

MINUTES - DRAFT

City of Flagstaff

REGIONAL PLAN CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

3:30 p.m. – 6 p.m. September 17, 2009

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 928-779-7632, ext. 7294 (or 774-5281 TDD). Notification at least 48 hours in advance will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Paul Babbitt called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m.

II. Roll Call

A. **Committee Members:**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Paul Babbitt (Chairman)	<input type="checkbox"/> Alex Frawley	<input type="checkbox"/> Devonna McLaughlin
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carol Bousquet (Vice Chairman)	<input type="checkbox"/> Jean Griego	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jerome Naleski
<input type="checkbox"/> Ben Anderson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shaula Hedwall	<input type="checkbox"/> Eva Putzova
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Susan Bean	<input type="checkbox"/> Richard Henn	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> William Ring
<input type="checkbox"/> Michael Chaveas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maury Herman	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David Walker
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ken Kaemmerle	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nat White	<input type="checkbox"/> Steve Darden

B. **Alternate Members:**

Judy Louks
 Larry Stevens

III. 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/>

Bill Menard, President of the Ponderosa Homeowners Association and designated representative of the Consolidated Ponderosa Trails subdivision. He commented that they had attended two focus group meetings: one on circulation and one on land use, both dealing with the surrounding area he represents. He presented two letters to the Committee on their recommendations for the I-17 interchanges as shown on the circulation map; as well as the land use development south of the airport.

OLD BUSINESS - (Continued, postponed, and tabled agenda items.)

A. Review Land Use, Growth Areas, Circulation and Bicycle Existing Policies

PURPOSE: To establish an overall understanding of future policy direction for Land Use, Growth Areas, Circulation and Bicycles through review of existing RLUTP policies, public comments and survey results.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Discuss, provide comments and direction

PRESENTERS: Bill Towler

ATTACHMENTS: Policy Review – survey results

Mr. Bill Towler facilitated the discussion on this issue. He informed the Committee that they would review the survey results and the comments made by the Committee and staff. Then, using the five finger voting method, the Committee would vote on each Policy - whether it would remain as it or ~~on~~ if any changes were recommended. Mr. William Ring asked if there was enough of a response on the survey from the Committee to know where the Committee stands. Mr. Towler's response was that 14 out of 19 had responded and they would be reviewing the comments made by the Committee. Mr. Towler recommended that the Committee follow along in their copy of the Regional Plan. He also said that in some instances, some of the language in the policy was more of a strategy, and some strategies language could be used to write policy. Page 2-5 - was skipped because the goal was not included in the survey.

LU1.1 – “Develop a Structural Framework for the Regional Land Use and Transportation Plan” – develop more detailed plans for individual districts, activity centers, and commercial corridors.

- 71% retain, 28.6% modify
 - o Strategy more important than policy.
 - o Finger vote was to keep the policy.

LU1.2 - “Establish an Urban Growth Boundary”

- 71.4% retain, 7.1% reject, 21.4% modify
 - o Question on timeline on comment #3 by Committee, the response was sometime within a year before the plan is finalized.
 - o Staffs comment # 6 and Committee comment #1 in regards to Prop 207 protects development rights. If the State law is changed, the committee would like the Plan to reflect that the city and county would respect some level of entitlements.
 - o Mr. Cronk's response was the Plan by itself does not take away any rights.
 - o Mr. Towlers' comments was to reword the policy as follows:
“**Maintain the urban growth boundary** - The urban growth boundaries shall be maintained and shall identify areas that are either presently suitable or will be suitable in the future for development.”
 - o Question on the vote whether it constitutes that there should be urban growth boundaries or does it set the urban grown boundary? The answer was no. no what?
 - o Vote was to keep the policy.
 - It was the consensus of the Committee to address private property rights policy later.

LU1.3 - *“Designate Areas to be Reserved for Future Urban Development” – establish Planning Reserve Areas (PRA’s) with average densities.*

- Mr. Jim Cronk agreed with the Staff comments, however they are concerned that designating a planning reserve area there may not be statutory authority to do. He would not recommend that this technique be used again but to use another technique such as designating a growth boundary. He said that if PRA’s are eliminated it would need to be replaced by something else.
- Comment by Mr. Bill Ring that PRA’s do serve a purpose and were conceived with the expectation that developers would infill with existing infrastructure first. PRAs were to encourage development within the core. Question is what we should do with them: should they remain as PRAs? More discussion is needed on this issue.
- Capital improvements plans should drive us towards the areas we want to grow; otherwise we do it by default.
- Propose keeping everything as low density as possible and let the zoning process deal with development.
- Mr. Bill Ring briefed the Committee on the consideration of a full build out of Flagstaff at one time and the question was: what is the highest and best yield of land use opportunities? The concern at the time was that primarily low density would result in Flagstaff ranches, one unit per five acres. On the other hand, the same five acres could yield 35 units. This led to some discussion on the intentions of the PRA planning concept.
- Population projection for the next 10 years within the region was discussed: approximately 80,000 residents in 2020; 104,000 in 2030; 117,000 in 2050. Source: Department of Commerce. Growth rate is under 2%
- Water supply was discussed: Mr. Cronk stated that the Utilities Department is looking into the broad, long term sustainable water question and hopefully will have something within the next six months before the Committee makes any decisions. He recommended against using PRAs as the planning technique of choice.
- The definition of PRA was read for the Committee by Mr. Towler. This can be found on page 1-26 of the Regional Plan.
- Minimum densities, unless enforced, lead to someone planning the last of their development. The Committee seemed skeptical of minimum densities as good planning.
- This is an important policy, but there are different ways of addressing PRA’s. Need to provide a way for staff and city to react as things change and some certainty for developers.
- Chair Babbitt commented that Traditional Neighborhood Developments need a minimum population to make them work.
- Mr. Ring discussed the designated PRAs on the Regional Plan land use map, and informed the Committee that these were the challenges the Committee had to decide: what services these areas require; what land is available for development within topography constraints; and what land use would be appropriate. Zoning more clearly defines these general land use categories..
- Ms. Celia Barotz said she disagreed; that it depends on how the regional plan is interpreted by the municipality.

