

# MEETING MINUTES

## City of Flagstaff

### REGIONAL PLAN CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

3:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.

November 3, 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 213-2611 (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"/> Julie Leid	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maury Herman	<input type="checkbox"/> Mike Nesbitt
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carol Bousquet (Vice Chairman)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alex Wright	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Judy Louks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eva Putzova
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ben Anderson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jean Griego	<input type="checkbox"/> William Ring	<input type="checkbox"/> Susan Bean
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shaula Hedwall	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Devonna McLaughlin	<input type="checkbox"/> Nat White	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Richard Henn
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jerome Naleski	<input type="checkbox"/> Don Walters	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Trish Rensink	

#### III. APPROVAL of MINUTES for October 6, 2011 CAC Meetings

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Recommend changes and approve [October 6, 2011 meeting minutes](#).

Jerome Naleski made the motion to accept the minutes as written and Trish Rensink seconded it. The motion carried.

#### 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/>*

There were no public comments.

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

##### A. Community Character

(est. 90 minutes)

PURPOSE: 1) Townsite Historic Neighborhood – *Duffy Westheimer*

HANDOUT: [Townsite Historic Neighborhood](#)

Duffie Westheimer presented a letter, Power Point and oral information to the CAC about the Townsite Historic Neighborhood, in which she lives. 79% of the residents in the neighborhood support the Historic District designation. She requested that the district be left off of any redevelopment map for the future Regional Plan.

2) Community Character Element - continued

FACILITATOR: Jim Cronk

HANDOUT: [Community Character Packet 2 - updated October 25, 2011](#)

Jim Cronk coordinated the information and discussion about Community character. This meeting addressed Neighborhood Preservation and Revitalization, section 2. Policy 2.1 and 2.2 were addressed simultaneously.

**Policy NP2.1**—Preserve the established Downtown intensity, land use, building height, and appropriate urban design.

**Policy NP2.2**—Future Downtown Development and contiguous development shall respect the established development intensity, historical architecture and urban design.

Judy Louks asked for clarification of what the “downtown district” is. Karl Eberhard, Community Design and Redevelopment manager explained that it is the historic district bounded by Humphreys to Agassiz and Route 66 to Cherry. Judy Louks asked what the contiguous area is considered to be. Karl Eberhard described it as the Central District, which is located between Butler to Columbus and Sitgreaves to Agassiz. Paul Babbitt noted that there is a block within that area in which the current zoning code allows a four story building to be able to be built. Jim Cronk said that is true. If the CAC wants to change the limits through policy, they can and then the zoning codes will be changed in accordance. Judy Louks commented that the skyline appearance and rooftop architecture design is more important than actual height allowance, especially in a low lying area. Maury Herman said that some of the current existing building design is not particularly architecturally significant. He would like the wording “selected” increases of building intensity. Jim Cronk said that from a development perspective that a hypothetic three story building would match the intensity of the downtown and would be allowed currently. He suggested that policy 2.1 and 2.2 be combined. Policy 2.2 would make the area covered larger. Trish Rensink commented that 2.1 is included in 2.2 and that 2.2 is sufficient. Judy Louks said that downtown was always meant to have more intensity. Maury Herman suggested not changing downtown’s intensity, but as you branch out further, allow some density changes. Jim Cronk clarified that the word intensity is for commercial areas and density is for residential areas.

Alex Wright moved that the CAC accept NP2.2 as amended and delete NP2.1. Trish Rensink seconded it.

**Approved Policy NP2.2**—Future Downtown Development and contiguous development shall respect the established intensity of the historic core, historical architecture and urban design, and allow increases in intensity and density outside the historic core

The vote was taken and carried by a voice vote.

Would these policies direct all new construction to comply with existing historical architecture, would this prohibit connector bridges? *No, but the bridge would not be steel and glass, but be respectful of the historical architectures.*

Clarification was asked about this policy implication to parking garages? *Parking garages would be not precluded or preferred, however, their architecture would have to comply.*

Revitalization and Redevelopment section was addressed next.

**Goal RR1** – Revitalization and Redevelopment of the urban core shall be compatible with and enhance Community Character.

There were no comments or discussion on it. Don Walters moved that it be accepted. Richard Henn seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous.

**Policy RR1.1**—Promote Quality Infill Development which is contextual with surrounding development

**Policy RR1.2**—Promote Identified Redevelopment Areas

The motion then was voted on to adopt RR1.2 and RR1.2 and the vote carried unanimously.

**Policy RR1.3** - Promote redevelopment over Infill.

Discussion: It is important to encourage redevelopment first and infill second, knowing that historic preservation is also important. Revitalization values preserving existing structures, addresses historic aspect in priorities – good discussion within text. How would this be implemented with private parcels? Zoning code could incentivize redevelopment over infill; incentives could be built in to encourage redeveloping more than infill building of a vacant lot. Jim Cronk asked if the CAC wanted to prioritize or not? Nat White wanted to support redevelopment first and infill secondly in prioritizing.

