

DRAFT MINUTES

City of Flagstaff BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE



Thursday, January 6, 2020 | 4:30 pm

Flagstaff City Hall, Council Chambers
211 West Aspen Avenue, Flagstaff, Arizona

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:32 pm. On roll call, the following Committee members were present:

Mark Haughwout, chair
Kim Austin
Daniel Crim
Jeff Goulden
Estella Hollander
Matthew Mitchell

Members absent:

Susan Hueftle

The following City and agency staff was present:

Martin Ince, multimodal transportation planner
Dan Symer, zoning code manager
Jacob Wang, Montoya Fellow

Public present:

None

I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Announcements

Mr. Goulden announced that a public open house was scheduled for the Flagstaff Trails Initiative draft regional trails strategy on Wednesday, January 15, 2020 at 4:30 pm at Flagstaff High School.

Ms. Austin reported that she attended a meeting of the Arizona Department of Health Services. She said there may be future funding available through their block grant program for pedestrian and bicycle projects.

2. Public Comment

There was no Public Comment.

3. Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the regular meeting of December 5, 2019 were not available for approval.

II. OLD BUSINESS

1. Active transportation master plan/FUTS master plan

Mr. Ince made a brief presentation on planning for buffered and protected bike lanes. The Committee offered a number of thoughts:

- There was a discussion about the role of bicycle boulevards. Birch Avenue may be a candidate.
- The Committee asked why the south end of Milton Road is not considered a candidate street for buffered or protected bike lanes. Mr. Ince explained that Milton, south of University, is a secondary rather than a primary route. As a result it falls out of candidate status. The Committee noted that there are still businesses to the south that must be accessed. Several of the planned PedBikeWays are good alternatives to busy streets. Building a protected bike lane on Milton would send a strong message that Flagstaff supports bicycling.
- FUTS are the most effective type of separation, when there is room.
- One-way protected bike lanes are preferable to two-way cycle-tracks.
- FUTS can be intimidating to pedestrians. Depending on the street, separation between pedestrians and bicyclists may be desirable.
- Protected bike lanes are needed on Butler Avenue.

III. NEW BUSINESS

1. Bicycle parking revisions to Zoning Code

Mr. Symer presented a series of proposed revisions to the City's Zoning Code to require indoor bicycle parking in future high-occupancy housing (HOH) projects. He explained that the revisions were drafted to help implement the recommendations of the City's High-Occupancy Housing Plan. Other changes to the code are also moving forward, in addition to the changes to bicycle parking.

He summarized the proposed code changes:

- There will be a new requirement for bicycle parking at high occupancy housing developments, including outdoor bicycle parking for 5 percent of required parking and indoor, secure bicycle parking for 15 percent of required parking.
- For mixed use developments, required bike parking will be calculated for both the residential and commercial components of the project.
- For all uses that require bike parking, the minimum number of spaces required will be increased from 5 to 10 percent of required parking.
- A new requirement for indoor secure bike parking will be added for parking garages.
- New descriptions and illustrations are included for approved rack designs, as well as minimum dimensions and setbacks.
- The revisions include new standards for secure indoor bike parking. Other types of racks are allowed, subject to staff approval.
- Standards for bike lockers have been added.

A discussion about the proposed revisions followed:

- A concern was expressed that the number of required bicycle spaces is based on the number of required vehicle spaces, and that the City is encouraging reductions in vehicle spaces, which may reduce the number of bicycle spaces below what is needed. The Committee asked if bicycle spaces could be based on beds rather than vehicle parking.
- The Committee asked if any empirical data has been collected at existing student housing projects, including the Standard or the Hub. Requirements should be checked against actual usage. There is anecdotal evidence that there may not be enough bicycle parking at existing projects.
- There was a discussion about proposed new student housing projects, and whether they will be filled given recent declining trends in enrollment.
- In response to an inquiry, Mr. Symer clarified that property owners are responsible for maintenance and policing.
- The Committee suggested expanding the requirement for secure, long term bicycle parking to transportation facilities, including bus stations, transit centers, and the airport.
- The Committee asked about the garage exception, which does not require bicycle parking if a garage is part of the unit. A potential scenario was discussed

where garages are rented separately from the unit. If a tenant chooses not to rent a garage, they will not have an indoor place to store a bike. The exception could be worded to apply only when garages come with the unit. Another option is to allow the exemption if a storage unit is provided in place of the garage. There is also an option to remove the exemption.

- It was brought up that all of the bike lockers on the NAU campus are rented.
- The Committee verified that the code requires bicycle parking in a well-lit, highly-visible location.
- The Committee asked if a requirement for covered parking could be included.
- Materials for bike lockers are not well-defined.
- The Committee asked about requirements for indoor secure bicycle parking from other communities. Mr. Symer replied that it is not common.

Mr. Symer said that he would be seeking public comments in February, in anticipation of a public hearing at the Planning and Zoning Commission on February 19. Final adoption from the City Council is anticipated in the early summer.

IV. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Reports

There was no discussion on the Reports.

2. Concluding Announcements

There were no Concluding Announcements.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:50 pm