


# La Plaza Vieja Neighborhood Specific Plan - Public Participation Report

*Last updated: August 2015*

## Overall Public Involvement Strategy

From 2008 to 2011, there was extensive public involvement carried out in the development of the La Plaza Vieja Neighborhood Specific Plan. However, the final draft was never adopted by the City Council and there has been a considerable change in physical and social circumstances. The Comprehensive Planning staff proposes to update the draft that was completed in June 2011 through a public involvement process that includes businesses, residents, property owners and the community.



The neighborhood and community were involved in the update of the neighborhood plan in five ways:

- 1) The La Plaza Vieja Neighborhood Association (LPVNA) had representatives who were involved in the core team for all phases of the project. The project manager also gave monthly updates at the LPVNA meetings on the 1<sup>st</sup> Wednesday of every month.
- 2) A November Kick-off Public Meeting informed the public about the process and involve the public in identifying the needed updates to the document and gathering input to inform the concept plan, goals and policies. These meetings were not be intended to reinvent the document entirely but to build on past collaborative efforts.
- 3) In January, the City held workshops and open houses to discuss major policy issues and to review an updated concept plan.

4) The Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed a pre-public review draft of the plan in April 2015.

4) A draft of the updated Neighborhood Plan was made available in May 2015 for approximately 60 days prior to the first Planning and Zoning Commission Hearing to allow adequate time for public review and comment to be incorporated. During these 60 days, the neighborhood association convened another neighborhood meeting in addition to a public meeting at the old Town Springs Park and a working session with the City Council.

5) In order to adopt the Specific Plan for the La Plaza Vieja Neighborhood as an amendment to the Regional Plan, the Planning and Zoning Commission will have two public hearings, one at City Hall and one at the flagstaff Aquaplex in September 2015. The public will have the ability to address the Commission about whether or not the plan should be adopted or revised. The City Council will then decide whether or not to adopt the final plan by resolution.

## **Stakeholders and Outreach**

Neighborhood meetings were advertised to all property owners in and within 500 ft. of the neighborhood by first class mail. Staff and the neighborhood association distributed flyers to reach residents in the neighborhood who are renting and commercial tenants. In this mailing, people were offered the option to be added to the project email list. Staff also solicited contact information at the neighborhood cleanup day, neighborhood association meetings, by soliciting the Regional Plan contact list and through flyers in October and November.

Staff posted to the “Flagstaff Matters” Facebook page and the City website. Press releases were prepared and distributed to local media outlets to advertise the neighborhood meetings, and public hearings. Documents and presentations from the neighborhood meetings were posted on the City’s website. Staff maintained a website and the Facebook page to keep the public informed about the content and comments shared in these settings.

## **Meeting Logistics and Advertising**

The November and January public meetings were held at the High Country Conference Center and Our Lady of Guadalupe Church. July meetings were held at McCracken Plaza and Old Town Springs Park. Hearings were held at City Hall and the Flagstaff Aquaplex. A sign that meets the requirements of the Zoning Code for public notice was placed on Clay Ave two weeks prior to November and January Neighborhood Meetings and public hearings. A smaller sign was posted at the Old Town Springs Park. Typical advertising for a meeting included:

- Reserve a diversity of meeting locations throughout the process
- Sending a postcard to the mailing list
- Make and Distribute flyers
- Post signs with meeting dates and times
- Email project notification list and update website
- Facebook page update
- Press Release and media outreach with newspaper and radio

## November Neighborhood Meeting

The purpose of this meeting was to inform the public about the project timeline and educate them on changed conditions in the area. City Staff and the Neighborhood Association convened the meeting together. The purpose of the meeting was to assess and receive feedback on the need for change from the last draft.

Staff provided:

- A summary of past public involvement
- A project timeline
- A concept plan updated for changed baseline conditions
- A review of the goals and policies from the 2011 draft with noted requests for changes from the neighborhood association
- A list of City identified work to update the plan

The project manager produced a report that summarizes the comments received through the neighborhood meeting process December 5<sup>th</sup> and presented the findings of this report at the following La Plaza Vieja Neighborhood Association meeting and project core team meetings. The report was also be transmitted to the Planning and Zoning commission and City Council by memo.

## January Neighborhood Meetings

The January public meetings were divided into two topical workshops and an open house that allowed for free-flowing discussion among participants.

<b>Tentative Meeting Date</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic</b>
Wednesday, January 21, 2014	6 pm to 8 pm	Land Use workshop
Monday, January 26, 2014	6 pm to 8 pm	Transportation and Traffic workshop
Thursday, January 29, 2014	6 pm to 8 pm	Open House

The workshop format gave the public the opportunity to respond to issues they see in the updated draft plan and related regulations (zoning, historic preservation, etc.) that can be influenced by the specific plan. This input was used to set the direction for the final concept plan, goals and policies. This was accomplished through marking up maps, filling out and returning comment cards and question and answer sessions.

The project manager produced a report that summarized the comments received through the neighborhood meeting process and presented the findings of this report at the following La Plaza Vieja Neighborhood Association meeting and project core team meetings. The report was also transmitted to the Planning and Zoning commission and City Council through work sessions held in April and June.

Agendas for the January meetings can be found in Appendix A.

## Summer 2015 Public Outreach

On May 26, 2015, the Public Review Draft of the Plan was released for a 60 day comment period. It was also be transmitted to members of the public on the mailing and email list and the following entities (based on Title 11):

1. Any person or entity that requests in writing to receive a review copy of the proposal.
2. Coconino County;
3. Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization;
4. The Arizona Department of Commerce or any other state agency that is subsequently designated as the general planning agency for the state;
5. The Arizona Department of Water Resources for review and comment on the water resources element, if a water resources element is required; and
6. Flagstaff Unified School District;
7. Coconino County Superintendent of Schools;
8. Northern Arizona Council of Governments;
9. Public land management agencies, such as the United States Forest Service, United States Park Service, Arizona State Land Department, and Arizona State Parks;
10. Other appropriate government jurisdictions;
11. Public utility companies;
12. Civic, educational, professional, and other organizations; and
13. Affected property owners, citizens and businesses

La Plaza Vieja Neighborhood Association hosted a meeting on July 8, 2015 from 6pm to 8pm. Ten members of the public attended. The intent of these meetings was to let the neighborhood residents hold their own forum to discuss the consequences of the goals and policies outlined in the plan and to understand and consider public concerns. City Staff presented information and poster materials on transportation and land use elements of the plan.

This City also held an open house on July 11, 2015 from 10am to noon at the Old Town Springs Park to encourage participation by residents who live along Coconino Ave. and Lower Coconino Ave. 13 residents from Upper and Lower Coconino Avenues attended the meeting. The park location allowed families to bring their children and still participate in the discussion. Residents provided extensive feedback on the park improvements and concerns about on-street parking in the area.

The City received 10 written comments, and dozens of comments at meetings from the public, the Neighborhood Association and the City Council. Consideration of these comments is documented in Appendix B.

## Adoption Process

The process for considering and adopting the specific plan will follow the procedures in the City Code pertaining to Major Plan amendments. Even though the adoption of a specific plan is typically a minor amendment, following the major amendment process will allow for more extensive outreach and citizen engagement. The steps outlined in the City Code are:

1. Public notices - 15 to 30 days before hearings
  - a. In the Arizona Daily Sun
  - b. Placement of signs announcing public hearings
2. Planning and Zoning Commission Hearing #1 – City Hall, September 9, 2015
3. Planning and Zoning Commission Hearing #2 – Aquaplex, September 23, 2015
4. City Council Meeting –Presentation of Resolution to adopt the Specific Plan, October 20, 2015

## Appendix A: Draft Meeting Agendas and Records of Proceedings

### Kick-off Meeting Agenda

November 12 2014, 6pm to 7pm at High Country Conference Center

	Topic
6:00-6:10 pm	Introductions
6:10-6:25 pm	Presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Summary of past public involvement</li><li>• Overview of Neighborhood Plan Content</li><li>• Proposed Path forward for the Neighborhood Plan</li></ul>
6:25-6:40 pm	Q&A
6:40- 7:00 pm	Poster session

### Kickoff Meeting Summary

**Project Team members in attendance:** Sara Dechter, Jennifer Mikelson, Tyler Shute, Andrew Hagglund, Dan Folke, David Wessel, Rick Barrett, Karl Eberhard, Jesse Dominguez, and Laura Bustamante-Myers

**Approximate public attendance:** 57 (a few individuals came but did not sign in)

#### Introductions

Sara Dechter, Comprehensive Planning Manager and the project manager, welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced the City staff present.

