



**FLAGSTAFF
REGIONAL
PLAN 2012**

Approved Minutes
Regional Plan Citizen Advisory Committee
3:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. – Thursday, January 17, 2013

Aquaplex
1702 N. Fourth Street, Flagstaff, AZ 86004

I. CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Bousquet called the meeting to order at 3:45 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Committee Members Present:

Carol Bousquet, Vice Chair

Julie Leid

Nat White

Maury Herman

Alex Wright

Ben Anderson

Richard Henn

Don Walters

Jerome Naleski (4:47pm)

Absent

Paul Babbitt, Chair

Judy Louks

Susan Bean

Shaula Hedwall

Devonna McLaughlin

Eva Putzova

Attendees

Theresa Gunn, Facilitator

Kimberly Sharp, Acting Comprehensive Planning Mngr.

Jim Cronk, Planning Director

Justine Otto, FMPO Admin Specialist Temp

Sue Pratt, Coconino County Community Development Director

John Aber, Coconino County Assistant Community Development Director

Tiffany Antol, Coconino County Senior Planner

Kate Morley, Coconino County Planner

Erika Mazza, NAIPTA Transit Planner

Adam Langford, NAIPTA

Kevin Burke, City of Flagstaff Manager

Anja Wendel, City of Flagstaff Senior Assistant Attorney

Roger Eastman, City of Flagstaff Zoning Code Administrator

Rich Bowen, ECoNA

Public

Betsy McKellar

Marilyn Weissman, Friends of Flagstaff's Future

Bruce Higgins, Conservation Study Forum

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

IV. APPROVAL of MINUTES

Ms. Leid moved to approve the Minutes for December 13, 2012 CAC Meeting. Mr. Walters seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. None

N/A

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

A. Editing Team Update

Ms. Sharp recommended modifying the agenda to spend the entire meeting completing the Land Use Element. The CAC moved on to Land Use.

B. Land Use Element

The CAC was given handouts outlining the Urban/Suburban/Rural sections with instructions to focus comments and suggestions on the introductory language, the goals and policies wording, and the images used to portray the different sections.

For the Urban section, the following was discussed:

- In the first sentence, “heart” is not accurate, replace with “within half a mile of downtown”
- The second sentence is factually true but misleading, automobiles, transit, and auto facilities are necessary
- The first paragraph needs to be moved and replaced with a visionary statement
- All the sections need to begin with clear visionary statements and have cohesive ideas that describe what we want, with past, present and future being clearly differentiated
- Parking needs more planning, development, value, and rational use
- The illustrations need more direction
- Policy 6.2 implies that amending zoning is practical, cut out the phrase “pre-zone”
- Mr. Aber stated that the County does not allow speculative re-zoning
- Preserving landscape is the City Council’s domain, the RP should focus on goals and policies
- Remove the word “proposed” from 6.1
- Add a policy supporting public and private
- Add a policy supporting vehicular traffic
- Splitting downtown out of the Urban/Suburban/Rural labels and into its own special zone is worthy of further discussion
- In 6.4 rephrase as “within and in between”
- There is not currently a set number of employees required to make an employment center
- The current map is of a hybrid network with Scenario D combined with suggestions
- Downtown is considered urban by Flagstaff standards; areas like Route 66 are called corridors
- The hospital should be included in future urban neighborhoods
- Mr. Eastman defined Urban as compact, walkable, mixed-use areas, and downtown
- The map shows both existing conditions and future aspirations, which is confusing. Consider making two maps, one for the present and one for the future

For the Suburban section, the following was discussed:

- The first sentence is misleading and needs to be reworded
- Ms. Weissman stated that NoHo was not a comparable neighborhood and that the last sentence is not a good statement of what the CAC wants. She inquired if they would continue the suburban model or add mixed use
- Mixed use is good, but spread-out areas can't support activity centers
- Ms. Sharp presented an article on improving walkability as a guide for the language
- The visuals need more work to represent the Flagstaff scale
- In the first paragraph past, present and future need to be differentiated
- 7.5 needs to be clarified—does each neighborhood have a range of prices, or only some?
- Mr. Cronk confirmed that larger subdivisions strive to have a range of sizes and prices
- Be Flagstaff-centric in descriptions and expand the policies beyond walkability
- The terms urban, suburban, and rural are hindering
- Mr. Naleski arrived at 4:47pm
- Mr. Burke stated that suburban neighborhoods can come in many forms and the Plan should strive to maintain diversity and variety; he recommended using Google Earth photos of Flagstaff neighborhoods for the illustrations
- The language should make aspirations clear, not just retrofitting
- In 7.4, Flagstaff suburban neighborhoods don't really have integrated strip shopping centers (Mr. Eastman confirmed that the policy was misplaced)
- Neighborhoods are not activity centers or corridors, but with the exception of Milton most suburban activity centers in Flagstaff blend into the surrounding neighborhoods

For the Rural section, the following was discussed:

- County representatives stated that there were discrepancies in the definitions of rural
- The goal of policy 8.6 is to keep rural activity centers clustered and not spread across long strips of road
- The County defines where activity centers are appropriate
- Bellemont needs to be included in the reference list of rural neighborhoods
- The language of 8.4 can be used in the suburban section too
- Rural Growth Boundaries follow private land borders and are not defined on the map

The CAC was instructed to read the Land Use section and forward any comments to Kim Sharp.

C. Schedule Forward

It was confirmed that the CAC would be meeting in February, and that the Plan draft would need to be completed for a final walk-through in February. It was inquired if the CAC would be willing to hold longer meetings in exchange for fewer meetings, and if members were available for a Saturday meeting. An online poll would be administered to determine the CAC's attendance schedule. After the initial draft is sent out, the CAC will reconvene in May to review public comments and make the necessary changes. Mr. Cronk stated that the City Council had voted to not add a new CAC member, but that public input was always welcome.

ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chair Bousquet adjourned the meeting at 5:26 p.m.