

MEETING MINUTES

City of Flagstaff REGIONAL PLAN CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

3:30 p.m. - 6:00 p.m. October 6, 2011

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 213-2611 (or 774-5281 TDD). Notification at least 48 hours in advance will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements.

Draft Regional Plan Vision Statement:

The Greater Flagstaff community embraces the region's extraordinary cultural and ecological setting on the Colorado Plateau through active stewardship of the natural and built environments. Residents and visitors encourage and advance intellectual, environmental, social and economic vitality for today's citizens and future generations.

I. <u>CALL TO ORDER</u>

Meeting was called to order at 3:35

II. Roll Call

Α.	Committee	Mem	bers:
----	-----------	-----	-------

<u>x</u> Paul Babbitt (Chairman)	<u>x</u> Julie Leid	<u>x</u> Maury Herman	_E_Mike Nesbitt
x Carol Bousquet (Vice Chairman)	<u>E</u> Alex Wright	<u>late</u> Judy Louks	<u>x</u> Eva Putzova
Ben Anderson	<u>x</u> Jean Griego	William Ring	<u>late</u> Susan Bear
Shaula Hedwall	<u>late</u> Devonna McL	aughlin <u>x</u> Nat White	<u>E</u> Richard Henn
Jerome Naleski	<u>x</u> Don Walters	<u>x</u> Mike Chaveas	
Alternate Members:	x Trish Rensink		

III. APPROVAL of MINUTES for September 1, 2011 CAC Meetings

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Recommend changes and approve September 1, 2011 meeting minutes.

Motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes. Motion passed.

IV. 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/

Mike Chaveas will be leaving the Citizens Advisory Committee's panel, as he is moving to Oregon. Julie Leid is now a full member of the CAC. Community College students will attend today's CAC meeting. No public comments were made.

v. OLD BUSINESS - Continued, postponed and tabled agenda items.

A. Kimley-Horn Report Update

(est. 15 minutes)

PURPOSE: Review Kimley-Horn (PARA Grant Land Use Consultant) work to date.

FACILITATOR: Bob Caravona / Dave Wessel

HANDOUT: Normalized Development Scenario A

Normalized Development Scenario B

Normalized Development Scenario C

Expert Forum correspondence, September 30, 2011

David Wessel gave a report on the CAC. There is an effort to make sure the digital representations are accurately representative of the development scenarios derived from the public during the charrettes process. Currently, the maps are being analyzed, and the next steps include map evolution for refinement, reality parameters and comparison to existing plans. The CAC will remain involved until the final plan is formed into a land use plan. He explained how the scenarios will be evaluated and how measurements will be addressed for land use, transportation, economic and fiscal stability, and conservation.

Julie Lied asked if the CAC would have extreme opposition to reducing the three scenarios to two by eliminating the dense core. Don Walters said the three scenarios are very important for the CAC members' understanding. Eva Putzova said she was not willing to drop the dense core scenario. Julie Lied commented that perhaps the committee should continue to develop all three scenarios before they abandon any. Maury Herman commented that the new Zoning Code is demanding higher density within the urban core. He predicts that if we do not change anything, we will end up with urban sprawl. Judy Louks commented that the density and height in the new zoning laws are not apparent in the scenarios visually. Jim Cronk reminded the group not to let the new zoning codes drive Regional Plan decisions, but at the same time realize that it would be foolish to ignore these codes as well. He said Proposition 207 protects any current density and stated that the current zoning will allow up to 220,000 people. Some of the growth and height issues being considered are beyond the time element of this particular regional plan, but the committee should be aware of them.

B. Community Character Element - continued

(est. 30 minutes)

PURPOSE: **A.** Continuation of reviewing proposed 'Community Character Element' sections: (G.) Neighborhood Preservation [one goal and four policies]; and (H.) Revitalization and Redevelopment [one goal and two policies].

B. To prepare for November 3, 2011 CAC meeting, introduce subsections: (C.) Community Character; (D.) Scenic Resources; and (E.) Arts, Science & Education.

FACILITATOR: Jim Cronk

HANDOUT: Community Character Packet 2 - updated September 29, 2011

Jim Cronk presented subsection G. "Neighborhood Preservation and Revitalization"

NP 1.3 – Retain existing affordable housing stock through conservation efforts of older residential neighborhoods, while allowing compatible infill development and accessory dwellings.

