

MINUTES - DRAFT

City of Flagstaff

REGIONAL PLAN CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

3:30 p.m. – 6 p.m. October 15, 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

The meeting was called to order at 3:38 p.m. by Vice Chair Carol Bousquet.

II. Roll Call

A. **Committee Members:**

<input type="checkbox"/> Paul Babbitt (Chairman)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alex Frawley	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Devonna McLaughlin
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carol Bousquet (Vice Chairman)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jean Griego	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jerome Naleski
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ben Anderson	<input 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

C. **Staff:** Sue Pratt, Kim Sharp, Bob Caravona

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/>

None

Approval of Minutes – October 1, 2009 Meeting Minutes

A motion to approve the Meeting Minutes of October 1, 2009 was made and seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

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

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

PURPOSE: To continue policy review as established at the Sep. 17, 2009 CAC meeting (Land Use policies 1-7 covered); 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: Sue Pratt

ATTACHMENTS: Policy Review – survey results

LU 1.8 TO PROMOTE TARGETED REDEVELOPMENT

Nat White asked what redevelopment means. Whether it meant developing an empty parcel, tearing down and re-building, or making an existing building or parcel better?

Ms. Pratt said her understanding was to provide incentives for redevelopment of targeted areas such as Fourth Street and was not to be confused with infill.

Bill Ring pointed out that Map 23 of the Regional Plan shows the areas of targeted redevelopment that have been designated and is most of the areas that is recognized as commercial districts.

Nat White commented that the distinction between infill and redevelopment can overlap.

Ms. Pratt said that this was correct; you can have redevelopment in areas of undeveloped parcels.

Judy Louks commented that she was still unsure whether sustainability had been defined and had an issue with including that word in a modified policy statement with development. As a group, the CAC needs to define sustainable.

Ms. Pratt noted that they could vote solely on the existing policy, with notes that definitions for 'redevelopment' and 'sustainability' were needed at a later time, when the new policies were being drafted.

Bill Ring commented that the issue for him was not in the policy but the strategy. How we attempt to achieve the policy is the detail that he hesitates on until they are able to see the types of incentives, grants, participation or RFPs. The strategies are more important than policy. He said these are instituted but not completely. He said he was okay with the policy, but was more worried about the strategy.

Judy Louks said she was in agreement with the way the policy was currently written.

Devonna McLaughlin commented that she did not understand how they could vote without clearly identifying the 'redevelopment area'. More discussion is needed on the appropriate areas.

Kim Sharp pointed out that the Committee will be discussing 'Activity Centers' in more detail, especially if the group wants to work with Sector Planning. These investigations would help determine the where.

Bob Caravona provided a clarification on infill and what the next steps would entail.

Alex Frawley commented that redevelopment is usually lower socio-economic areas and if the City of Flagstaff has adopted the International Energy Conservation Code (IECC), that would ensure any redevelopment or infill would be energy efficient. We don't have to say sustainable, we're talking about energy bills and using the existing building code.

Nat White pointed out that section 1.8 introduces targeted redevelopment and 1.9 promotes quality development design. He commented that these all work together and an accompanying policy could specifically address environmentally sensitive development and design. Strategies and other policy statements must support what type of redevelopment is desired.

Ms. Pratt commented that the recommendation of Staff was to move 1.9 to the Community Character element.

Bill Ring commented that it would be interesting to define what redevelopment might be. Redevelopment could be retrofit of existing facilities to be more energy efficient and/or re-use of existing buildings.

Nat White commented that the goal would be to promote redevelopment but describe it as a very general term in the policy.

Ms. Pratt commented that the vote would be on the bold part of the policy which is "To Promote Targeted Redevelopment" and the rest of the text of the policy would be revisited and discussed in more detail.

Celia Barotz commented on the word "targeted". What the difference was between-targeted redevelopment and redevelopment? Could the goal be general redevelopment in appropriate locations?

Ms. Pratt noted that this would be displayed on the accompanying map.

Ms. Sharp commented that 'targeted redevelopment' was used as an economic development tool in writing grants and requesting state and federal funding through programs such as Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Zones, as well as local incentives for infill development.

Devonna McLaughlin requested that the CAC develop a targeted redevelopment map over the next many months through this planning process.

Ms. Pratt commented that more information was needed to help decide what the strategies will be, and to define and differentiate between infill and redevelopment. She recommended voting on the original policy to accept the general concept of the policy but to be refined in future discussions. Compound adjective "targeted and opportunities for redevelopment". Do not use 'targeted' but develop a map (Map 23 evolved) that identifies these areas. CAC action - Original policy concept with future refinement and strategy development.

