



FLAGSTAFF REGIONAL PLAN 2012

Draft Minutes Regional Plan Citizen Advisory Committee 3:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. – Thursday, January 24, 2013

Aquaplex
1702 N. Fourth Street, Flagstaff, AZ 86004

I. CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Bousquet called the meeting to order at 3:36 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Committee Members Present:

Carol Bousquet, Vice Chair
Julie Leid
Nat White
Eva Putzova
Maury Herman
Shaula Hedwall

Richard Henn
Alex Wright
Don Walters
Susan Bean
Jerome Naleski
Devonna McLaughlin (4:25)

Absent

Paul Babbitt, Chair
Judy Louks
Ben Anderson

Attendees

Theresa Gunn, Facilitator
Kimberly Sharp, Acting Comprehensive Planning Mngr.
Jim Cronk, Planning Director
David Wessel, FMPO Manager
Justine Otto, FMPO Admin Specialist Temp
Sue Pratt, Coconino County Community Development Director
John Aber, Coconino County Assistant Community Development Director
Kate Morley, Coconino County Planner
Mark Landsiedel, City of Flagstaff Community Development Director
Roger Eastman, City of Flagstaff Zoning Code Administrator
David Womochil, City of Flagstaff Senior Assistant Attorney
Erika Mazza, NAIPTA Transit Planner
Adam Langford, NAIPTA

Public

Betsy McKellar
Marilyn Weissman, Friends of Flagstaff's Future
Bruce Higgins, Conservation Study Forum

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

IV. APPROVAL of MINUTES

Mr. Naleski moved to approve the Minutes for January 17, 2013 CAC Meeting. Mr. Henn seconded. It was noted that Ms. Putzova had not been present and the minutes were adjusted. The motion passed unanimously.

V. **NEW BUSINESS**

A. None

VI. **OLD BUSINESS (Continued, postponed, and tabled items.)**

A. Land Use Element

Ms. Sharp overviewed the changes made to the Land use draft, focusing on the new organization of the sections, which CAC members approved of. The CAC was instructed to review the Corridors as Placemaking section. The following was discussed:

- The first paragraph is historically incorrect, the corridors began with sawmills; Route 66, Highway 89, and the hotel expansions are much more recent
- Include recognition on progress on bike access and beautification fronts, including removal of ugly billboards on Route 66
- Commercial corridors in Flagstaff have historically lacked cohesive planning
- Mr. Herman distributed a copy of his comments for the downtown section, stating that he had requested input from downtown property and business owners and would pass on their suggestions when received

In regards to the Milton corridor:

- Snowbowl traffic causes congestion on through streets
- The section should mention that the City doesn't have right-of-way for most of Milton
- Milton is congested, unfriendly/unsafe for bikes and pedestrians, uninviting, has a great view but a bad presence
- A traffic-calming entry feature (i.e. a roundabout/traffic circle) would enhance the sense of place both for Milton and Flagstaff and give a better, more distinct feel to visitors
- Brick facades on even some of the buildings would add a cohesive feel
- Previous improvements have been suggested and destroyed in the past due to lack of implementation
- Roads connecting to Milton are being diverted and fixed to sync up

In regards to the Route 66 corridor:

- Better than it was in 1990, but still lots of opportunity for rebuilding
- Renewable energies could be installed/utilized along Route 66 for an artistic edge
- Don't forget its main purpose is getting in and out of town
- Potential roundabouts aren't pedestrian-friendly
- Roundabouts can be pedestrian-friendly, but for large roads like Route 66 and Milton it's difficult
- Unique billboards on Route 66 are nostalgic and add flavor
- Renovations to h/motels can be funded by grants if they register as historical buildings, but owners may prefer to leave their property the way it is, despite the "dirty old railroad town" image it projects
- Old h/motels could be converted to student or single-family housing
- As Route 66 is the longest street in town, it should be sectioned out and addressed as different areas

In regards to the Fourth Street corridor:

- Poor transit stops, bad accessibility for bikes and pedestrians

- The Ponderosa Pines are place-making, adding both a historical and a natural edge that should be accentuated instead of landscaped over
- Feels like a transition between urban and suburban
- Not a tourist destination like other corridors, more of a local attraction
- Underutilized, especially the abundant parking
- Devonna arrived at 4:25
- The overpass was invested in before the economy faded, leaving the area underdeveloped
- Could be a good place for artists and galleries
- Ms. Mazza stated that many of their transit consultants were focused on Fourth Street as a future activity center
- Ms. Weissman inquired about a Fourth Street study group and it was confirmed that there had been a Fourth Street Plan the previous year, but it was limited to right-of-way, not development
- “The Downtown of the East Side,” should be treated as such with raised density and mixed-use buildings (i.e. housing above stores, buildings closer to the street with parking behind, etc.)
- Large sums not needed to make changes, just the right incentives
- Huge anchor stores can’t be easily moved, but more frontage development can be encouraged
- Local neighborhoods will provide the economic base needed to support an activity center
- Plan language can be used to encourage unique zone designs for future development without changing the zoning
- Buildings of more than three stories need an elevator, Federal buildings of two or more stories require an elevator

In regards to the Fort Valley corridor:

- Replace “multiple museums” with “two museums”
- The corridor has lots of access to schools, the hospital, and the tree line
- “Gateway to the Grand Canyon” has already been claimed by Williams, but would be great descriptor
- An ADOT road
- Heavily suburban with Bashas as the anchor, but if Bashas moves will become more commercial and less walkable, steps should be taken to keep families
- An east-west bypass would greatly aid emergency vehicles
- Mr. Higgins pointed out that transit could help reduce congestion, particularly a shuttle to Snowbowl or the addition of a toll
- As a natural corridor, commercial interests should be kept in nodes

In regards to the Highway 89 corridor:

- It was noted that 89 A is south of town, the section being discussed is 89 North
- Avoid value-laden words like good/bad/sprawl
- Horse owners/riders in the area have difficulty crossing the road
- Doney Park doesn’t quite have the rooftops to support an activity center and locals oppose additions, but putting a small grocery store there would cut down on day-to-day congestion from shoppers
- The new casino will change the character of Doney Park

In regards to the Maps:

- Based off the Regional Transportation Plan
- Transportation corridors are not necessarily placemaking
- The legend needs to be updated
- Route 66 needs to be broken into sections
- Fort Valley connects to Route 66
- Maps are made to Flagstaff's MPO boundaries, but printed copies are zoomed in on Flagstaff for the CAC's ease of reading/focus, full map too small for 11x17 but a full version is displayed at most meetings
- The four not-yet-labeled boxes are Bellemont, Cheshire, Kachina Village, and _____

In regards to Growth Areas:

- Keep formatting the same as in previous sections, including past/present/future structure in writing
- Activity centers aren't one-size-fits-all, they act as gathering places but otherwise have no consistency between the types
- The centers in the document were carefully selected by a committee over a 9-month period for best accuracy
- Growth should be concentrated on activity centers, but activity centers are places where things are already happening, not just spots with future potential
- Clarify in policies that activity centers should be appropriate to the surrounding areas
- Many goals and policies in this section can be shuffled into related sections
- Be careful when naming rural activity centers as they are outside the growth boundary
- Activity centers can act as incubators for art, community, or non-profit enterprises, which don't need to be limited to one building
- Current goals and policies are generic enough to be meaningless, add character that matches the environment and encourages a sense of place
- Activity centers need anchors that appeal to locals, not just visitors
- The colleges and University are "Special Districts," therefore not in this section

B. Schedule-February Meeting Agenda

Ms. Sharp stated that quorum was split between two potential Saturday meetings in February. The CAC approved Thursday the 28th for the final draft review meeting. It was agreed that the meeting shouldn't exclude members who wanted to be present but whose schedules could not allow for it, though members confirmed that they trusted their cohort to remain fair and balanced in their decisions without the full group. The CAC agreed to look the President's Day weekend for their all-day meeting and save vital issues for the final meeting when most members could attend and give input.

C. Editing Team Update

This item was not discussed due to time constraints.

ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chair Bousquet adjourned the meeting at 6:08 p.m.