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Executive Summary

The intent of the High Occupancy Housing (HOH) Specific Plan is to address how the City might promote viable options to increase density and provide more reasonably priced and diverse housing choices, while at the same time, continue to enhance the character and economic vitality of the City that is important to all. This issue of HOH arose from the community dialogue about new mid-rise buildings (4- to 6- stories) near existing and historic neighborhoods, and the impact of housing specifically catering to college students on the overall housing market. During the hearings for several rezoning proposals related to HOH buildings¹, the lack of specificity in the Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030 (Regional Plan) related to the treatment of special site characteristics, such as historic, recreational, natural resources, and rapid and unpredicted growth warranted the need for special planning and examination of existing City policies and codes.

A specific plan provides more detail with goals and policies to a specific area or topic from the Regional Plan. All specific plans must be reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission and sent to City Council for adoption. Details of specific plan requirements can be found in Title 11-10.30 within the Flagstaff City Code. Specific plans are a minor amendment to the Regional Plan; however, the adoption of a specific plan follows the procedures applicable to a major amendment to the Regional Plan, except for its timeline. Further details on plan amendments and specific plans can be found within Chapter III of the Regional Plan.

The HOH Specific Plan is a City-wide topic-based plan. It is not intended to replace the process of developing area-specific neighborhood, corridor, and master plans that incorporate the character of a particular district. An area-specific plan may provide details about materials, landscaping, and architectural design that the broader HOH Specific Plan would not address. Therefore, when there is a conflict between an area-specific plan that addresses HOH, and the HOH Specific Plan, the area plan prevails.

A specific plan has several required elements. In this document, these are organized by chapter:

- **Chapter 1: Introduction** – Provides a background narrative of the history, community concerns, and policy foundation for the HOH Specific Plan.
- **Chapter 2: Site and Area Analysis** – Maps and descriptions of the current conditions in the City of Flagstaff or the relevant site. Chapter 2 also describes principles and practices that are gleaned from scholarly, professional, and peer city research relevant to the policy decisions in the HOH Specific Plan.
- **Chapter 3: Concept Plan** - An illustration of the land use and transportation concepts in the document with accompanying descriptive text. It does not encumber private land or limit the ability of a private landowner to develop in accordance with their current zoning or City standards.
- **Chapter 4: Goals and Policies** - Goals and policies are written broadly and intended to be viable for a 10- to 20-year planning horizon. All City capital projects, rezoning, annexation, and plan amendment applications will be reviewed by City staff to determine consistency with the goals and policies of applicable specific plans.
- **Chapter 5: Implementation Strategies** - Implementation strategies are actions that the City can take to achieve the goals and implement the policies of the Regional Plan and High Occupancy Housing Plan. The chapter also outlines intended timing and resources needed. Implementation strategies are only effective once they have been adopted through the appropriate public process. They are not effective with adoption of this plan unless otherwise stated.

¹ For the purposes of this Specific Plan, HOH is generally buildings that house more than 75 bedrooms per acre or have more than 30 dwelling units per acre in dormitory or apartment-style units. This could also be called very high-density housing or mid-rise buildings.
Chapter 1: Introduction

The goal of this document is to produce a new specific plan for the City of Flagstaff that defines future urban patterns for High Occupancy Housing (HOH) developments. The Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030 (Regional Plan), the Flagstaff community, and research on some practices to achieve the goals set forth within this plan will guide these patterns.

The Regional Plan strongly supports infill, redevelopment, and mixed-use activity centers as the future sustainable land development pattern of Flagstaff. The City spent 5 years building consensus around the Future Growth Illustration (Maps 21 and 22 in the Regional Plan) and these concepts. However, the first rezoning cases that fully utilized these goals and policies were met with strong community opposition. The HOH Specific Plan has been developed in response to community reaction surrounding some of the larger mixed use buildings recently completed or in development stages. The public has also been concerned about buildings being marketed primarily to students, who can pay a higher rent, making those units unaffordable to a typical family that needs housing in Flagstaff. At public hearings and workshops, the community has expressed concerns that these larger mid-rise buildings are out of context with their surroundings or will negatively affect their neighborhoods. The goals and policies of the HOH Specific Plan are intended to address these community concerns, uphold the “active stewardship of the natural and built environment” in the Regional Plan’s Vision, and respect the existing development rights that the landowners possess.