Five finger vote: 5/4 votes

LU1.9 PROMOTE QUALITY DESIGN

Staff recommendation is to move this policy to the community character element for more discussion.

Nat White asked if there would be a reference to see community design once this is finished.

Ms. Pratt answered that there should be links to the related topics.

Nat White commented that within Community Character, there is also an Energy Character which has to do with transportation, heating, lighting and other things that use energy yet how they are aesthetically implemented has much to do with Community Character.

Ms. Pratt pointed out that Energy is an element, but not in the current plan. It has been identified as an element to develop, and the CAC will have opportunity to address this concern.

It was noted by Ms. Pratt that some of the Land Use Elements were not available and the discussion moved on to the Commercial Development section.

C1 COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Recommendation by staff was **"Commercial development shall be well designed and appropriately located while remaining compatible with surrounding land use."**

The Committee was in agreement with the staff recommendation.

Five finger vote: 5/4/3

C1.1 DESIGNATE COMMERCIAL AREAS ACCORDING TO THEIR ROLE AND FUNCTION IN THE REGION

Staff's recommendation was "New commercial development shall be targeted to identify regional, neighborhood, urban, and rural activity centers with other planned commercial areas. In order to promote efficient and safe traffic movement and to avoid esthetic problems, strip commercial development is strongly discouraged."

Ms. Pratt commented that the County does not support strip commercial development along major corridors.

Bob Caravona pointed out that the first sentence in this policy uses the same language as the FMPO's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and this proposed policy statement was developed using the RTP, which is based upon activity centers.-Community Character Design may be the document element to address whether strip centers were desired for our community or not.

Judy Louks commented that a Policy statement should state what we want, not what we don't want, and this document should avoid negative statements such as "discouraged" – just state what is desired.

Ms. Pratt asked the Committee if Staff's recommendation captured the essence of desired policy rather than what is in the current policy. She asked if the first sentence captured the intent of this policy.

Maury Herman asked to have the sentence read over again, saying that it was more of a definition rather than a policy.

Ms. Pratt commented that Coconino County would consider a proposed development as to whether it fits within an activity center location, as well as the intention for the planned activity center, such as a neighborhood center or civic use.

Maury Herman asked if it should read that "Commercial areas are to be designated as" and referenced later as to what they are.

Bob Caravona gave an example of the auto mall, which was designated as a regional center, with shoppers coming from all over the region. Thus, designating commercial center types according to use makes sense. Big ticket items are not desired in your neighborhood centers, which helps explain the role and function of defining commercial area types.

Maury Herman commented that they would have to be designated according to their role and function in the region and the next sentence is supposed to elaborate on that by listing what they are.

Bob Caravona commented that in staff's suggestion, he would- delete the words "new commercial development", because new development or redevelopment may be included in a commercial area.

Alex Frawley commented that they might take out the word "targeted".

Maury Herman commented that he has had experience with the definition of both local and regional centers where acceptable activities are initially not allowed because of complications with those definitions. He used the example of an Alzheimer's facility in a residential area planned neighborhood commercial center. The proposed facility was not met with approval at the initial review, because it was not directly used by the surrounding neighborhood. After further discussion, it was eventually approved. He point being that a 'regional center' activity may very well work in a local neighborhood center, as long as it didn't destroy the neighborhood character.

Bill Ring commented that he is still trying to figure out what the original policy is addressing and what we want it to address. He commented that he thought the first three words were the purpose of the policy. He said that staff's recommendation was asking them to adopt the strategy as a policy, in which he would be okay with making the strategy a policy.

Nat White stated that he supports Mr. Ring's recommendation making the strategy a policy.

The question was whether to take the word "new" out and the Committee was in agreement with taking it out. Modified statement for vote: **"Commercial development shall be targeted to identified regional, neighborhood, urban or rural activity center or to other planned commercial areas" with an accompanying map.**

Five Finger vote: 5/4

C1.2 APPLY DESIGN AND LOCATION STANDARDS FOR LARGE RETAIL COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT INCLUDING BIG BOX DEVELOPMENT.

Ms. Pratt commented that Staff's suggestion was to reword to "Large retail establishments, big box retail shall be located in regional and community scaled shopping centers where adequate multi modal access and infrastructure can be provided. Such establishments shall be required to meet city design standards. Big box shall be strongly discouraged outside urban growth boundaries."

Maury Herman commented that he is advocating ensuring big boxes are designed for future re-use. Flagstaff has experienced a number of empty big boxes no longer having function after the initial use, and re-using these large buildings is a huge design challenge. He would like to see any proposed large box buildings designed and engineered to allow them to be recycled, enabled by a proactive policy.