Jesse Dominguez, La Plaza Vieja Neighborhood Association President, presented his board members.

Sara Dechter reviewed meeting objectives, agenda and ground rules for the meeting.

#### Presentation

Sara Dechter provided 15 minute presentation on the process for updating the plan, the content of the plan, what needs to be updated and requesting feedback from the public about how to move forward.

#### Question and Answer

**Q:** Explain how plan is used once adopted and give an example.

**A:** A small area plan can be used in a number of ways.

- 1) Every rezoning case will need to have a finding about how the proposal conforms to the general plan and any applicable specific plans.
- 2) The Plan can recommend changes to City programs and policies that drive development and redevelopment, such as the zoning code, housing policies, etc.

- 3) The plan can be an educational source for developers and property owners that are looking to redevelop their property. Even if the property owner is not obligated to follow the plan's direction, the information is available and hopefully will attract individuals that are interested in the types of development that would be compatible.
- 4) The plan can be used in the City and County's budgeting process by identifying priorities.
- 5) The Plan can be used by the Neighborhood Association and other non-profits to apply for grant funding that assists with implementation of the plan.

**Q:** What do the orange circles represent?

**A:** There are orange circles on the Concept Plan slide that was presented at the public meeting on November 12, 2014. These circles represent areas of the neighborhood that have already experienced infill and redevelopment in the last three and half years.

**Q:** Who is responsible for deciding what is a historic building? How to deal with demolition of historic properties?

**A:** Typically, consultants hired by the property owner assess and evaluate properties as to whether or not they are historic through the preparation of a Cultural Resource Study. Any property can be demolished – property owners have the right to demolish their buildings. Whether or not it is historic, only affects the level of documentation required. If it is significant and if it has integrity, a Phase II Cultural Resource Study is required which entails complete documentation of the building prior to demolition. There is a one-year demolition delay provision if the City Council wishes to save a building from demolition.

**Q:** Will the plan include Coconino Ave?

**A:** Yes. The Neighborhood Plan has always included the Houses along Upper and Lower Coconino Ave. For some reason, the 2011 concept plan did not include a concept for the part of the neighborhood that is north of the railroad tracks. That will be a part of updating this document as we move forward

**Q:** How much involvement does the Council have in developing and approving this plan?

**A:** Throughout the process, the Council will receive reports on the progress and strategies for the project and we can hold working sessions for them at any time. There will be a working session with the Planning and Zoning Commission during the 90 day comment period and we can have an earlier one at any time in the process. For the plan to be adopted there will be two Planning and Zoning Commission Hearings and then they will make a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council will have a hearing on the plan and will adopt it by resolution, which only needs one reading.

**Q:** What are the streets/boundaries of this plan?

**A:** The northern boundary of the plan area is the alley north of Coconino Ave. The western boundary runs along the northern edge of the Mill Pond Apartments property and the western side of Arrowhead Village. South of Arrowhead Village, the western boundary follows Blackbird Roost. The southern boundary is Route 66 between Blackbird Roost and Milton. The eastern boundary is S Milton Road.

**Q:** Where is the floodplain in the area?

**A:** The floodplain is defined by the Clay Ave Wash, which enters the neighborhood at the SW corner of Clay Ave and Milton Rd and passes through the neighborhood on the south side of the McCracken Building, along McCracken Road and through the Arrowhead Village Mobile Home Park. The one hundred year floodplain impacts the neighborhood very broadly south of Clay Ave, but if the larger Rio de Flag process moves forward it would be significantly reduced. Maps of floodplain conditions can be provided at the January workshops.

**Q:** How was the boundary drawn, particularly the jog around Arrowhead Village?

**A:** Jesse Dominguez explained the neighborhood had determined the boundary through public involvement. Arrowhead Village was considered part of the neighborhood by participants but there was less concern about including the Saga Inn or the adjacent auto parts store.

**Q:** Can someone talk about/explain the proposed crossing under the railroad that would connect Florence and Walnut?

**A:** The Florence-Walnut bicycle and pedestrian tunnel has funding but the estimate from the railroad on the cost of the work means there is a \$900k shortfall for the project. The City is working with BNSF to reduce the funding gap and there is some FUTS funding that just passed with the sales tax election (Prop 406) that can be used to fund this project.

**Q:** Based on what you said before, the plan doesn't have a legal basis; it's more an advertisement for what is desired?

**A:** It is both. There is a legal requirement for rezoning cases, annexations and conditional use permits to have a finding about conformance with the specific plan, but in other cases it would just be advisory and would not obligate the City or a property owner to follow it. At the same time, having a clear statement on desired conditions and compatibility will help to get attention from developers and property owners to promote good outcomes for the community.

**Q:** How/when does this plan have teeth?

**A:** Neighborhood or specific plans can be used in a number of ways. The plan is used to assist in land use decisions. For example in order to approve a rezoning request a finding that the request is consistent with both the general plan and any applicable specific plans is required. Neighborhood plans can also lead to development regulations. As shown in the "planning pyramid", development regulations found in the Zoning Code can implement goals and policies found in the general plan and a specific plan. As you move down the pyramid the goal, policy or regulation should be more specific. This can be tricky in

Arizona with potential Proposition 207 issues. Specific plans can be used to set budget priorities based on goals and policies. Finally, adopted specific plans can assist with grants. Often applications will score higher if they are implementing an adopted plan.

**Q:** When did they change the height limit from 2-3 stories?

**A:** Staff present was not certain about when the current entitlements related to building height were put into place. Since 2006, it has become more difficult in Arizona to reduce private property entitlements that come from the Zoning Code without a willing property owner. The current maximum building height in the Highway Commercial (HC) zone is 60 feet, and in R1N - which is the primary zoning north of Clay Ave. - it is 35 feet.

### **Poster Session**

Members of the public and staff broke out around the room to comment on goal and policy recommendations and the concept plan from the 2011 plan. They provided handwritten comments as well as red and green dots to indicate their questions, concerns and preferences about how the City should update the plan.

Comments about Goals & Policies

#### GP1 posters - Preserve, Redevelop, & Infill with Appropriate Architecture + Create Housing Milestones & Standards

1. How can commercial development address desired services?
2. No "net loss" of affordable housing units as a result of multi-family development
3. Any infill incentives must be accompanied by permanently deeded affordable units
4. Limit size of boarding house student development in keeping with goal of increasing percentage of home ownership.
5. Incentivize single family owner-occupied homes (preference for historic).
6. Land Trust
7. Overlay District: ok as long as it doesn't squeeze longtime residents out or create gentrification. Encourage home ownership.

#### GP2 posters – Integrate Appropriate Urban Design + Increase Pedestrian Safety

1. Ped crossing at Clay Ave and Malpais.
2. Grade crossing = less costly than tunnel
3. Skybridge from Butler/Clay across Milton
4. Ped/bike tunnel would greatly improve transportation. Agree!
5. School zone speed limit restrictions on Clay Ave at Haven Montessori School (I know it's a private school, but...)
6. Minimize cut-through traffic
7. Consider impacts of new/changing bus lines.
8. We do need ped crossings over Milton for older people and children. Crossing Milton right now is taking a high risk on your life.

### GP3 posters – Build Upon Neighborhood Safety + Build Upon Neighborhood

1. SBDC no longer exists. Identify other partners.
2. Pedestrian friendly: Need to make certain neighborhood residents can safely cross old Rt. 66. That is needed in order for the area to be pedestrian friendly. Also, need to address traffic cutting through neighborhood to avoid Milton.
3. Hard curbs would make walking easier.
4. Discourage auto cut-thrus but encourage bikes and peds. Agreed!
5. Design and/or disallow “alley” only access to residents.
6. Money spent on roundabouts could have been better directed. They are silly in such a small neighborhood with low traffic flow.
7. There are no yield signs! (at roundabouts)
8. Community center: Fire station by Natural Grocers?

