

Draft Minutes

Regional Plan Citizen Advisory Committee 9:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. – Friday, February 1, 2013

Aquaplex

1702 N. Fourth Street, Flagstaff, AZ 86004

I. CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Bousquet called the meeting to order at 9:17 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Committee Members Present:

Carol Bousquet, Vice Chair

Nat White

Richard Henn

Susan Bean (1:20pm)

Jerome Naleski

Judy Louks

Alex Wright Devonna McLaughlin

Don Walters

Absent

Paul Babbitt, Chair Shaula Hedwall
Ben Anderson Julie Leid
Maury Herman Eva Putzova

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

Roger Eastman, City of Flagstaff Zoning Code Administrator

Michelle D'Andrea, City of Flagstaff Deputy Attorney

Erika Mazza, NAIPTA Transit Planner

Mark Sawyers, City of Flagstaff

Lisa M. Leap, National Park Service Chief of Cultural Resources

Jim McCarthy, Flagstaff Planning and Zoning Commission

Public

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

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

IV. APPROVAL of MINUTES

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. None

VI. <u>OLD BUSINESS (Continued, postponed, and tabled items.)</u>

A. Land Use Element

Ms. Sharp overviewed the changes made to the Land Use draft beginning on page 14. Regarding the overall vision, the following was discussed:

- Too wordy, needs to be rearranged to flow clearly
- Include Urban when specifying Suburban and Rural
- "The right locations" implies that someone will decide what is right in the community. Replace it with "designated locations"
- The first paragraph isn't really needed
- There is already an overall vision, as this one is more focused it could be renamed Land Use Vision
- People come West for the open and spread-out areas, smaller lots and more houses might drive them away
- It's important to keep the entire Flagstaff region in mind, not just the city of Flagstaff
- The National Association of Realtors trends don't necessarily reflect our reality
- The language should describe us, not generalized areas similar to us
- The table on page 15, as a guide to all other tables, should have greater prominence

Regarding the goals and policies, the following was discussed:

- Remove the phrase "social fabric" from the overall goal for reasons previous discussed
- The overall goal should be rephrased as "Balance the housing and employment land use needs of the community with the desire to preserve and protect our unique natural environmental setting."
- In Goal 1 "equitable" is not a good phrase to use, replace with "responsible"
- Ms. Weissman stated that equitable was a word that in this context may help prevent discrimination
- Rephrase "equitable distribution of public services" so it doesn't seem infrastructure-centric
- Goal 1 tries to accomplish too much, split it into a Land Use goal and an Infrastructure goal
- Goal 2 needs to be qualified to match its policies for the region
- Ms. McKellar pointed out that specifying "most lands" in 2.1 weakened the boundary and protection
 of those lands
- Ms. Morley reminded the CAC that not all lands outside the Urban Growth Boundary is designated as open space
- Duplicate policies like 2.2 will be condensed
- Not all neighborhoods fit into the connectivity mold established in the 2001 Regional Plan
- 3.2 can be removed as the CAC is already designating areas for development
- The Style Guide will fix instances of Flagstaff/region confusion/mislabeling
- Goal 3 would make a good Goal 1
- 4.1 seems to be repeating Goal 4 in different wording, perhaps replace "designated" with "available"
- Keep language consistent with other documents addressing the topic, be careful with phrasing especially if the Regional Plan is a model to other documents
- Add a third policy to Goal 4 about infrastructure and supply, but keep a separate rural policy

- Ms. Sharp reminded the CAC that there was a Water section that dealt more directly with these issues
- Under Goal 4, policy 1 addresses overall issues, policy 2 addresses infrastructure, and the proposed policy 3 would address rural
- The County representatives told the CAC that small lots couldn't be done without water, but larger subdivisions could be done without a community water supply
- It's difficult to prevent people from coming to the region even when water is limited
- In Goal 5 replace the limiting phrase "retail" with "commerce"
- Some of the employment policies under Goal 5 are repeated in the Economic Development section, but repetition between sections is all right
- 5.3 came from the previous Regional Plan and doesn't flow with the rest of the policies
- In the past, people have feigned interest in building resorts in order to get zoning changed to their benefit
- The intent of 5.3 is "Don't build if you can't provide the services"
- 5.4 is too specific, remove it or its specific (non-inclusive) language

Regarding the Downtown section, the following was discussed:

- Set the tone first before addressing parking, etc.
- Switch Goals 6 and 7
- Some policies are made with long-term vision and will make sense as planned changes (such as the Lone Tree connection) are implemented
- Connections are good for pressure relief without turning into arterials
- In Goal 7, rephrase as "continued reinvigoration of downtown," change "the highest priority" as "a high priority," and change "government" to "civic"
- In 7.5 take everything after "ages and income" and make it into a strategy
- In 7.8, the listed facilities may move, but a civic presence keeps downtown vital, though too much focus as a government hub could drive away commercial interests. Rephrase as "civic spaces"
- Ms. Weissman stated that 7.2 was not necessary
- Reword 7.9 to match the intent of other policies

Regarding the Maps, the following was discussed:

- Ms. McKellar handed out documents regarding the potential impacts of increased development in the vicinity of the Walnut Canyon National Monument, stating that in 2002 both the City and County unanimously passed a resolution protecting the study area, with Section 30 on the map as the highest protection priority
- Ms. Leap, the National Park Services representative, added that they were looking at the Walnut Canyon study area for "special designation" in federal agencies for protection (without turning it into a National Park,) so the CAC shouldn't expend too much time and energy on that particular area
- Mr. Higgins added that Section 30's protection from fire may be insufficient, Ms. Leap stated that the Forest Service would handle fire protection/prevention
- Ms. Sharp directed the CAC to select one of three options on the agenda regarding the Urban Growth Boundary and the Urban Service Boundary
- A fourth option was suggested: have no growth boundary and instead incentivize growth in desired areas

- The staff's opinion was sought, and they responded that boundaries are as effective as they are
 enforced, that City limits are a political line that doesn't limit or require the providing of services, and
 that the Service Boundary is an important tool for predictability, taxpayer protection, and directing
 growth inward
- It was determined that no one was in favor of eliminating the Growth Boundary
- Mr. White moved to use Urban Growth Boundary 2 from the previous Regional Plan as the Growth Boundary, amended the motion to encompass only the South East side, Ms. McLaughlin seconded, motion passed with only Vice Chair Bousquet voting against.
- It was clarified that the Urban Growth Boundary is inside the Wildlife Corridor
- Mr. Henn moved to accept the full Urban Growth Boundary 2 as the Urban Growth Boundary, Mr.
 White seconded, motion passed with only Vice Chair Bousquet voting against.

The Committee took a 30-minute lunch break and reconvened at 12:40, continuing map discussions.

- The County stated that rural conditions hadn't changed much and recommended leaving the Rural Growth Boundary as it was
- Mr. Naleski moved to accept the Rural Growth Boundary as it currently is, Ms. McLaughlin seconded, motion passed unanimously.
- The CAC moved on to the Growth Illustration maps while they had quorum, with Ms. Sharp outlining Map 1 as what is and Map 2 as what could be. The CAC made minor changes and suggestions to the maps. Ms. Bean arrived at 1:20, Ms. Louks left at 1:35.

Regarding Urban Neighborhoods, the following was discussed:

- Clarify that no heavy industry is allowed
- Reword Goal 8 to clarify "accessible to a variety of services and goods"
- Reword 8.8 to include walkability
- Mr. Cronk recommended splitting 8.9 off into a second goal
- Define units of measurement for block size
- Graphics are needed to help describe/detail the tables

Regarding Suburban Neighborhoods, the following was discussed:

- In the definition, clarify "access to public transportation" (and also the FUTS)
- Goal 9 needs to be more clear
- Blend 9.1 and 9.2 into one policy
- Shorten the El Paso policies before incorporating
- Suburban Parks are different than Regional Parks, even if there's overlap
- Air quality and solar access might need to be added to the tables, though that may be a civil issue as there is Federal legislation on solar access

Regarding Rural Neighborhoods, the following was discussed:

- In the definition, remove "rural" and "vast" descriptors
- 10.1 has already been accomplished, remove
- Acknowledge that some things might be allowed in rural areas that would not be in the city

Regarding Corridors, the following was discussed:

- In Goal 11, remove Flagstaff descriptor
- Most corridors are in Flagstaff, the ones outside are mostly transportation gateways to Flagstaff

- Mr. Aber recommended encouraging aesthetics over density, though "beauty is in the eye of the beholder" so people may have different ideas as to what is appealing or not
- "Corridors" implies a commercial area, consider replacing with "parkway" or "natural corridor"

B. Schedule-February Meeting Agenda

It was questioned if another meeting was needed, and what was left to do. It was agreed that draft policies would be suggested to staff during the working group meeting following the CAC's adjournment. Mr. Cronk stated that a decision needed to be made after a more thorough look at the map. It was agreed that a poll would be taken to gauge the CAC's availability on the 7th and 14th.

ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chair Bousquet adjourned the meeting at 2:39 p.m.