- Need to maintain *regional scenarios*, not just city numbers.

The Committee was asked to email any questions or comments before charrettes in July. Scenarios will be further revised and refined after charrettes by the CAC through the Kimley-Horn consultant process.

**B.  Infill / Redevelopment Assessment** (est. 30 minutes)

PURPOSE: Discuss Assessment Report and suggest priorities, as well as relate to section

FACILITATORS: John Saltonstall

HANDOUTS: [Redevelopment Assessment](#) – March 22, 2011

MAPS will be available at the meeting for discussion.

Mr. Saltonstall gave follow-up on last month's topic, in which CAC feedback was requested. The [redemption and incentive assessment](#) discussion with Council was reviewed.

Handouts were provided to the group, and questions were entertained:

- Naleski: asked facilitator to elaborate on incentives presented at last meeting. *Department staff and outside suggestions, including CAC, initiated further incentives and tools, which will be incorporated into the new regional plan. Council wants to redevelop certain areas of town.*

- King: Infill & Redevelopment needs to work in conjunction with Community Character.
- If the plan is to draw density to the core, then tools and incentives need to be considered along with infrastructure needs.
- Putzova: What tools do other communities use? *In the last paper, general tools we described in detail. Ones that have worked with other cities were chosen and inserted in the plan. That framework will be used in the scenarios.*
- Which tools to use will depend on specific data collected, as well as site specific considerations?
- Need to bring it all together into a new Redevelopment Plan.
- Definitions were provided.
- Reviewed tools for advancing R&I

Three maps were shared to begin conversation on these matters.

1. [Heritage Map](#) showing construction, years improvements were made going back to the 1960's. This information assists with historic preservation.
2. [Infill Map](#) showing city limits, urban service boundaries and vacant properties, urban infill and outside city limits. There are many 'vacant' parcels, of which many in the community assume is 'open space. This ensued the conversation:
  - a. Need to define "infill" – there are national standards and AZ State Statute definitions that will be outlined. What is appropriate for Flagstaff?
  - b. Need to define "redevelopment areas – again referring to national standards and AZ State Statute definitions, and then deciding what is appropriate for Flagstaff.
3. [Activity Centers Map](#): age of infrastructure and water/sewer lines since the 1960's, which outlines needed upgrades and/or up-sizing to encourage 'infill' and 'redevelopment' in particular areas. These areas will be articulated more through the community design charrette process.

Facilitator reviewed the feedback that had been received and reviewed the need of a commission to be formed to make the changes.

- Charlotte Welsh (public) explained Arizona statues that relate to implementing infill plans and provided copies to the group.

Facilitator asked group to email him any concerns.

BREAK was called.

c.  **Community Character** (est. 60 minutes)

PURPOSE: Review and discuss text, goals and policies thus far with proposed edits

FACILITATORS: Jim Cronk

HANDOUT: [Community Character Packet #2](#) – updated 5/26/11

An updated "Community Character Element Packet #2" was provided to the group, with suggested CAC edits highlighted in red. Open House comments regarding urban, suburban and rural areas were discussed; along with public assumptions of 'worst characteristics', 'challenges' and proposed definitions of neighborhood 'preservation', 'revitalization' and 'redevelopment'. Today we will discuss 4 goals and 10 policies.

### **Goal #1 Heritage Preservation**

**“Preserve Heritage Resources and consider regional heritage in future developments”.**

**Policy 1.1** had no comments received.

**“Protect Historical, Archeological and Cultural Resources by identification and preservation.”**

Discussion: Zoning code doesn't mesh with this policy. These are “goals and policy”. Zoning code defines “how” to make it happen.

Voted on by group. PASSED.

**Policy 1.2** had no comments received.

**“Preserve and improve the Quality of historic housing, buildings and structures and neighborhoods through their restoration and rehabilitation.”**

Discussion:

- Why some words and phrases were capitalized – what's the meaning?  
Decided it was formatting errors, no meaning.
- Strategies need work to promote character by investing in neighborhoods.  
King to email Jim strategy to be added.
- Charlotte Welsh added Secretary of Interior standards and guidelines need to be followed for preservation.