### GP4 posters – Encourage Economic Development + Enhance Parks Maintenance, Design, & Connection

1. Keep Clay Ave as collector not main arterial.
2. Make it safe for children to cross Clay Ave to get to the park. Excessive vehicular speed and traffic due to vehicles cutting through neighborhood.
3. Important to get safe railroad crossing for pedestrians at Tombstone to Lower Coconino.
4. How dense? What do the residents believe will be “commercial” that is appropriate? Small cottage industry ok.
5. I don’t like it. I feel that older residents are being squeezed out. Me too.

### GP5 posters – Encourage Sustainability Projects + Boost Environmental Services with Local Projects

1. Can developers support pedestrian access and improvements (such as bridge funding with impact funds)?
2. Possible community garden at Milton & W Phoenix.
3. Can we include such sites (community gardens) on concept map?
4. Update drainage across Clay Ave at Malpais. Culvert is needed.
5. Work with NAU student orgs to help in clean up.

### **Comments about Concept Map**

1. Commercial/Mixed Use: concerned about the height of what would be allowed. Some commercial could “dwarf” the neighborhood and increase traffic.
2. Need traffic controls and landscaping
3. People are not obeying the arrow signs (at roundabouts)
4. The roundabouts’ lack of stop signs = conflicts with people and playing children
5. Overlay ownership, (private, BNSF, city) existing zoning rights, flood plain, and regional plan designation.
6. Can property owners downzone in the area between Clay and 66 and Malpais and Blackbird Roost to lessen the density of the wish? Is that an acceptable goal – Highway Commercial on Clay? Doesn’t sound like a good idea.
7. Need a traffic study to see how many folks are entering neighborhood to avoid traffic backup at Milton and 66.

**Parking Lot Comments**

1. What are services residents want to see in redeveloped lots?

If someone comes to the city wanting to demo 2 historic single family properties, facilitate finding owners who want what exists.

## Land Use Workshop Agenda

Wednesday January 21, 6 – 8 pm at Our Lady of Guadalupe Chapel, 224 S. Kendrick St.

	Topic
6:00-6:15	Introduction, explanation of workshop format, terminology review
6:15-7:15	Breakout groups*: Residential Core and Transition Area/Commercial Edge
7:15-8:00	Report out from groups

Break out groups each have a facilitator and 2-3 discussion questions to guide the conversation. The group selects a reporter from the participants to speak out on the values associated with the area they discussed and the areas of agreement or disagreement from their discussion.

## Land Use Workshop: Summary of Report out

### Group 1: Neighborhood Core

**What makes this neighborhood a great place to live? What are the landmarks that make it unique within Flagstaff?**

- Historic Value of the Neighborhood
  - Hispanic culture and families - Very rich historic value and flavor. Important.
  - Nostalgia runs deep - Many great stories about the people and vibrancy of the neighborhood could be incorporated into Historical Signage to provide a sense of nostalgia
- Social center is missing - The Armory - a place for dancing and community events. Rich musical history. Also a roller rink at one time. Also the Canyon Explorations building was once a community center. More people living there then - pre-1950's but there are fewer areas for social interaction.
- Old growth trees - One or two of the old pine trees still left
- Streets named after cities in AZ
- Small scale walkable neighborhood
- easy access to everything - central location
- Friendly and Safe atmosphere - know neighbors, people wave, people watch out for each other
- NAU students live during school and come back to stay - Not so much friction with students - easy going
- Keeping the railroad - Original residents were railroad workers - built homes from railroad ties. This aspect of history should be incorporated into new development.
- Character - shorter homes with character - "approachable"

### Improvements needed:

- Some student issues though - 4 duplexes on Park Street: Don't know how to manage garbage. Many issues with beer cans, parties, etc. Only 2 story building on the block. Cheap townhomes - out of scale.
- Too many students in one unit (8 non related adults) as a result, there is not enough on-site parking
- Students going to class on north campus, park in LPV and go to NAU
- Alley not plowed behind duplexes
- Need to protect the architectural and historic integrity of the neighborhood - this will dictate size of houses and how many live within them

- Height restriction for the neighborhood
- Establish design and architectural standards appropriate for the neighborhood - smaller, modest homes most desirable.
- Protect view sheds - too many have been compromised. Drury Inn not inviting - a monstrosity. Lost viewshed of historic bldgs. on campus
- Railroad is part of LPV history - use it as a design influence. Use of historic colors, textures, and materials as a design standard. Use colors and materials in the church as an influence.
- Design review process for LPV? Historical signage standards and signs explaining the history.
- Clarify historic district
- Pedestrian crossing of the railroad needed – Florence – Walnut project may move forward soon.
- Community garden needed - Natural Grocers has a plan to put one on their property for residents

### **What is the relationship between residential core and activity centers?**

- Residents may use the activity centers but not the other way around. This neighborhood is already used to the idea of Activity Centers
- Safety with road crossings - esp. Rt. 66
- Zoning processes will safe guard the neighborhood. from development
- College America could be out of scale in some places but is OK because it's on the edge
- Need to deal with the back of structures: plain graffiti, shadows, unsightly
- RT 66 a lost opportunity in Flagstaff - should be celebrated and embraced a lot more. e.g. at Route 66 and Milton

### ***Group 2: Commercial Edge and Transition***

#### **Commercial Edge**

- Difficult access for current residents because of congestion on Milton and 66.
- Most current commercial uses serve students and tourists
- It would be nice to have more that serve residents such as café's, restaurants, bike shops
- Blending commercial and residential uses
- Neighborhood scaled commercial could work set back from Route 66 and Milton if it is not tall and scales appropriately from the arterial to the residential area.
- Interior neighborhood businesses are not going to get enough traffic for some services because of visibility and access issues.
- Compatibility is the key to commercial edge fitting the community needs – What are we inviting into the neighborhood?
- Concern on the urban feeling of redevelopment -"urban and ugly"
- Taller buildings take away the viewshed
- The Corner of Milton and 66 is the "entrance of the city" or the gateway of downtown.
- Maintaining the character of Flagstaff and Creation of a corridor that brings people into the downtown are reasons architecture of the edge is important.
- Make the backs of buildings look as good as the front.
  - The Route 66 should be celebrated in the commercial edge instead of hidden
  - Don't hide the neighborhood

- Building heights can hide the neighborhood from the community and vice versa.
- Community space is needed such as a commercial center

### **Transition**

- Mixed use is the key to a vibrant and safe transition area
- No big ugly box buildings close to the residential area.
- Keep high traffic volumes on Milton and 66- less traffic will keep the scale human.
- The feel of buildings should connect to the origins of the community
- Connect Townsite to La Plaza Vieja – bike/ped access will enhance the market for neighborhood services.
- Bars and alcohol providers should be limited because of the school and transient issues.
- Design Review
  - Gabled roof forms as opposed to flat roof on commercial buildings – will make a difference for residents who look down from hills/slopes on the neighborhood.
  - Color and material (texture) i.e. the Armory and the infamous "mustard house"
  - Architecture should also face the neighborhood, not just Milton and 66

### **Take home points**

- Participants at the meeting discussed many possible solutions and found several reasons to feel that La Plaza Vieja is valued by Flagstaff, adjacent neighborhoods and business.
- The mix of uses in the area conforms to the concept of an activity center, but poor design, deterioration of renter-occupied housing and the potential for buildings that are out of scale with residential uses, threaten to erode the character of the La Plaza Vieja Community.
- The residents want a vibrant and safe commercial area and a residential area that respects the origins of the neighborhood and Flagstaff. Some of this can be achieved through better design for redevelopment projects, but the limited ability to reduce zoned building heights because of existing entitlements is a major impediment to maintaining neighborhood character.
- The relationship between traffic and the neighborhood is one of the key issues to resolve in preserving the community character.
- Enhancing and preserving the historic relevance of La Plaza Vieja should be woven into whatever solutions are developed for land use issues. It's the fabric that holds the area together.

## Transportation Workshop Agenda

Monday January 26, 6 – 8 pm at Our Lady of Guadalupe Chapel, 224 S. Kendrick St.