Much of the early discussion related to HOH began through the community’s process of addressing off-campus student housing and its growth in recent years. Northern Arizona University (NAU) is the biggest
contributor to Flagstaff’s base economy, and the students’ economic impact allows a more diverse mix of retail, restaurants, and small businesses than is typical of a town of 70,000 residents. Even though NAU, for the purposes of this plan, is outside of the City’s jurisdiction and does not have to follow City plans or regulations, the HOH Specific Plan was developed with extensive coordination between NAU and the City of Flagstaff to meet the needs of the City’s general and student population.

HOH in this Plan is defined as a development with at least 30 units or 75 bedrooms per acre in dormitory or apartment-style units. Traditionally “high density” residential developments in Flagstaff have been apartment buildings with lower density than HOH. 29 dwelling units per acre is the maximum density in High Density Residential zones, without the use of density bonuses for sustainable building or affordable housing. There are many examples of this traditional high density style apartment buildings in Flagstaff, most prominently within the Woodlands Village neighborhood (See bottom right photo).

For context, buildings exceeding 30 dwelling units per acre are often mid-rise buildings that are approximately four to six stories tall within a suburban environment that mandates on-site surface parking, landscape setbacks, and maximum building coverage areas. The Village at Aspen Place is the first example of a modern HOH development built in the City and Freemont Station is a more recent example (See photo on page 1). To provide more context to what may constitute HOH, in an urban environment, similar to Downtown, with buildings up to the edge of the sidewalk, no on-site parking, and no landscape setbacks, 30 dwelling units per acre can theoretically be achieved with a low-rise building of one to three stories.¹ Under this definition, several of the existing historic buildings in downtown Flagstaff, such as the Weatherford Hotel, the Hotel Monte Vista, and even the Switzer building on N San Francisco St, which contains the Artists Gallery and Flag Terroir (see top right photo), could accommodate densities of at least 30 residential dwelling units per acre above a commercial ground floor.

¹ Dividing the square footage of an acre (43,560 sq. ft.) by 30 yields 1,452 sq. ft., so even subtracting lost space due to hallways, common rooms etc., 30 comfortably sized apartments can be achieved on one acre with only one story. However, it is understood that this building form would likely not be very attractive or functional and it should instead be assumed that a HOH development in the described urban form would likely need to be at least two stories.
What is a Specific Plan?

A specific plan provides more detail with goals and policies to a specific area or topic from the Regional Plan. All specific plans must be reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission and sent to City Council for adoption. Details of specific plan requirements can be found in Title 11-10.30 within the Flagstaff City Code. Specific plans are a minor amendment to the Regional Plan; however, the adoption of a specific plan follows the procedures applicable to a major amendment to the Regional Plan, except for its timeline. Further details on plan amendments and specific plans can be found within Chapter III of the Regional Plan.

Public participation is a large component of the time spent on any specific plan. Between July and November 2016, the City of Flagstaff hosted five community cafes alongside online public engagement to listen to the community about how density, building design, and their impacts are affecting neighborhoods, affordability, and community sustainability. Later in November, the City hosted two open houses containing informational presentations and posters on the topics of NAU housing, property management, water, traffic, transit, peer cities, land use, parking, and affordability. In April 2017 the City facilitated an HOH focus group with a selected cross section of the community to vet ideas and concepts in order to build consensus on how our community moves forward with HOH. Many of the same concepts were then discussed in a policy workshop open for all interested people to further gauge popularity of and trade-offs for the potential policies. The release of the public review draft of the HOH Specific Plan begins a 60-day public review period, during which the City will hold more informational open houses and meetings with City Boards and Commissions to clarify the Plan’s goals, policies, and limitations. After the comments received are incorporated into the document, public hearings with the Planning and Zoning Commission and the City Council are scheduled.