- Comment was to leave the policy as a bold part of the title.
- Not sure what PRA does for system. They are areas designated for future growth.
- Mr. White read the policy title "Designate areas for future urban development."
- Five fingers vote was to go with what Mr. White read to the Committee.

LU1.4 – *"Encourage development within the Urban Growth Boundary"*

- What would be an incentive for people to develop within the Urban Growth Boundary? If not encouraged in the plan by the city, the city would not be amendable to fund any infrastructure or to use public money that is not in the plan.
- Citizens should use the plan to testify to the government.
- Five finger vote was to keep the policy as is.

LU1.5 – *"Provide for New Mixed-Use Neighborhoods"*

- Some areas make sense and some don't; makes little sense on the outskirts. Should be accessible to major employers.
- Mixed use is a term that is quite broad and should be encouraged. It does have a place in here. University Heights as an example.
- Give and take for the growth of the city, allowing-some leniency.
- What is required for the plan to provide? Are we going to designate a mixed use land use? Yes, but if it is decided that there is no place appropriate, then it would be taken out.
- Does your interpretation include future redevelopment of areas? Yes would be appropriate.
- Current policy talks about streets, bicycles and FUTS trails; will this be put in another area.?
- Concern was voiced about smart growth. The committee would like a presentation on this, to define the term for Flagstaff.
- 'Smart Growth' was discussed as a type of conservation design: clustering to preserve open space, creating a neighborhood that is walkable and viable.
- Need to add something about healthy neighborhoods to raise families, with amenities like parks, close to schools and jobs.
- 'Mixed-use neighborhoods' for Flagstaff should be a community character.
- Will the word "future" be taken out of the bold face?
- Does this mean that urban development must be developed according to smart growth and traditional design? Do we really want to say that at this point?
- Only applies to areas designated for mixed use.
- Current code has a definition of smart growth
- Keep policy more simple and define under strategies.
- Five finger vote was to keep the policy. There was also a one two vote.
- Mr. Kaemmerle commented on the "shall part". In a policy this big, it just seems a bit too much. There was also another member that did not agree with the word "shall".

LU1.6 – “Require Urban Development to Locate within City Boundaries”

- Definition of urban land use bothersome. We have a number of urban land uses way outside the city.
- Need to revisit the definition of urban.
- We’re talking about major development centers like Walmart.
- Don’t think this statement states it. I think the professionals need to think about what urban development really means
- Is it commercial activity centers we are talking about as opposed to urban development?
- Could support a vote on this if we can define urban. It always looks better in words. This is supportable, if the staff will come back with a definition. But would vote a 2, if we don’t have an annexation policy.
- Vote on staff comment #4 “Annexation of areas adjacent to the city limits is strongly encouraged when the proposed redevelopment requires urban infrastructure”
- Five fingers Vote of staff recommendation.

LU1.7 - “Promote Infill Development”

- Promote properly designed infill development if.
- There are opportunities for infill development while preserving the character of the neighborhood. Don’t want this language to discourage infill development. This language on character and content should not be interpreted as an absolute bar against development.
- Redevelopment of infill around hospital: Residents resistant to change might interfere with good planning.
- How do you protect the character of a community and allow for change to happen?
- Important to look at designating neighborhoods and let the neighborhood decide what they think their neighborhood should be.
- Need to know what the neighborhood plan is and what are the boundaries.
- Needs more work about what infill means.
- Five finger vote on the Bold and middle two sentences

IV. NEW BUSINESS

No new business

V. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS

Chair Babbitt commented that it is obvious more meetings are needed and asked the Committee to think about meeting on October 15th or October 22nd. The Committee will be informed on the dates. It was recommended that more dates be planned.

A. Announcements (*Informal Announcements, Future Agenda Items, and Next Meeting Date*)

1. **Next CAC Meeting:** October 1, 2009 - 3:30 p.m. to 6 p.m. at N.AZ Healthcare facilities

Future Agenda Items:

1. RTP update & coordination (Oct. 1)
 2. Regional Plan document format & organization (Oct. 1)
 3. Review existing RLUTP policies for Water, Conservation, Energy & Environment
3. **Zoning Code Design Charrette with Opticos** – October 5-9, 2009

Focus groups meetings on conservation, water and energy will be on the September 24th from 4-7 p.m. at the community college.

There will be a Town hall on October 22nd at city hall from 5:30 – 7 p.m.

Juniper Point citizen participation meeting will be held on October 1st at the community college beginning at 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Cronk reminded the Committee about quorum problems, and he encouraged participation from the Committee. He asked if they will not be attending a meeting to inform Ms Sharp.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Babbitt adjourned the Meeting at 6:02 p.m.