	Topic
6:00-6:10	Welcome and Introductions
6:10-6:20	Presentation on Transportation Planning context for the LPV plan
6:40- 7:25	Rotate between stations: Traffic Micro-simulations, Clay Extension, Pedestrian Safety and Underpass
7:25-7:45	Spend your transportation budget?
7:45-8:00	Close out and Thank you

Info Stations: Three stations were set up in the room with exhibits and handouts available. Each station was staffed by 2-3 city employees to answer questions. Stations covered the following topics: Clay Ave, Traffic micro-simulations, and Pedestrian Crossings.

## Transportation Workshop: Summary of Report Out

*Some general themes from the workshop:*

- There is generally strong support for pedestrian, bicycle and transit improvements
- There is general support for better access into and out of the neighborhood indicated by support for the intersection improvements and pedestrian connections
- There is high concern about cut-through traffic, especially with the speed of vehicles

### Clay Ave. Extension

- When the Standard was going to be on Blackbird Roost there was discussion of traffic calming measures on Clay Ave. – bump outs at the cross streets and medians where appropriate.
- If the Clay Ave extension were constructed, then cut-through traffic would just move north to Tombstone and Tucson. Better to see what can be done to slow traffic on Clay and keep the volume there.
- The most important thing is that any projects that impact Clay Ave protect the pedestrian environment and do not add more traffic lanes.
- Private property owners on Clay have given up their front yards to eminent domain in the past; so right of way expansion needs to be approached very conservatively. 5 feet is more likely than 12 feet to be considered reasonable.

### Traffic Micro-simulations

- 2 participants supported the combined choice of Milton/Butler 6 lanes and Humphreys/66. Meanwhile, 4 participants supported the Humphreys/66 improvements by themselves.
- Four people supported widening Milton and using the new outside lanes for buses, bikes and right-turning vehicles only.
- 10 people supported a full intersection at Blackbird Roost and Route 66 (all vehicles and modes and all turn movements permitted). Only 3 supported a pedestrian only crossing. During meetings about the “Standard” most people expressed interest in the pedestrian only crossing
- There is broad support for pedestrian connections and improvements. What are the advantages these bring to the neighborhood (safety? Connectivity to the services needed/desired by neighborhood residents).

- In spite of the broad support for the pedestrian improvements, there was very little support for a tunnel under Milton at Malpais

*Some general comments/observations from the Milton corridor study to date that seem relevant to the LPV process:*

- Growth in traffic on Milton will increase cut-through traffic on Clay. Only the largest improvement (Milton at 6 lanes) reduces the amount of growth in cut-through traffic.
- If nothing is done, growth in traffic on Milton will degrade peak hour performance per vehicle. Several of the bundles return these to near today's levels and the 6-lane option improves on today's conditions.
- Widening Milton to 6 lanes for general traffic purposes attracts a lot more traffic to the corridor

### **Pedestrian Crossings**

Q: Overpasses vs. Underpasses? Where would they go?

- Pedestrians are more likely to use underpasses than overpasses (easier to use)
- Underpass at Malpais- several more proposals for underpasses on Milton extending down to University Ave.

Q: Intersection at Malpais and Milton?

- Restrict left turns- one of the leading cause of accidents

Q: Businesses on the Southside of W Rt 66? How would pedestrians cross?

- Medians on W Rt 66 b/c it is traffic calming and safer for pedestrians to cross
- Also prohibits left turns onto a busy street

Q: Issue w/ Clay Ave. Extension:

- "If I lived there, I wouldn't want it b/c there would be more cars going through, and also more cars speeding through neighborhood"
- "Maybe just limit to emergency vehicles or public transit?"

### **Funding Exercise & Further Transportation Questions**

Q: If an idea shows up that isn't in the program plan, how would you address it?

- Bring it up within the transportation commission or council
- When priorities are established, we tend to stick to them
- Opportunities for ideas in places such as public meetings

Q: A major problem with the neighborhood is the overflow from Milton, are there any plans to fix that?

We want to "slow people down"- that is what we're looking for.

-Apart of the dialogue during this process, there are plans for a future more comprehensive study of the Milton corridor. We need to apply for and receive a grant from ADOT in order to address this.

-Appreciate the concern, Plaza Vieja is not the only neighborhood with this problem. Plaza Vieja is the "epicenter" of the congestion due to the proximity with Milton

-The reason for the Clay extension with the FMPO is to provide a partial solution Milton (which is an ADOT road) and so we can't take it off the table without having a solution that will deal with congestion issues on Milton or allow for Lone Tree to proceed.

-The cost of the Clay Ave. extension will be around the same if you try to fix some elements of Milton, such as the Humphrey's intersection It is not a solution by itself that would be effective.

**Parking Lot: various comments from the public:**

- Six-lane Milton under the rail road to calm congestion at curve? **Possible but VERY expensive, discussed in the funding exercise**
- What about a pedestrian overpass across Milton down by Riordan?
- Have studies been done that indicate how close a bus stop needs be before people are willing to use it? **1/4mile**
- Superstructure at Florence and Walnut is a waste of money b/c it doesn't do anything to alleviate traffic.
- How to keep children safe on Clay / Speed
- How to manage bottleneck at railroad overpass
- What is staff's recommendation?
- What about the right of way for 6 lanes on Milton (Granny's Closet)
- Removing left turns at Butler hurts access to businesses, so does medians
- How many cars can transit remove?
- What are (traffic) cycles downtown?
- Worried that connecting Clay to Kaibab would move cut-through traffic to Tombstone (unintended consequence).

## **Open House Agenda**

*Thursday January 29, 6 – 8 pm at Our Lady of Guadalupe Chapel, 224 S. Kendrick St.*

There were stations at the open house for Transportation, Land Use, Infrastructure, Housing, Parks and Parking. There were few attendees and no formal presentations. An email was sent by the project manager to staff for any notes or significant conversations that were had between staff and the public. No email responses were collected.

## July LPVNA Public Meeting: Record of Proceeding

*July 8, 2015 6 pm to 8 pm, 397 S. Malpais Lane*

The La Plaza Vieja Neighborhood Association held a public meeting and invited City staff to present on the Transportation and Land Use items in the Draft Plan. David Wessel presented updated information on the findings of the microsimulation for Milton and Route 66 relevant to the neighborhood. Sara Dechter presented on the different policy and concepts for the Neighborhood Core, Transition Area and Commercial Edge. 7 community members were present for the meeting, including one who was not a member of LPVNA.

### **Topics discussed:**

- 1) Reducing traffic volume on Clay Ave. was an important objective we heard at meetings in January. Only 2 options from the microsimulations were able to achieve that outcome: expanding S. Milton Rd. to 6 general purpose lanes and routing traffic to the McCracken Extension. Tentative support was expressed for both options. Staff stated that rationale for the McCracken Extension is stronger if it connects to Kaibab at the western end of the neighborhood. The key to successful meeting the neighborhood objectives is making the new road attractive to traffic and pedestrians and placing appropriate diversion mechanisms to discourage cutting through on Clay Ave. after other streets are added.
- 2) Blackbird Roost traffic signal- There was concern about adding the light without traffic calming leading to additional cut-through traffic which is supported by the microsimulation findings. Staff pointed the attendees to the policies already in the draft plan for these topics. Another concern was additional back up on southbound Milton from the additional signal. David Wessel stated that the microsimulations showed that the lights could be timed to avoid that outcome and that it is an assumption that will be further tested later this summer.
- 3) Appropriate architecture and building sizes were another major concern in the neighborhood in January. The response of the attendees was that the townhomes and duplexes at the end of Clay Ave. (Illustration 1) seemed too large and blocky and need further refinement. The other illustrations were given neutral or positive responses. Staff encouraged the attendees to submit comments on what they think during the public review.
- 4) Park improvements – The new road that would connect Clay Ave. and the McCracken Extension on the Concept Plan was a concern for the neighborhood because it would displace playground equipment and handicapped parking for the ball field. The Concept Plan shows the playground equipment moved to the other side of the park on what is currently private land. The Plan may need a policy that these features should be replaced elsewhere within the block if they are removed for the purpose of connecting the street grid.