Discussion:

- Inconsistency between the interests of older neighborhoods and infill new development.
- Intention to preserve the character of old neighborhoods?
- Is the variety of house pricing was what they were trying to preserve.
- Utilized both character and variety simultaneously this may cause tension
- Oppose increasing height density of buildings in older neighborhoods?
- Decided on a project by project basis, but that the regional plan cannot make those decisions. They belong to the area of zoning codes
- The policy needs to be stated in a way that it is understood that as density changes, neighborhood character will change also.
- Never a perfect blending where neighborhoods meet.
- Neighborhood or area plans address this.

- The first and second goals under the housing sections address the wide variety of housing issues.
- Old neighborhoods are not necessarily the affordable ones. They may be more expensive than the new buildings.
- Not every old area should necessarily maintain its neighborhood characteristics.
- Affordable housing is not an issue appropriate to be addressed in this section of the plan
- The issues are connected at this point.
- To the extent we preserve older neighborhoods; the price will go up and up. Cheaper housing can be maintained by building denser housing. Remove the word "affordable" from this section.
- Maury Herman made a motion to go with the staff recommendation. Trish
 Rensink seconded it. Jim clarified that this section makes it harder to tear down
 existing structures.
- This section is redundant and repeats Policy NP 1.1.
- Confining the area of growth will be hard if we cannot tear down and rebuild. Motion is withdrawn.

CAC Decision: Policy NP1.1 covers the intent of preserving neighborhoods, thus Policy NP1.3 is not necessary.

NP1.4 - Establish Interconnected Neighborhood Street and Sidewalk Patterns.

Discussion:

- Add the words "and trails" to the end of it.
- Add the words "or trails" instead.
- Traffic flow between undeveloped areas and the desire to preserve open space.
- Trails do not provide direct routes.
- More connections to keep a neighborhood quiet.
- Nat White made a motion to keep the words "and/or trails." It was seconded by Donna McLaughlin. No discussion. Motion passes with one dissenter, Judy Louks.

CAC Decision: Approve Amended NP1.4 – Interconnect neighborhoods through streets, sidewalk patterns, and/or trails.

Jim Cronk moves on to **Goal NP2 – Downtown Flagstaff serves as the primary focal point of the community**.

Discussion:

- Do other recreation centers serve as focal points of the community?
- Downtown is the PRIMARY focal point based upon attraction, tax revenues, private and public investments and community character.
- The policy should be worded to specify "character" of the community.
- There are more vacancies downtown now, and commerce sustains the culture, so the downtown matters.
- Judy Louks made a motion to add "character" to the end of the wording. Nat White seconded it. Motion passed unanimously.

CAC Decision: Approve Amended NP2- Downtown Flagstaff serves as the primary focal point of the community character.

The rest of Community Character section was tabled until November 2011.

(est. 90 minutes)

VI. NEW BUSINESS - Introduced agenda items.

A. Housing Element

PURPOSE: Review and edit Working Group's proposed 'Housing Element' text, goals and policies

FACILITATOR: Jim Cronk

HANDOUT:

Housing Packet #1, updated 09/27/11; Housing Packet #2, updated 09/28/11 Proposed Housing Goals & Policies, Working Group Notes, updated 09/19/11

Devonna McLaughlin served as the chairperson of the housing working group and gave a report. Judy Louks and Jerome Naleski also served on the working group, as well as city staff, and experts from the community on issues such as homelessness, and habitat. Many voices were part of the document. Policies and goals developed include the influence of multiple viewpoint positions. Although a lot of goals address affordable housing, this policy actually addresses all housing. Bob Caravona said that these housing goals and policies were handed out at the last meeting to receive comments, and only two comments were received, so it was assumed that the CAC is in agreement with them. Jim Cronk reported that policies 2 and 3 are the only ones under Goal 1 with comments.

Discussion:

- Eva Putzova reported that the text was overestimating NAU housing and underestimates off-campus housing.
- Maury Herman says that he didn't send in any comments, but that doesn't mean he is willing to skip going over this part of the policy without discussion.

Policy 2: Support on-going funding for community housing non-profit organizations which provide housing services, further the development of housing stock and promote innovative solutions to attainable housing needs for clients along the housing continuum – from homelessness to homeownership.

