

# Draft Minutes Regional Plan Citizen Advisory Committee 3:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. – Thursday, October 18, 2012

\_\_\_\_\_

# Aquaplex

1702 N. Fourth Street, Flagstaff, AZ 86004

#### I. CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Bousquet called the meeting to order at 3:50 p.m.

#### II. ROLL CALL

### **Committee Members Present:**

Carol Bousquet, Vice Chair Maury Herman Julie Leid
Jerome Naleski Nat White Don Walters

Devonna McLaughlin Ben Anderson

Absent

Paul Babbitt, Chair Judy Louks Alex Wright
Eva Putzova Susan Bean Shaula Hedwall

Richard Henn

#### Attendees

Theresa Gunn, Facilitator
Jim Cronk, Planning Director
Kimberly Sharp, Acting Comprehensive Planning Mngr.
David Wessel, FMPO Manager
Justine Otto, FMPO Administrative Specialist Temp
Michelle D'Andrea, Assistant City Attorney
Tiffany Antol, Coconino County Principal Planner
Lisa Leap, National Park Service Archeologist
Gordon Taylor, State Land Department
Marilyn Weissman, Friends of Flagstaff's Future, President

### **Visitors**

Rick Miller, Lina Wallen, Betsy McKellar, John Doskicz, Kristin Bornstein, John Aber, Tish Bogan-Ozmun, Bruce Higgins,

# **III. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

#### IV. APPROVAL of MINUTES

It was noted that Ms. Hedwall had been present at the previous meeting. Vice Chair Bousquet questioned the line on page 3, "It was agreed that the Land Use map was a guide, and any buyers should attempt to adhere to it." Mr. Cronk confirmed the first half of the line. Mr. Naleski moved to strike the second half of the line and to approve the corrected Minutes for October 4th, 2012 CAC Meeting. Mr. Walters seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

#### V. OLD BUSINESS (Continued, postponed, and tabled items.)

#### A. Growth Areas

## 1. State Trust Lands

Mr. Cronk gave and overview of the maps and noted that growth areas were only shown inside of City limits. The following points were discussed:

- Section 10B (south of the I-40) would be difficult to develop, but section 10A (north of the I-40) is open for development
- State department approval is needed to change the Growth Boundary
- Sections 20 and 30 should be viewed as a coupled parcel in which approximately 768 acres are developable with a density of 3 dwelling units per acre; 768 was an agreed-upon rough estimate. That is less than 2/3 of each parcel.
- Parts of the sections nearest the Walnut Canyon Monument may eventually become part of the federal monument land with a potential expansion.
- Sections 8, 18, 6, 9, 12, 22, 28, 2, and 4 are candidates for permanent open space areas and may be purchased by the city or other conservation tools used to designate them as conservation areas.
- The National Forest parcel on Observatory Mesa is not private land.
- An ownership map needs to show National Forest
- The map being reviewed was for the purposes of discussing State Trust Land only; striped portions are eligible for open space classification, yellow sections are eligible for development
- The CAC's purpose in this section is to suggest an acceptable density level and Growth Boundary to be approved by the State
- Ms. Sharp will organize a tour of some of the parcels in question on November 9<sup>th</sup>, members of the public that wish to attend should contact her
- Recommendations for State land parcels will be made November 15<sup>th</sup>
- Ms. McKellar presented pictures of an archeological site to the CAC, and stated that the site was
  within a mile (walking distance) of section 30. She urged the Committee to consider the impact an
  addition of 3000 residents would have on the area, and the potential damage to the site that may
  result.