## July Old Town Springs Park Open House: Record of Proceeding

July 11, 2015 10am to 12 pm, Old Town Springs Park

City staff: Sara Dechter, Jennifer Mikelson, Mike O'Connor, Steve Zimmerman

City Staff held a neighborhood meeting in the Old Town Springs Park to provide easy access to residents of Upper and Lower Coconino Ave. 10 residents of the neighborhood came to the meeting including several who were able to bring their young children because of the location.

### Topics discussed:

1) Conditions of the spring in the park: Residents wanted to see the springs recognized for their historic importance as a water source for residents, commercial businesses, and the railroad. The spring was developed in the park. Pictures or a historic replica of the development would be appreciated assets in the park. One resident believed the Cline library has such photos. One older resident stated a preference for having a replica or the original installed at the park because she missed seeing it there. Restoring native spring vegetation to the spring is a concept that received support from participants. It would be valuable to visually separate the spring from the surrounding grass and discourage dogs from urinating close to the water. Also residents wanted to know if removing silt from the bottom of the spring would increase the quantity and reliability of the flow.

2) Flagpole in the park: The flagpole is a very important feature in the park because it is one of the possible sites of the first flagpole that Flagstaff was named for. The other 2 possible sites in town have a flag up full time and the residents feel that when the City stopped supporting their flagpole that it was unfair and very upsetting. The residents would help the children in the neighborhood put the flag up and down historically in order to teach them pride and respect. Everyone present had a memory of why it was important to them individual or their children and grandchildren that this part of their neighborhood culture is maintained. Staff promised to explore ways of creating a volunteer relationship with residents who want to maintain this asset. Steve Zimmerman is also going to look into the condition of the flagpole because the top is bent. This should be prioritized as an implementation strategy and may be achievable in the short term.

3) Vegetation in and around the park: The juniper trees in the park are overgrown and need trimming. Some residents would also like to see a path through the juniper for easier park access. Residents also asked if the City could clear the elms that are in the ROW of Lower Coconino between the road and the fence because they obstruct views for some residents.

4) Basketball court: Some residents asked that the basketball court be widened so that they could make wider shots. Steve stated that would require bringing in dirt and might risk disturbing archeological resources in that portion of the park and so that may not be feasible.

5) Ramada rental issues: The park is very popular for ramada rentals on weekends, which keeps some residents from being able to use the park with their families and causes parking issues on the adjacent

roads. Residents prefer that the ramada go back to first come first served so that it can serve local residents that fought to have it created.

6) Railroad crossing for pedestrians and bicycles: The residents expressed a desire to see a railroad crossing near the park. Staff explained that a Florence-Walnut crossing was in the works but that an at-grade second crossing was not an acceptable option for BNSF and a overpass is cost prohibitive.

7) History and Interpretive Panels: There was unanimous support for providing interpretive panels in the park about the history of the spring and surrounding area.

8) Historic District inventory: Residents present stated that they would support an application for a portion of the area north of the tracks to be considered as a historic district and would be able to provide some paperwork to assist in an inventory. This should be prioritized as an implementation strategy.

9) Road conditions: Upper and Lower Coconino are both narrow for a local street. Residents asked if there is a possibility to widen the upper portions of the road in order to facilitate parking and snow removal. They would also like to see "Children at Play" signs to the east of the park to make drivers aware to look out for children.

10) Clay Ave. Extension: Staff answered questions about how this was treated in the concept plan and if it is imminent.

## Appendix B: Consideration of Public Comments

Commenter	Topic	Comment	Staff Response
<b>CC Work Session -6/9</b>	Funding	Provide more information about how CBDG funding can be spent in the neighborhood.	CBDG funding is currently distributed throughout the City using an application process. Staff has identified the implementation strategies that could be funded in whole or in part by CBDG funding so that LPVNA can prioritize and apply for those funds.
<b>Property owner in La Plaza Vieja</b>	207 concern	Our property, McCracken Place, has been placed in the "Transitional Zone" although it has been commercial for over 40 years. Goals and implementations for this zone are serious downzoning and will devalue our property.	The City cannot change land-use (zoning) entitlements without revising its Zoning Code. The Transitional Area is not a zone, but instead is a planning area which encourages commercial and mixed uses, just as the current zoning allows.
<b>Property owner in La Plaza Vieja</b>	207 concern	The plan states clearly (p.35) that approval of property projects depends on whether they are consistent with its "Specific" goals and policies. Goals and policies of the "Transitional Area" (p.380 shown as incompatible uses (p.40) "Included but not limited to" are commercial buildings with parking garages, buildings over 3 stories, metal buildings. This eliminates portions of the park and Canyon Explorations.	-Additional explanation was added to page 35. - Metal buildings are not permitted in commercial zones under current design standards. Existing metal buildings - are non-conforming developments. -Examples of incompatible developments (not uses) listed under Policy 6T.1 only apply in the case of discretionary decisions and do not change existing entitlements.
<b>Property owner in La Plaza Vieja</b>	207 concern	On (p.61) Implementation 6T4 will certainly be downzoning for all commercial uses in the Transitional area, and have a devastating effect on their future value.	If a property owner does not seek a zone change, then the goals of the Specific Plan, like those of the Regional Plan, will be aspirational and the Zoning Code will determine what the owner is allowed to build and how what uses are available.
<b>Property owner in La Plaza Vieja</b>	207 concerns	although the plan recites it "does not impact existing entitlements," it appears to contradict the premise on its face,	If a property owner does not seek a zone change, then the goals of the Specific Plan, like those of the Regional Plan, will be aspirational and the Zoning Code will determine what the owner is allowed to build and how what uses are available.

Commenter	Topic	Comment	Staff Response
<b>Meeting with Council member</b>	207 concerns	Earlier entitlement permitted 4-plexes in this neighborhood, but they are now disallowed under the new zoning code. Is this a taking?	The timeframe for requesting compensation or a waiver under Prop 207 is 3 years and so the deadline has passed if these changes originated from the 2011 Zoning Code update.
<b>Meeting with Council member</b>	207 concerns	Be sure to include more reminders about existing entitlement near each illustration so they are easily found.	Completed in Chapter 2 and 3.
<b>Meeting with Council member</b>	Alleys	Review alley access for residences in the plan and when they need to be improved with new construction.	The Zoning Code (10-30.50.070) currently states, "G. Alley/Lane Improvements When property access is necessary or proposed via an alley/lane, full width alley/lane improvements along the full property frontage in accordance with the Engineering Standards. Alley/lane improvements shall also be extended to the nearest public street if no improved alley or lane connection presently exists." Some problem alleyways were developed prior to the adoption of the current Zoning Code.
<b>CC Work Session -6/9</b>	Arrowhead Village	Arrowhead Trailer Park and a true revitalization of the park	Language about affordable housing incentives has been added under Goal 7
<b>Meeting with Council member</b>	Arrowhead Village	Plan should be very clear about Arrowhead redevelopment. Relocation plan for all residents should be explicit in this plan, regardless of the final redevelopment project.	Created policy 6.1 and added Regional Plan policy LU.1.12 to the list of related policies
<b>Property owner in La Plaza Vieja</b>	Bicycling	Many of our tenants ride bikes along the street to work at the hospital or university. (We welcome any plan that incorporates bike paths.)	Bike paths are incorporated into the Map 2 of the Concept Plan and the Transportation Goals and policies.
<b>Property owner in La Plaza Vieja</b>	Crossings	It is hard to cross route 66 to get to some restaurants/businesses there if you are on foot.	The Plan proposes a signalized intersection which includes crosswalks at Blackbird Roost/Metz Walk and Route 66.
<b>CC Work Session -6/9</b>	Crossings	Any plans for residents to access the neighborhood across the tracks	An underground pedestrian/bike crossing is planned to connect Florence (in LPV south of tracks) and Walnut (north of tracks), dependent on BNSF coordination