Ms. Pratt recommended including some of the wording from comment #1 in the policy for future discussion.

Nat White said he liked the staffs wording with Maury's comments added in parenthesis.

Bill Ring concurred with Maury's concerns, in which he calls the empty big boxes 'urban caves'. He recalled a past discussion about a Demolition bond, to be able to tear down the building and redevelopment the infill.

Judy Louks suggested using words of what is desired, and not what is 'NOT desired'. The discussion was to leave it the way it is for further discussion.

Carol Bousquet noted that the second sentence "required to meeting city design standards" is not necessary here, because all new development must meet these standards. Remove second sentence.

Bob Caravona commented that the developer does have to go through design review and the second sentence may not be necessary.

Nat White commented that older development insisted upon building to their own standards, but now the City has learned to set the standards.

Ms. Pratt commented that the county did adopt a big box ordinance, and there is a limit to square feet allowed.

Ms. Sharp read her suggested wording to the Committee. **"Well designed large retail establishments (big box retail) shall be in regional and community scale shopping center within the Urban Growth Boundary where adequate multi-modal access and infrastructure can be provided. Big Boxes shall be "pre configured" for reuse after their initial use is no longer viable."**

Five finger vote: 5/4

Alex Frawley asked how the FMPO Regional Transportation Plan relates to these commercial centers. The Regional Transportation Plan is still in draft form and there will be a town hall meeting for review on October 22, and comments can be submitted via e-mail and at the Town Hall. Mr. David Wessel will be at the Town Hall to explain the plan.

Alex Frawley asked if the Regional Transportation Plan was separate from the transportation policy within the Regional Plan.

Ms. Sharp explained that a small portion of the transportation plan budget was set aside to include revisions based upon Regional Plan updated policy.

Bill Ring commented that these are good questions coming from Alex and suggested that they explain FMPO, what role they play and how it is different from the City of Flagstaff.

Ms. Sharp gave a brief explanation of what FMPO is and who are involved in this. They are a separate entity and the board consists of the city manager, county manager, two elected city official, 2 county officials, ADOT and staff.

Bill Ring commented that the FMPO is a separate entity and his concern is that they may be overruled by the objectives of the FMPO when it comes down to transportation planning. The jurisdiction may be overlapping.

Judy Louks asked who has jurisdiction? Who has the final say? She commented that you can't plan for the activity centers until you have the transportation plan. In her perspective, the transportation plan dictates where the activity centers would be.

Celia Barotz commented that the deadline for comments to the FMPO is November 19,-and if the Regional Transportation Plan is adopted, it ties the hands of this group. You could not write any transportation plans that would conflict with their plans.

Bill Ring commented that he has experience in which particular developments were provided with an FMPO traffic model that was in conflict with city engineers.

Ms. Pratt encouraged the CAC to participate at the Town Hall, and suggested that Mr. Wessel will be at the next CAC meeting (Nov. 5) which is prior to end of the comment period. Celia Barotz's understanding for the Regional Transportation Plan's purpose is that it is federally mandated, and it helps our region acquire-federal funding for transportation projects.

Bob Caravona commented that Mr. Wessel has used the existing Regional Plan for the RTP analysis, and he is one of the planners on the Core Planning Team to ensure the RTP policies are not in conflict with the Regional Plan policies.

Maury Herman commented that he went to hearing on a proposed pipeline roadway and asked how this ties in with the plan. Bob Caravona stated that proposed road has been eliminated from the RTP.

Bill Ring asked about the east bypass road. Bob Caravona stated that this is a controversial issue, and the CAC should be prepared with their comments.

C1.3 INCLUDE A MIX OF USES IN NEW COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT

Ms. Pratt said this is a policy intended to support mixed use development.

Maury Herman commented that some of his concern relates to scale. He would like it to say 'when it is appropriate.'

Judy Louks gave an example of what she is faced with concerning a piece of property that she can't use. She did not think every parcel is worth mixed use. She did not like the way this was worded.

Nat White commented that it should say 'new development shall encourage mixed use.'

Bob Caravona had a problem with the use of the word "shall"; to him it meant absolute with no wiggle room.

Alex Frawley commented that this policy identifies the desire for mixed use in Flagstaff. There are many people who want mixed use, and we are here for the community. Times are changing, and we can't continue to develop like we did because there are too many people against it. We cannot write a Regional Plan for developers and property owners.

Judy Louks asked how you support a mixed used in certain areas.

Davonna McLaughlin commented that she would not want mixed use in every area.