#### 2. Growth Boundary

Ms. Sharp presented the options of keeping the current Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), amending the boundary, or adopting the Service Areas Boundary (SAB) as the new boundary. She stated that in the past 10 years, there had been one request to change the Growth Boundary, whereas there had been four requests to change the Service Area Boundary, leading to the belief that the SAB was an effective boundary. The following points were discussed:

- The previous decision to use the SAB as the UGB was to remove the political aspects from a
  disagreement with people outside of the boundary and make it a technical issue
- The SAB already acts as a growth boundary in its own right, because developers will avoid building in places where they will not be able to access services without significant financial expenditure
- The County and areas outside of the City of Flagstaff follow a Rural Growth Boundary, which is represented on the map by a dotted yellow line
- While an UGB would encourage infill, special areas need to be accounted for by adjusting the SAB; the CAC wants to promote growth in the right places and encourage compact development
- The SAB could be a communication tool to send a message to the public and developers
- The UGB is not an absolute preventative of growth, and the SAB will not be either

Mr. White moved to adopt an as-yet-undefined Urban Growth Boundary, Mr. Naleski seconded, the motion passed unanimously. The CAC will define the Boundary at a later date based off a more detailed map provided by Ms. Sharp via the City/County GIS. A mapping exercise will be included in the field tour on November 15<sup>th</sup> as well as be discussed by the Economic Development working group.

#### 3. Growth Areas

Ms. Sharp referenced the Growth Area handout from the previous meeting. The Committee briefly perused the handout and determined that areas of focus for Growth Areas should be:

- Infill
- Redevelopment
- Densities
- Urban Growth Boundary
- Activity Centers
- Education/Entrepreneurship
- Open space/Conservation

#### B. Land Use

Ms. Sharp overviewed the handouts and stated that due to time limitations, the chip game would be forgone and the Staff would work on Growth Illustration maps in which the CAC will have multiple opportunities to amend and refine. The following points were discussed:

- The number of visitors (4 million) and local trade area residents (250,000) needs to be taken into account when making plans, as well as the different types of visits made (i.e. a day trip, stopping for lunch on the way to/from the Grand Canyon, spending the weekend at Snowbowl, etc.)
- "Rooftops" needs to be changed into "people" for clarity
- The Bellemont employment center is also a suburban neighborhood center
- The handouts will be made available online for later perusal, as well as a larger map of the entire region
- Corridors are different than centers, though the two can intersect, such as where the University center runs along the corridor
- Historical Downtown may be a regional center, but redevelopment of the area would be on an entirely different magnitude of other regional centers
- The term "retrofit areas" needs to be used more in the policy to lend it meaning
- If two regional centers (such as Historic Downtown and the University) are right next to each other, are the population numbers in those areas double-counted? No, the total number of people in a region dictates how many centers can be supported, not their location
- The exact definition of "regional centers" will be determined at the next Economic Development working group meeting
- Historic Downtown and the University should be an integrated "urban core" center, tied together with Mountain Link bus Route 10
- Scenarios B and D are not a solid basis for the maps, just a starting point for the CAC to work from, though the final product should be more Scenario D and less Scenario B
- County Planners are frequently consulted when making draft maps
- A disclaimer should be added to the map when including in the Regional Plan
- A general consensus emerged of the following language to be included: "The [land use map] indentifies where the City would support the development of particular uses, reflective of the City's desire to promote a more predictable, sustainable, and connected pattern of development and conservation for the future. The map gives information to represent ideas of growth areas, conservation areas, and connections needed to meet the overall vision of the Regional Plan."

#### C. Economic Development Element

Mr. Cronk presented the new draft of the Element in Ms. Wright's absence, outlining the specific changes the working group had made based on the CAC's previous suggestions. The following points were discussed:

- In the Activity Centers section, naming specific centers is confining
- Policy 3.9 has good intent, but the wording needs to be changed

Mr. Anderson moved to make the changes and send the draft to the editor. Mr. White seconded, the motion passed unanimously.

#### D. Announcements

Ms. Shark introduced Kristin Bornstein, who had been selected as editor for the Regional Plan. Ms. Bornstein stated that she would introduce the brand identity of the Plan to the CAC at the November 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. Ms. Sharp informed the CAC that their refreshment budget had been generously provided by Deputy Mayor Coral Evans. Mr. Cronk stated that the staff meeting would be held at 4pm on the 22<sup>nd</sup>. Vice Chair Bousquet suggested that interest groups review the draft to speed the process.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Vice Chair Bousquet adjourned the meeting at 5:58 p.m.