Commenter	Topic	Comment	Staff Response
<b>P&amp;Z Work Session -4/22</b>	Crossings	Pedestrian crossings on Milton and their impacts	The microsimulations conducted by the Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning organization are looking at impacts of proposed crossings on the periphery of La Plaza Vieja. They show that the timing could be achieved that would allow for crossing without impacting traffic level of service. Part of the comprehensive planning work program is to develop a comprehensive land use and transportation plan for the Milton corridor. This project is currently unfunded.
<b>Old Town Park PM-7/11</b>	Crossings	The residents expressed a desire to see a railroad crossing near the park.	Staff explained that a Florence-Walnut crossing was in the works but that an at-grade second crossing was not an acceptable option for BNSF and an overpass is cost prohibitive.
<b>Property owner in La Plaza Vieja</b>	Crossings/Streets	Implementation strategies (p.51) #10.2 and 11.5 show no definite locations.	Definite locations are determined at the design phase of a project. The specific plan is a precursor to that work. In the case of the Clay Ave. Wash FUTS connections, the specific location will be determined by the Rio de Flag design work. The updated draft looks at a narrower ROW for the McCracken Extension, will clean up language about the FUTS trail and McCracken Extension and will discuss fair market value compensation of ROW
<b>LPVNA</b>	Gateways	supports installation of two permanent gateway structures on Blackbird Roost and Clay Avenue. These "first impression" entrance structures into our community gateway neighborhood should reflect our sense of identity and pride.	These gateways are included in the plan goals and policies and concept plan.
<b>Resident of Townsite</b>	Historic Preservation	"Encourage putting qualifying homes on the National Register, and/or in our local Landmark District."	Policy 8.1 and Implementation Strategy 8.2 address this issue

Commenter	Topic	Comment	Staff Response
<b>LPVNA</b>	Historic Preservation	Support: "While the neighborhood does not qualify for historic designation, the City has recommended applying for historic designation of small areas or individual structures, based upon owner request."	Implementation Strategy 8.1 and 8.3 address this issue
<b>Property owner in La Plaza Vieja</b>	Historic Preservation	And also to preserve the historic building stock and keep a neighborhood feel. "We intend to place a plaque on the house that explains its historic significance in the hope of creating some community pride."	Implementation Strategy 8.7 addresses creating interpretive opportunities that are coordinated throughout the area.
<b>Old Town Park PM-7/11</b>	Historic Preservation	Residents present stated that they would support an application for a portion of the area north of the tracks to be considered as a historic district and would be able to provide some paperwork to assist in an inventory. This should be prioritized as an implementation strategy.	Staff added "Implementation Strategy 8.3: Conduct an inventory of eligible historic structures along Lower Coconino Ave., W. Coconino Ave. and Spring St."
<b>Old Town Park PM-7/11</b>	Historic Preservation /Park	Residents wanted to see the springs recognized for their historic importance as a water source for residents, commercial businesses, and the railroad.	Policy 3.2 addresses this desire generally and the Master Plan for the Park addresses it more specifically.
<b>Old Town Park PM-7/11</b>	Historic Preservation /Park	...support for providing interpretive panels in the park about the history of the spring and surrounding area.	Policy 3.2 addresses this desire generally and the Master Plan for the Park addresses it more specifically.

Commenter	Topic	Comment	Staff Response
<b>Resident of Townsite</b>	Housing occupancy	“... the neighborhood would benefit from is a lot more owner occupied existing housing and that is not what "reinvestment" provides.” “Odds are extremely good that with the proposed and likely increased density the area will transition to an even higher proportion of rentals and be even less of a real neighborhood.”	There are few financial incentives that the City can provide to encourage owner occupancy directly. The La Plaza Vieja Plan tries to influence this indirectly by stating clear preferences that single family cottages with yards and ADUs as the preferred building type (Policy 6N.3) and by focusing on the preservation of the existing housing (Goal 7). In the Commercial Edge and Transition Area, the compatibility language strongly encourages that the neighborhood scale back from the frontage along Milton and 66 to the Neighborhood Core (Goal 6T) but the existing entitlements cannot be removed without voluntary action by the property owner or a fair market purchase or trade of those rights.
<b>Resident of Townsite</b>	Housing occupancy	“Intensely developed student housing will ruin our city and specifically the areas where they are built. They are mono-cultures.”	This topic is outside the scope of the La Plaza Vieja Plan but may be addressed as part of the action plan for Student Housing adopted by Council in January 2015.
<b>Resident of Townsite</b>	Housing occupancy	“Once a neighborhood hits something like 45% rentals have a tax deduction for owner-occupied homes.”	This is not a strategy that can be pursued under the current laws in Arizona per discussion with the County Assessor’s office.
<b>Meeting with Council member</b>	Housing occupancy	Is it a City rule or a Federal rule that City Housing Rehab Program can’t work with homes in a family trust?	Staff got clarification that a trust can apply for owner occupied housing assistance but that the income qualification would include all members of the trust not just the resident. This has been a source of rejected application for trust owned properties in the program.
<b>Meeting with Council member</b>	Housing occupancy	Include a provision about the rental rehab program helping landlords who truly need the help; prove financial need.	Though the plan supports a pilot program, the details would need to be applicable City-wide and therefore are outside the scope of an area-specific plan. This threshold would be determined as part of developing the authority for the housing staff to execute this program.
<b>CC Work Session -6/9</b>	Implementation strategies	How to kick start a lot of these improvement projects in the neighborhood. How to coordinate our City timeframes and funding available to the neighborhood.	Appendix 1 has been updated in response to this information.

Commenter	Topic	Comment	Staff Response
<b>Property owner in La Plaza Vieja</b>	Landscaping	We do not believe in cementing over yards for lower maintenance. We have not only planted trees, front back and side, but installed a bird bath and plants that attract butterflies and bees. Tenants are permitted to have raised beds for growing vegetables in some units.	Emphasized the importance of landscaped yards in policies 6N.3 and 6N.4
<b>Property owner in La Plaza Vieja</b>	Landscaping	We are particularly interested in ways the community can be encouraged to plant trees and improve landscaping. “We have noticed that the Montessori School on Clay has planted trees and also Grand Canyon Explorations. The ball park is well-maintained and we welcome Natural Grocers into the neighborhood. (We welcome the tenants across the street who have installed a raised vegetable bed and a flock of back yard chickens.)”	Staff added POLICY 6N.8: Encourage property owners to plant and maintain deciduous trees that shade the sidewalk in the summer where there is no parkway strip for street trees.
<b>LPVNA</b>	Neighborhood Boundary	La Vieja Neighborhood Association supports no boundary change to the La Plaza Vieja Neighborhood.	No response required
<b>CC Work Session 6/9</b>	Neighborhood Boundary	How was the neighborhood boundary established?	Continued same boundary from last draft. Based on historic familial/cultural ties between the tracks that the boundary is intended to preserve. Staff added information to the Site and Area Analysis of the document to reflect the intent of the boundary line.

Commenter	Topic	Comment	Staff Response
<b>Resident of Townsite</b>	Neighborhood character	“Ultimately everything (in the plan) is done piecemeal as properties become available or an owner decides to do something and so the area may never again have a cohesive character.”	La Plaza Vieja has over 200 individual property owners, most of who own small lots. The Parts of the proposal that would be spearheaded by the City, such as the McCracken Extension have the potential for the largest impact. The City’s options for changing this scenario are limited unless there was an effort to acquire property in the neighborhood or an opportunity for public-private partnership is available. The LPV plan is designed to provide consistent area-specific information about compatibility to all levels of development from duplexes to large scale mixed use projects.
<b>Resident of Townsite</b>	Neighborhood character	“...plenty of people who work at NAU, City, County, have or work at small businesses who want to live in the historic core...these people do not want to live in apartments or town homes...they want to live in the smaller--theoretically more affordable--historic houses with yards.”	The La Plaza Vieja Plan has policies intended to encourage the renovation and preservation of single family homes. However, developing single family homes in areas zoned Highway Commercial is not economically feasible for a for-profit development because of the underlying cost of the land.
<b>Resident of Townsite</b>	Neighborhood character	“All the illustrations are for apartments and multifamily housing and a few single family "bungalows," I think the term used was, and none are in scale with the historic--everything is larger, at least another story taller, if not multiple stories taller.”	All of the illustrations in the draft are in the Transition Area or Commercial Edge, which is predominantly zoned Highway Commercial. The illustrations represent a balance between the maximum scale building allowed and the historic residential scale. Illustrations in the final will include a examples few single family redevelopment of non-conforming apartment buildings in the R1N zone.
<b>Resident of Townsite</b>	Neighborhood character	If redevelopment occurs next to smaller established homes require trees to buffer the difference in size.	Requiring this may block views from the neighborhood homes based on feedback at public meetings during July. Street trees were preferred to requiring trees for screening between properties.
<b>Resident of Townsite</b>	Neighborhood character	The code (should) say new construction can be only X number of feet taller than adjacent properties and certainly not block natural light or views.	The specific plan cannot remove existing entitlements but the document does discuss mass and scale as a compatibility issue in the policies under Goal 6.