After adoption of a specific plan, its goals and policies (see Chapter 4) are considered when Council and City staff review discretionary development proposals, such as requests for rezoning property, updates to City Codes, or to inform the most appropriate City capital improvements. The specific plan only applies in discretionary decisions and does not impact existing entitlements on private land. When no changes to existing entitlements are being proposed for a potential development, the development needs to meet only the existing Zoning Code, the Engineering Design Standards and Specifications, and all appropriate building codes. However, after a specific plan’s adoption, the City Codes and Standards can be amended to implement the adopted policies. After these code updates, “entitled” developments will have to meet the Code as it exists at the time of their application (see Chapter 5).

History of Large Buildings and Zoning in Flagstaff

There was no zoning during the earliest days of Flagstaff. The city was founded in 1890. Buildings were, at first, constructed based upon the form needed and the technology available. The largest buildings at the time were the mixed-use buildings close to the train station. Many of these buildings were two stories with retail on the first floor and residences or hotel rooms above. On New Year’s Day 1900, the three story Weatherford Hotel was opened. In 1927, the four story Monte Vista Hotel opened. The tallest manmade features of this era were the smoke stacks of lumber mills to the west and southeast of the town.

Federal statutes that enabled State and local governments to enact planning and zoning laws were first created by the Department of Commerce between 1926-1929. Flagstaff’s first zoning code was completed in 1949. This ordinance (officially the “Building Zone Ordinance of the City of Flagstaff, Arizona”), promoted the “public health, safety, convenience and general welfare” by, for example, regulating the location and use of structures and land for various land use designations. This ordinance established the first zoning districts, and established use, height, setback,
lot coverage, and density standards for each district. It allowed building heights up to 110 feet in the central business district. The tallest building constructed while this Zoning Code was active was the Bank of America Building in 1969 at 63 ft. tall. Prior to 1969, the Monte Vista Hotel, built in 1927, was the tallest building at 50 feet in height.

Flagstaff’s next extensive zoning update occurred in 1972 and the building height in the downtown was reduced to 60 feet, the approximate height of a mature Ponderosa pine tree. In 1991, the City adopted a new zoning code called the Land Development Code, which added performance standards to the classical Euclidean or conventional zoning districts. The Code was regularly reviewed and modified for a number of community concerns, changes to other laws and policy changes. (Section P.100 of the current Zoning Code’s preamble provides more detail on these and dozens of other historic zoning code updates.)

The Land Development Code was replaced by the current Zoning Code in 2011. The purpose of the Zoning Code is still to “protect and promote the public health, safety, convenience, and general welfare of the citizens of the City.” This update preserved and reorganized the conventional or Euclidean zones, but added a new form-based code called transect zoning. The intent behind this update was to focus the regulations for the Downtown on place-making rather than regulating the use of each building. The 2011 Zoning Code was also designed to encourage the adaptive reuse of existing buildings, like the DuBois Hotel on Phoenix Ave., and the Toasted Owl Café on Mike’s Pike, because most of them could not meet the standards of the conventional zones, such as higher parking and setback requirements. (For more details on the current zoning framework, see the Planning and Land Use section in Chapter 2).

Most of the past zoning code amendments were completed at a time when Arizona law governing property takings was similar to the rest of the United States. However, following the Supreme Court eminent domain case, _Kelo v. City of New London_ in 2005, Arizona voters quickly passed Proposition 207 (the Private Property Rights Protection Act),
which redefined the rights of a property owner when the state or a local
government exercises this power. The Private Property Rights Protection
Act, passed by voters in 2006, requires local governments to waive regu-
lations or compensate a private property owner if the value of the owner’s
property is reduced by the enactment of a land use law. A land use law
regulates the use or division of land, such as municipal zoning laws. This
is the reason why “downzoning” or changing development standards to
permit less intensive development can be more difficult to accomplish in
Arizona. Compensation is an expensive option for local governments in
many cases, and how it would be calculated is uncertain (see Appendix A
for more information on legislative constraints in Arizona.)