Rich made motion to accept. Jerome 2<sup>nd</sup>. Voted on by group. PASSED.

### **Goal #2 Neighborhood Preservations and Revitalization**

**“The Flagstaff region will maintain healthy and diverse neighborhoods, from urban to suburban to rural. “**

Discussion:

- Would like definitions of “healthy” and “diverse” before vote.
- Words are defined through the strategies.
- How do we decide which neighborhoods are “healthy” and “diverse”?
- Proposed to use the word “foster” instead of “maintain.

Call to approve Goal #2 and all following policies.

*Goal #2* – Putzova made motion to modify word to “have” not “maintain” DENIED

Ring motioned to approve as written. Jerome 2<sup>nd</sup>. Discussions continued about defining “affordable”. Ring withdrew motion.

Facilitator proposed to break out issues and vote in them individually.

Nesbitt motioned to modify words to “foster and maintain”, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Trish Resnick. Voted. APPROVED.

**“The Flagstaff region will foster and maintain healthy and diverse neighborhoods, from urban to suburban to rural. “**

Voted on by group. PASSED with amendment.

**Policy NP 1.1** no comments received

**“Preserve and Enhance Existing Neighborhoods”**

*Policy NP 1.1 Nesbitt* motioned to approve. Ring 2<sup>nd</sup>. Voted. APPROVED.

**Policy NP 1.2** no comments received

**“Changes to neighborhoods should respect traditions, identifiable styles, proportions, streetscapes, relationships between buildings, yards and roadways; and use historically appropriate and compatible building and structural materials for the historic districts.”**

- Suggested to add urban, suburban and rural.
- The various neighborhood types are a ‘known’ since GOAL states that.
- Strategies will be discussed at a later meeting.

*Policy NP 1.2 Henn* motioned to approve. Jerome 2<sup>nd</sup>. Voted. APPROVED.

**Policy NP 1.3** no comments received

**“Retain existing affordable housing stock through conservation efforts of older residential neighborhoods, while allowing compatible infill development and accessory dwellings.”**

**Discussions:**

- Define “affordable”. *Use National, State and Local standard definitions – available.*
- Once regional plan is completed, the new zoning code will need to be amended to reflect these policies. *Yes, that has been a known from the beginning of this process.*
- Proposed to remove “affordable” to put discussions to rest.
- “Affordable” housing is a huge community priority.

*Policy NP 1.3 – discussions continued about “affordable”. Jim suggested tabling this vote until next time and trying to keep working out the wording. Policy 1.3 tabled until August meeting.*

**Policy NP 1.4** no comments received

**“Establish Interconnected Neighborhood Street and Sidewalk Patterns”.**

*This is where the CAC will pick up next meeting (August or September).*

**D. Regional Plan Process – Path Forward** (est. 30 minutes)

PURPOSE: Discuss process based upon discussion with City Manager Kevin Burke and Community Development Director Mark Landsiedel

FACILITATORS: Mark Landsiedel

This item tabled for next meeting, as time ran out.

**VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS**  (est. 10 minutes)

1. **Next regular CAC Meeting:**

**August 4, 2011, 3:30 p.m. to 6 p.m.** (2 to 6 p.m.?) at N.AZ Healthcare facilities

Agenda Items: Design Charrette results; Community Character

**Agenda Items:**

a) July Design Charrettes Open Houses (please see detailed schedule for all events):

- i. July 14, Thursday: 10 a.m. – 2 p.m. and 2 – 5 p.m. Public Open House – *big ideas*
- ii. July 15, Friday: 11 a.m. – 2 p.m. – Public Open House – *discuss OPTIONS*
- iii. July 21, Thursday: NOON – 4 p.m. – Public Open House – *Scenarios A, B, and C*
- iv. July 22, Friday: 4 – 6 p.m. Public Final Presentation

Kim reminded the group there is no meeting in July. Next meeting is August 4<sup>th</sup>. The Community Design Charrettes will be at Community Federated Church at 400 W. Aspen. Need to keep it fun – invite people to attend. Postcards will be given to Committee members to disseminate. Working on getting walking tours planned ahead of the Charrettes.

- Charlotte offered her house as part of the tours.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

Babbitt adjourned meeting at 6:03 p.m.