Eva Putzova made a motion to prioritize and Nat White seconded it. The hand vote was eight to eight. Paul voted to break the tie, and the motion failed.

Is 'infill' really any vacant lot within city limits?

**Definitions** (used at Design Charrettes; CAC may revise):

**Revitalize:** Repairing what is already in place, adding new vigor, remodeling and preserving.

**Redevelop:** New development replacing outdated and underutilized development.

**Infill:** New buildings on vacant parcels within city service boundaries and surrounded by existing development.

**Goal CD1 - New buildings, public spaces and landscaping will reflect the design traditions of Flagstaff.**

What are the 'Design Traditions of Flagstaff'? *The Draft Community Character Element page 4 described the overall aesthetics of the 'design traditions' in the manner of local materials, colors and respecting the natural environment. Pages 17-19 describe the various 'Design Eras' – in which the Pre-Route 66 eras are more sympathetic with the idea of natural materials and colors.*

Paul Babbitt said that the turn of the century architecture is simply utilitarian design, not non-architectural. Karl Eberhard said that the local modern designs have more architectural design than the older ones. Modern architecture can be respectful of traditional architecture, with scale, proportions, site design, materials and colors. Maury Herman stated that some of the past architecture is less interesting and that the CAC should define where they want to go architecturally. Carol Bousquet wanted the definition linked to traditional designs.

Nat White moved to accept Goal CD1 with amended changes, and that the traditional design be the standard. Trish Rensink seconded it.

A motion was made and seconded that Goal CD1 be accepted with a footnote on page 17 concerning traditional design. Vote carries.

Judy Louks inquired whether this would prohibit using newer building materials that might be more cost efficient and energy efficient. *New materials and modern technologies can reflect past architecture styles and are able to be used to emulate the style. The design traditions in Flagstaff are currently interpreted to mean pre- Route 66.* Julie Leid doesn't want to prohibit 'modern' design. Karl Eberhard explained that the real question is, "Is it contextual?" If it is not, it does not belong there and should be kept in a separate

area. Judy Louks said Route 66 is an integral part of who Flagstaff is. Karl Eberhard agreed that along Route 66 that the 1960's and 50's style would be appropriate, but that elsewhere it does not belong. Location is the key and it is already included in the new zoning code.

Jim Cronk stated that CD 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 (community design) received few comments. Jerome Naleski pointed out Bill Ring's written submitted comments, and asked who is financially responsible to construct new infrastructure to support building projects. *When new development comes in and the existing infrastructure is insufficient to support it, the new development pays for it, because the new development created the need. Other options are: to create 'development district's' for smaller areas of new development or redevelopment so the cost is share; CIP Planning; and 'Improvement Districts'.* Jerome Naleski inquired whether the city should be paying for infrastructure as an incentive for redevelopment areas. Jim Cronk responded that incentives are possible, and will be discussed during the 'Cost of Development' section, and will need to be addressed in 'Economic Development' also.

Regarding CD 1.2 and 1.3 (streetscape plans and corridor plans) Maury Herman noted that if we truly want 'complete streets', which are significantly wider, then setbacks need to be mandated earlier instead of later to accommodate those amenities and new development or redevelopment as it happens. *The CAC will discuss and decide upon these locations in 'Circulation'.*

Devonna McLaughlin commented that CD 1.3 appears to be a strategy. She suggested putting it below CD 1.2 as a strategy. Trish Rensink said that CD 1.2 is also a strategy for CD 1.1.

Alex Wright made a motion to accept CD 1.1 and CD 1.4 as policies and CD 1.2 and CD 1.3 are placed as strategies under CD 1.1.

The vote was taken and the motion carried.

**Policy CD1.1-** Promote quality design and development for all future projects to enhance a positive image and identity for the Region

**Strategy CD1.2-** Develop a streetscape design plan.

**Strategy CD1.3-** Develop Coordinated Corridor Plans for major arterials.

**Policy CD1.4-** Utilities are considered part of the overall design aesthetics.

Mike Nesbitt asked how these strategies fit into the County's Belmont region. Jim Cronk explained that the County Comprehensive Plan and the Regional Plan both defer to the County's area plans for details of how these policies apply.

Regarding Policy CD1.4 and the possibility of undergrounding utilities: Maury Herman noted that this is very expensive and not in anyone's budget. Jim Cronk said that the intent is to address overhead utilities and more applicably huge utility boxes that sit on the curb or right on the corner of sites where they are highly visible. Nat White noted that the city has historically found cheaper ways to bury utility lines when residents were insistent. Kim Sharp said people repeatedly brought up their displeasure about the visibility of utility boxes during community discussions. This is a way to make future expectations known, that utility boxes could be placed in more aesthetically pleasing locations and/or be screened, and that overhead lines may be able to be buried in some locations, especially within significant viewsheds.