Commenter	Topic	Comment	Staff Response
<b>Property owner in La Plaza Vieja</b>	Neighborhood character	Hope that the infill development will be in character with Old Town and sensitive to environmental and community needs	The goals and policies take into account the character of the oldest buildings in the neighborhood and call for even buildings in the Commercial Edge and Transition Area to incorporate architectural elements of historic buildings.
<b>CC Work Session -6/9</b>	Neighborhood character	Does the plan include design review of new buildings?	The plan cannot change the current design standards without further action by Council. Changes could be brought forward in an overlay district or other appropriate ordinance (Implementation Strategies 6N.1, 6N.2 and 6N.3 support this).
<b>P&amp;Z Work Session -4/22</b>	Neighborhood Character	What about all of the 4 unit apartment buildings in the neighborhood core?	Non-conforming developments are treated consistently across the City under the Zoning Code (10.20-60).
<b>LPVNA-hosted PM-7/8</b>	Neighborhood character	The townhomes and duplexes at the end of Clay Ave. (Illustration 1) seemed too large and blocky and need further refinement.	Staff developed a modified concept for this illustration to address this comment.
<b>Old Town Park PM-7/11</b>	Park	It would be valuable to visually separate the spring from the surrounding grass.	Incorporate into Park Master Plan.
<b>Old Town Park PM-7/11</b>	Park	Also residents wanted to know if removing silt from the bottom of the spring would increase the quantity and reliability of the flow.	Silt could be flushed from the springs using a high pressure hose from a fire hydrant or other City water source. The overall flow of the spring has always been relatively low and the only way to increase the flow significantly would be to supplement with water from another source on a regular basis, which is cost prohibitive.
<b>Old Town Park PM-7/11</b>	Park	The flagpole is a very important feature in the park because it is one of the possible sites of the first flagpole that Flagstaff was named for. The other 2 possible sites in town have a flag up full time and the residents feel that when the City stopped supporting their flagpole that it was unfair and very upsetting.	Steve Zimmerman, Parks Manager, is working on costs and logistics about how to put the flag back up most efficiently and permanently.

Commenter	Topic	Comment	Staff Response
<b>Old Town Park PM-7/11</b>	Park	The juniper trees in the park are overgrown and need trimming.	Incorporate into Park Master Plan.
<b>Old Town Park PM-7/11</b>	Park	Some residents would also like to see a path through the juniper for easier park access.	This may pose a liability issue and increase traffic through the park. Staff did not include this concept in the Master Plan.
<b>Old Town Park PM-7/11</b>	Park	Some residents asked that the basketball court be widened so that they could make wider shots.	May not be feasible. This might require bringing in dirt and might risk disturbing archeological resources in that portion of the park.
<b>Old Town Park PM-7/11</b>	Park	Residents prefer that the ramada go back to first come first served so that it can serve local residents that fought to have it created.	Staff took this request to discuss the Parks and Recreation Commission in August and it was not accepted. The Commission felt that if they allowed a deviation from the City-wide policy in one area that others would pursue the same remedy. Staff recommended that notes and information in the reservation system could better inform citizens about the size of the park and limited parking, prior to finalizing their reservation.
<b>LPVNA-hosted PM-7/8</b>	Park	The new road that would connect Clay Ave. and the McCracken Extension on the Concept Plan was a concern for the neighborhood because it would displace playground equipment and handicapped parking for the ball field.	Added policy that if the playground is displaced it should be replaced by another space near the current location.
<b>Meeting with Council member</b>	Parking	Considering the upcoming neighborhood parking plan through Community Investment; cost of parking shouldn't be put on residents. This plan should address the parking situation in the neighborhood and mention any upcoming changes in the ZC about parking requirements.	The plan emphasizes on shared parking lots with reinvestment, as well as additional on-street street parking with either road extension option. On-site parking for residences is being addressed through Zoning Code updates and management of on-street parking by a separate City policy initiative.
<b>LPVNA</b>	Parking	street parking continues to be a significant neighborhood concern and requires further review.	On-site parking for residences is being addressed through Zoning Code updates and management of on-street parking by a separate City policy initiative.

Commenter	Topic	Comment	Staff Response
<b>LPVNA</b>	Parking	Duplex Issues: Number of occupants and parking continue to be of significant concern to the Association and the neighborhood.	On-site parking for residences is being addressed through Zoning Code updates and management of on-street parking by a separate City policy initiative.
<b>La Plaza Vieja Property Owner</b>	Parking	"Shared parking" (p.30) between apartments and commercial, increasing parking capacity for commercial buildings. This is prime parking next to an university. Students will use it.	Students use parking throughout the City in commercial lots, regardless of whether or not it is shared with adjacent businesses. Many larger lots have security guards and towing contracts. The solution to this issue is a comprehensive parking policy that is currently under development by City staff.
<b>Old Town Park PM-7/11</b>	Parking	The park is very popular for ramada rentals on weekends, which keeps some residents from being able to use the park with their families and causes parking issues on the adjacent roads.	Lower Coconino Ave. has sufficient space for parking on one side of the road because it only has houses on one side of the road. From the park to the road junction there is a red curb on the south side and no parking signs. There is more than the minimum travel lane width if everyone parks legally. The red curb could be extended to the west if the problem persists beyond a compliance issue.
<b>La Plaza Vieja Property Owner</b>	Policy Areas	It would be best to omit the Transitional Zone which includes 3 single family residences on our block which are used as rentals and a group home on Clay Ave.	Staff will add a more comprehensive description of each policy area to clarify the intent of the Transition Area. Name changes were considered but none carried forward. Removal of the transition area is not in compliance with the Flagstaff Regional Plan2030, which distinguishes between the commercial core, corridors and pedestrian sheds.

Commenter	Topic	Comment	Staff Response
<b>CC Work Session -6/9</b>	Policy Areas	Were the businesses included in the commercial edge contacted?	Our recent update outreach included several post card notifications of public meetings and public review drafts to all property owners and flyers were hand delivered to all businesses in the Commercial Edge and Transition Area last November. Phone calls to property owners in the Transition area were made early in the public involvement process and all received postcards announcing the public review period. Only one property owner came forward to speak with staff.
<b>Property owner in La Plaza Vieja</b>	Property Maintenance	Also, the side of the street with the hillside to the back where there is currently a lot for sale is used by the entire community and beyond as a dumping site.	The City has Environmental Codes that address dumping on private property. Code compliance staff regularly remediates dumping on private land.
<b>Resident of Townsite</b>	Property maintenance	“Promote home maintenance with public dollars for qualifying low income owners.”	Owner Occupied Rehabilitation Program and Implementation Strategy to pilot a rental rehab program
<b>Resident of Townsite</b>	Property maintenance	Require a set minimum percentage of rental income be reinvested into the property.	No legal mechanism by which to require this.
<b>Resident of Townsite</b>	Property maintenance	Have a property maintenance ordinance!	Building and Code Compliance staff conducted a review of the current City codes as part of this project. They determined that the only area where the current code does not allow for management of a health and safety issues is overgrown vegetation on private land (Policy 2.3).
<b>CC Work Session -6/9</b>	Property Maintenance	Was there any discussion about the property maintenance ordinance since there were some buildings in the area that are uninhabitable last time the plan was presented to Council?	The building official enforces subject to the standards in that code. Many of the buildings have been boarded up and others renovated.
<b>Resident of Townsite</b>	Reinvestment	“I see a focus on ‘redevelopment’ and ‘reinvestment’ as encouraging neighborhood decline. A value judgment is being placed on someone else’s property”	These terms do not mean that in the context of this document. Add definitions to the glossary and clarifying language or explanation where needed.