Discussion:

- Policy 2 is addressed by Devonna McLaughlin, regarding non-profit housing organizations. Supporting these efforts means letters of support by the city or even support by city financial contributions.
- Can the wording be changed to make the type of support expected clearer.

Policy 3: Further and advance the establishment of home ownership and affordable rental opportunities for all economic sectors.

Discussion:

- Is there really a need to advance home ownership at the higher end and not only at the affordable end? The policy language needs to give support for people who need it rather than for all who desire to be homeowners.
- The current language's intent is for low and moderate households.
- Concern in supporting home ownership by those who can't afford it.
- Housing is more affordable now than before for those who have stable incomes.
- Not concerned about second-home ownership, as second homes do not drain the schools and community resources.
- Do not support subsidizing second home ownership, but supports second home ownership in Flagstaff.
- That is why the committee added "affordable rental opportunities" to address the affordable housing issue, but not necessarily as a preference of home ownership over rental options.

- Likes the original wording because subsidizing housing is artificial and the economy should drive ownership.
- Rentals should be separated into a separate policy because fifty percent of the population rents, therefore it should have its own focus to be addressed more thoroughly.
- Doesn't want the CAC to appear to be pushing affordable housing over other options.
- Policy could be clearer if a second section about rental housing was added.
- Do other areas need to be separated out also? Does the committee want to use HUD's housing categories and definitions?
- The Regional Plan should not be promoting home ownership over rental opportunities.
- Rentals should be addressed, as NAU increasing enrollment drives the need for more rental housing.
- Is the word affordable needed in the policy when it already says "all economic sectors"?
- No need for multiple policies.
- The goal reads more like a policy at this point.
- Two policies should be developed here, one for permanent residents and one for part-time or short-term residents.
- The housing goal needs to reflect the Flagstaff area's need to have housing for all economic sectors.
- Nat White suggests the housing working group take the issues back and look at them again. Paul Babbitt agrees.

CAC Decision: All Housing Goals and Policies to be re-considered by the Housing Working Group and brought back to the November 2011 CAC Meeting.

B. Economic Development and Cost of Development Element (est. 10 minutes)
PURPOSE: Self-select sub-committee for drafting and reviewing packets 1 and 2
FACILITATOR: Jim Cronk

Jim Cronk asked if the CAC group thinks staff and experts meeting together with CAC members in working groups is the right model, or should the staff and experts operate separately from the CAC as "straw men" and then the CAC work with the results later? Some of the CAC members thought the process was good and eye opening while others thought the current process was a little confusing because of the complicated multiple issues involved. Paul Babbitt suggested that another possibility is to have the overall committee give the working groups guidelines. Eva Putzova wondered whether the CAC members have the time capacity to participate in the work groups. Don Walters said he likes the subgroup model and thinks it is the best use of the committee's time. Paul Babbitt instructed the city staff to go ahead with the sub group model. Kimberly directed the CAC members to get their comments in so that the next papers can be drafted and edited by October 22nd for the November meeting. Jim Cronk stated the city needs Economic Development working group members and asked the CAC members to consider becoming part of that.

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

(est. 5 minutes)

- 1. Tentative regular CAC Meetings Schedule:
 - A. November 3, 2011, 2 to 6 p.m. (proposed extended time)
 - 1. Element Review: goals and policies

- (i) Complete Community Character
- (ii) Economic Development
- (iii) Cost of Development
- 2. Scenario development / modeling

B. December 8, 2011, 2 to 6 p.m. (proposed extended time)

Agenda Items:

- 1. Element Review: goals and policies
 - (i) Complete Economic Development (complete)
 - (ii) Complete Cost of Development (complete)
 - (iii) Public Facilities
 - (iv) Public Safety
- 2. Kimley-Horn process: scenario development / modeling
- 3. ASU Decision Theater preparation / discussion

C. January 5, 2012, 2 to 6 p.m. (proposed extended time)

Agenda Items:

- 1. Element Review: goals and policies
 - a. Circulation
 - b. Bicycle
 - c. Land use and growth (iterative and on-going)
- 2. Kimley-Horn process scenario development / modeling
- 3. ASU Decision Theater preparation / discussion
- 4. Strategies, implementation (on-going)
- D. T.B.D. ASU Decision Theater

VIII. <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>

The meeting was adjourned at 6:05 pm.