**B.**  **Development Scenarios** (est. 20 minutes)

PURPOSE: **Review Kimley-Horn Preliminary Report**

FACILITATOR: Dave Wessel

HANDOUT: [Kimley-Horn Summary Report](#) - 10/28/2011

[CAC Working Group / FMPO – Round 1 Scenario Analysis](#)

[Scenario Assumptions](#)

[Regional Plan Guiding Principles / Scenarios Comparison](#)

This section was tabled, as time ran out.

**VI. NEW BUSINESS** - Introduced agenda items.

**A. SEDI Indicators Report** (est. 10 minutes)

PURPOSE: Review SEDI's work on defining 'measurement's of community sustainability.

FACILITATOR: Bill Ring, CAC Member and SEDI Member

This section was tabled until December.

**B.**  **Path Forward: Schedule Alternatives** (est. 30 minutes)

PURPOSE: Discuss schedule

FACILITATOR: Paul Babbitt, Chair and Carol Bousquet, CAC Vice-Chair

HANDOUT: Regional Plan Schedule Alternatives – *hard-copy available at CAC Meeting*

Carol Bousquet gave a description of the historic progress of the CAC to create the regional plan, including a Power Point presentation. A recent steering committee meeting gave a modified work schedule and timeline proposal, in order to avoid burnout from committee members and make the city staff's time more productive. The original commitment was for two years, but the committee has now been working for two and a half years already, with the projected possible time of completion at this rate now being November 2014. The proposed plan is as follows: Current group CAC meetings would be suspended for five months and working groups would meet instead with staff and community experts to draft the remaining sections. In May of 2012, a complete draft prepared by city staff would be presented to the CAC and community and full CAC meetings would be reconvened for 3 months. This would allow the CAC to attend to policy issues as opposed to editing issues. After consideration by the CAC and revisions, the draft would be given again to the community for review in September 2012. A public education and comment time would ensue until January 2013. In January, the public comments would be considered and the plan revised. The document would be sent in April 2013 to the Planning and Zoning Commission, the City Council and Supervisors. The document would then be presented for public vote in November 2013.

Jim Cronk asked the CAC members to give direction as to what their big issues are for the remaining elements (housing, economic development, public facilities, growth areas, cost of development, circulation and land use) at the December 2011 CAC meeting. The CAC input would be combined with public input from the focus groups, town halls, experts research, and the surveys. The CAC should give input into what community members or experts the CAC wants included in the groups. The CAC members need to volunteer for the working groups as well.

Nat White appreciates the effort to improve the plan's efficiency. The CAC could then focus on the larger issues rather than the smaller ones and he believes the issues will come back to the CAC anyway.

Judy Louks appreciates the diversity of the focus groups, but thinks splitting into smaller working groups is eliminating the appropriate diversity. She believes that it is inappropriate to condense the process now and limit the input of the members of the CAC group that have waited patiently through the other portions of the plan in order to have the same amount of input about issues they are personally passionate about.

Maury Herman stated that it has been valuable to listen to discussions during meetings about issues that are not that personally important to him. He does not support the changes in the timeline.

Ben Anderson stated he has lost some enthusiasm for the process because of the increased length of the commitment. The new timeline meets his original expectations better.

Don Walters supports the new plan because the CAC would review and revise the draft that would be created by staff.

Richard Henn supports the new plan because of having a more completed draft document to consider puts the 'whole picture' into perspective.

Jerome Naleski thinks that the time frame is too short and he would like to see the two time frames combined.

Trish Rensink believes the CAC's line by line analysis has been too extensive and that the discussion by the CAC after the working groups have met would be more efficient.

Maury Herman said that the acceptance of the document depends substantially on the buy-ins from interested groups such as the Friends of Flagstaff's Future.

Paul Babbitt said that the proposed plan gives ample opportunity for the interest groups to be included.

Judy Louks wants a list of who is in each working group. She stated that the strong interest of some of the CAC members is because the existing Regional Plan document has been used against them (the development community) in economic development in the past. The word-by-word, line-by-line process is very important to the group members involved in development. It can be very costly if it is not done.

Alex Wright stated that some of the group members have been waiting very patiently as other members addressed their passions. She believes that these discussions should be held in front of the full CAC, that the rest of the issues in economic development deserve the same respect, time and attention as previous issues. She prefers not moving to the new timeline.

Richard Henn said the new plan gives the staff the opportunity to provide the CAC with a strong document to work from and the CAC's review can be extended as is needed, the CAC can take 5 months if 3 is not sufficient.

The vote was taken. Six were in favor of option 2, and 7 were opposed. The currently existing timeline and plan will be followed.

**VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**A. CAC Working Groups:**

- a. Housing (McLaughlin, Louks, Naleski, )
- b. Economic Development (Wright, Walters, Ring, Rensink)

**B. [Community Resilience to Climate Change](#) – Memo, Stephanie Smith**

[The announcement section was not addressed during this meeting.](#)

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

[The meeting was adjourned at 5:58 pm.](#)