Commenter	Topic	Comment	Staff Response
<b>P&amp;Z Work Session -4/22</b>	Reinvestment	Better explain why some properties are reinvestment and others are not	Opportunity to add ADU or currently vacant lots. Also looked at buildings that had age or condition issues that might make them possible reinvestment opportunities. The concept plan does not show any single family residences as opportunities for reinvestment, except those in commercial zoning districts. However, the staff recognizes the reality that not all buildings in the neighborhood will be restored.
<b>Resident of La Plaza Vieja</b>	Single property issue	990 W. Coconino Ave has had addressing problems because the City abandoned a right of way on Wilson Ave. This has impacted their emergency services response time. (synopsis)	City Staff confirmed that this ROW was abandoned on Oct 13, 1987 by Ordinance No. 1513. City's addressing team is working to resolve this and several other addressing issues nearby.
<b>Resident of La Plaza Vieja</b>	Single property issue	Alleyway next to 113 S. Kingman Street is full of trash and not maintained properly by the City.	Following up with individual property owner and public works on this issue
<b>Property owner in La Plaza Vieja</b>	Snow removal	One concern of the families on our end of Clay Avenue is that the City does not clear snow there. (One of the home owners currently does the snow clearance).	Clay Avenue is a local street in front of the houses in question and is therefore at the bottom of the priority list for snow removal. In addition, there is no turn around and so a loader must be used for clearing snow. The concept plan for creating a loop back to Chateau Drive would improve the ability of street crews to remove snow from this road.
<b>LPVNA-hosted PM-7/8</b>	Streets	Another concern was additional back up on southbound Milton from the additional signal.	David Wessel stated that the micro-simulations showed that the lights could be timed to avoid that outcome and that it is an assumption that will be further tested later this summer.
<b>LPVNA</b>	Streets	Safe street access for all users into and within the neighborhood is essential to preserve and improve the neighborhood's walkable character.	Policies 12.1, 12.2, 12.3 and 12.5 all support safe and comfortable neighborhood streetscapes.

Commenter	Topic	Comment	Staff Response
<b>LPVNA</b>	Streets	La Plaza Vieja Neighborhood Association does not support the Clay Avenue Extension, as it would divide the neighborhood into three sections. The City is proposing the McCracken Street Extension, an alternate route through Malpais Lane, which would better preserve our neighborhood character.	The Plan cannot remove the possibility of a Clay Avenue extension being pursued. The document does have policies concerning mitigations for traffic, a possible alternative route and a statement that the neighborhood considers the development of a Clay Ave. extension incompatible with the neighborhood character.
<b>Property owner in La Plaza Vieja</b>	Streets	We like the neighborhood feel of the street on Clay Ave, children played there not so long ago, and people walk up the street looking for the trail.	Policies 12.1, 12.2, 12.3 and 12.5 all support safe and comfortable neighborhood streetscapes.
<b>La Plaza Vieja Property Owner</b>	Streets	The Published plan to extend McCracken Street, shown as 81 feet wide (p.27) as an alternative to the regional plan and add a street on the north side of our property (p.17), would leave a sliver of land with a limited use. The new streets will leave very little building property and certainly will not leave room for town-homes, commercial space, and shared parking as envisioned. The concept plan (p.25) and map (p.26) will not be understood by most people as future dreams.	<p>The alignment for a possible extension of McCracken Street is meant to provide an alternative to the Clay Avenue alignment that would be considered in future studies of transportation solutions for Milton Road and Route 66. The 81 foot ROW cross section in the draft plan was only intended to show a maximum ROW because no design work is completed as part of neighborhood planning for infrastructure. At a conceptual level, a portion of the ROW would be dedicated to stormwater if the Rio de Flag project comes to fruition and the road would be over the stormwater pipe. Also the ROW would likely not come from just one side of a property line.</p> <p>If the City proceeds with a project for McCracken Street, property owners would have the opportunity to negotiate the value of the property after receiving an appraisal. When Flagstaff acquires property, like other government entities, we determine our offer giving consideration to the impact of the acquisition on the value of the remaining property.</p>

Commenter	Topic	Comment	Staff Response
<b>La Plaza Vieja Property Owner</b>	Streets	We object strenuously to (p.52) Strategy 12.4 as it would require demolition of our 17,000 square foot office building.	<p>There is more than 81 feet between buildings in the area conceptually proposed for a McCracken Street extension and therefore no buildings would need to be demolished for its construction. Ideally, land would be acquired or dedicated to the City as property owners redevelop their properties in order to provide the greatest flexibility.</p> <p>If the City proceeds with a project for McCracken Street, property owners would have the opportunity to negotiate the value of the property after receiving an appraisal. When Flagstaff acquires property, like other government entities, we determine our offer giving consideration to the impact of the acquisition on the value of the remaining property.</p>
<b>La Plaza Vieja Property Owner</b>	Streets	The extension of McCracken Street and the new street provide no greater access to the highway.	The McCracken Street extension if connected through to Kaibab Lane would provide access similar to that proposed by the Clay Avenue Extension. The main difference would be that the proposed route would pass through a commercial and multifamily portion of the neighborhood and would not degrade pedestrian access between the neighborhood and the park and the school on the south side of Clay Ave.
<b>Old Town Park PM-7/11</b>	Streets	Residents also asked if the City could clear the elms that are in the ROW of Lower Coconino between the road and the fence because they obstruct views for some residents.	Elms on the north side of the fence could be cleared but those rooting up on the south side need to be cleared by BNSF. Stump treatments could be done on either side of the property line
<b>Old Town Park PM-7/11</b>	Streets	Upper and Lower Coconino are both narrow for a local street. Residents asked if there is a possibility to widen the upper portions of the road in order to facilitate parking and snow removal. They would also like to see “Children at Play” signs to the east of the park to make drivers aware to look out for children.	Both Upper and Lower Coconino are local roads whose width and construction meets the current Engineering Safety and Design Standards. There are signs with a child on a seesaw on either side of the park along both roads.

Commenter	Topic	Comment	Staff Response
<b>LPVNA-hosted PM-7/8</b>	Streets	Reducing traffic volume on Clay Ave. was an important objective we heard at meetings from the public in January. Only 2 options from the micro-simulations were able to achieve that outcome: expanding S. Milton Rd. to 6 general purpose lanes and routing traffic to the McCracken Extension. Tentative support was expressed for both options by those in attendance.	No response
<b>LPVNA-hosted PM-7/8</b>	Streets	Blackbird Roost traffic signal- There was concern about adding the light without traffic calming leading to additional cut-through traffic which is supported by the micro-simulation findings.	This is a possibility and a clear trade-off between better access to the larger community for residents and the percentage of cut-through traffic. Policies 12.1, 12.2, 12.3 and 12.5 all support safe and comfortable neighborhood streetscapes.
<b>Meeting with Council member</b>	Streets	Consider alternatives outside neighborhood and exhaust those before pursuing Clay Ave Extension.	Policy 13.2 was written to address this concern.
<b>Meeting with Council member</b>	Streets	Why the dirt roads in the neighborhood? Explain why they aren't paved.	All City roads in the neighborhood are paved. Some "dirt roads" are alleys and private driveways. The dirt road at the end of Clay Avenue is a BNSF maintenance road that is technically outside of the City limits. Dupont was once a dirt road but was paved in 2014.
<b>Meeting with Council member</b>	Traffic	LPV and 5 Points area are the ones experiencing impact of NAU closing off access through campus. Plan should speak to NAU's role	This is outside the scope of a neighborhood plan, as it affects a broad area beyond the boundaries of the neighborhood including the Southside neighborhood. I can be addressed by ongoing engagement with NAU but the City cannot make NAU open it's campus to through traffic unilaterally.

Commenter	Topic	Comment	Staff Response
LPVNA	Transit	More discussion needed	Policy 14.3 was added to address continued engagement between the City, NAIPTA and the neighborhood.
	View Sheds	Vistas and View Sheds: ...further discussion ... is needed.	Staff discussed vistas and viewsheds with LPVNA and their desired outcome was to include a list of what views should be preserved from the neighborhood in the relevant policies. POLICY 6T.7 and Policy 6C.4