Maury Herman commented that the market does lead to mixed use. There is huge potential for some intergenerational housing.

Ben Anderson suggested removing the words "include and encourage" and add to the end 'where appropriate' and that it should definitely remain as a policy.

Alex Frawley asked what the planners in the group thought about the policy.

Bill Ring commented that what sounds like flexible language is really not, and the zoning code will set the essential terms.

Nat White commented that we're talking about a policy, how we want our community to be. Sometimes shall is important and sometimes it's not. The policy needs to be something that provides a guide but not every step of the way.

Celia Barotz commented that with her experience on the P & Z Commission,-it is the land use map that dictates. The planners are trying to implement the land use plan.

Bill Ring commented that the plan is intended to produce mixed use results and we don't want it to seem that we are diluting the policy by replacing words like shall to encourage, one size does not fit all. Ms. Pratt commented that this area needs more discussion and asked if the Committee would want to go with Ben's recommendation.

Ms. Sharp commented that if the Committee uses sector planning, the noted 'activity centers' would have this flexibility.

Encourage a mix of uses in new commercial development and redevelopment where appropriate.

Five finger vote on Ben's recommendation. 5/4

C1.4 PROMOTE A HIGH QUALITY URBAN ENVIRONMENT IN ALL COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT AREAS.

Bill Ring commented that he thought this policy was to modify the strategies. The strategies in the Plan were design guidelines and have had their intended results.

Ben Anderson commented that they need to come to an understanding of the kind of issues where we have made changes and defining language. There is a need to come to some agreement where they will be making changes.

Nat White commented that he supported the need to establish consistency within the Regional Plan document.

Ms. Pratt asked if they wanted to vote on bold policy wording.

Nat White commented that it was fine with him as long as there is some kind of direction underneath.

PROMOTE A QUALITY URBAN ENVIRONMENT IN ALL COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT AREAS. Five finger vote: 5/4/3. This will require more discussion and detail.

C1.5 DESIGN AND ESTABLISH NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL CENTERS.

Maury Herman commented that this was not clear to him, when you say neighborhood commercial, it is different from neighborhood activity. Neighborhood activity could be a school or post office, where 'Neighborhood Commercial' is sustained by businesses that draw on multiple sources of revenue. No real idea what the ultimate user will be. Regional centers will prosper better if there are other types of businesses besides just retail.

Alex Frawley commented that they need activity centers to be defined.

Nat White commented that the goal for commercial development is shopping and services area that meets the needs of the community. He did not think there was anything wrong with the policy.

Devonna McLaughlin commented that TNDs promote this type of development.

Nat White commented that C1.5 is more of a definition of what the policy statement is about.

Ms. Pratt suggested using the same words for mixed use. Suggested:

Maury Herman suggested the following wording. "Neighborhood commercial centers in the city shall be designed as pedestrian oriented gathering places open to a mix of retail, office and services providing goods and service necessary to meet the needs of the neighborhood and a larger community while reflecting the identify and character of the surrounding residential neighborhoods."

Nat White recommended the bold wording as the policy and Maury's statement as the follow-up to it. **"Encourage the establishment of neighborhood commercial centers where appropriate."**

Five finger Vote: 5/4

C.2 DOWNTOWN FLAGSTAFF WILL CONTINUETO SERVE AS THE PRIMARY FOCAL POINT OF THE COMMUNITY AS ESTABLISHED BY DEVELOPMENT INTENSITY, LAND USE, BUILDING HEIGHT, AND HIGH QUALITY URBAN DESIGN.

Five Finger Vote: 5 unanimous

C2.1 REINFORCE THE ROLE OF DOWNTOWN.

Carol Bousquet commented that this lays the groundwork for form based code. The role of downtown shall be reinforced by making downtown more accessible, supporting a variety of uses as a focal point for the entire region, improving the appearance of the area, and promoting the preservation of the original architecture of historic buildings.

Ms. Sharp suggested the following wording: **“The improvement of downtown shall be supported through design and historic preservations standards, additional multi-modal access, improved parking, enhanced appearance and appropriate densities.”**

Five finger Vote: 5/4

V. NEW BUSINESS

No new business

VI. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS

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

1. **Next CAC Meeting:** November 5, 2009 - 3:30 p.m. to 6 p.m. at N.AZ Healthcare facilities

Future Agenda Items:

1. RTP update & coordination - continuation
 2. Regional Plan document outline & underlying principles
 3. Review existing RLUTP policies for Water, Conservation, Energy & Environment
3. **Town Hall meeting**– October 22, 2009

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:54 p.m.