1 Examples of downzoning would be: taking away the ability to build an office
building in favor of single family homes, reducing the density of housing units
from 8 dwelling units per acre to 3 dwelling units per acre, or reducing the
maximum allowable building height from 65’ to 35’.

Land owned by the Arizona Board of Regents is not subject to Flagstaff’s
zoning authority; therefore, the tallest buildings within the community
are on NAU’s Campus. Sechrist Hall was built in 1967 and is the tallest
building on campus at 110 feet in height. The new NAU Science and
Health Building can be seen prominently above the tree line on campus.

Chapter 1: Introduction

The Flagstaff Regional Plan and
High Occupancy Housing

The Regional Plan does not directly call out HOH. However, the need
for and concerns about HOH are tied into implementing the communi-
yty’s vision, which has been revised and refined since the City adopted its
first Growth Management Guide in 1990. This vision speaks to what the
community values (vitality and sustainability) and what assets it wants
to protect (character that embodies the cultural and ecological setting).

Vision of the Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030

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.

Numerous trade-offs are embedded within these values. In order to
preserve our extraordinary ecological setting, the community must
avoid sprawl, and therefore, embrace strategic increases in density. To
protect social and economic vitality, it must be diverse and affordable.
Behind all of this, the stewardship of the built environment is the key to
accomplishing these outcomes. The challenge of addressing HOH is one
of the central trade-offs related to these values. These buildings present
an opportunity for a sustainable, affordable, walkable community, and a
challenge to preserving cultural and neighborhood character. In Chapter
2, the “Principles and Practices for Moving Forward” sections talk about
the mechanics of how these trade-offs can work and what the associated
opportunities, risks, and costs are based on peer-reviewed literature and
practices from other communities.

The Regional Plan provides a framework for making decisions about the
desired location of larger, denser buildings by identifying activity centers.
Goal LU.18. from the Regional Plan states that Flagstaff should “Develop
well designed activity centers and corridors with a variety of employment,
business, shopping, civic engagement, cultural opportunities, and resi-
dential choices.” Activity centers are anticipated to be walkable, vibrant
places where people would choose to live, work, and play, thus creating housing choices and sustainability benefits for the entire community.

Current zoning allows for HOH buildings in a much larger area than just the activity centers and corridors, including several historic neighborhoods, such as Sunnyside, La Plaza Vieja, Southside, and North End. The Regional Plan has a policy to “Value the traditional neighborhoods established around downtown by maintaining and improving their highly walkable character, transit accessibility, diverse mix of land uses, and historic building form” (Regional Plan Policy LU.10.3). At the same time, the existing rights and entitlements for those properties allow for a large change in the bulk, mass, and scale from old to new buildings. This juxtaposition of existing and valued neighborhoods and places with the desire for new, walkable, and well-integrated places is at the core of the controversy over HOH and mid-rise buildings. The conditions that preceded this issue have existed for over 40 years, but the market and feasibility of building mid-rise buildings did not exist until recently.

Mid-rise buildings and increasing population within activity centers is important for supporting a walkable central place that integrates a mix of uses that supports pedestrian and commercial activity. The Regional Plan supports the construction of mid-rise buildings within the commercial core of an activity center and diverse housing choices with some commercial in the pedestrian shed of the activity center. The commercial core and pedestrian shed can be defined in a number of ways depending on the pedestrian connectivity and physical barriers of an area. For example, the topography of McMillan Mesa, the railroad, and Butler Avenue constrain the walkability and connectivity that can be achieved at the activity center on Ponderosa Parkway and Route 66. Currently, there are no residential units in this activity center, which provides one of the few areas between the east and west sides of Flagstaff. This activity center like many others has significant challenges and opportunities for future development. Illustrations (Chapter 3) and goals (Chapter 4) cannot account for all of these complexities, but they can be used in problem solving and understanding the competing values that may influence how an activity center is developed and how it can or cannot incorporate HOH. This Plan will clarify many inconsistencies and trade-offs for activity centers, but some will be too site-specific to address in a city-wide plan and will be deferred to area planning efforts.

The High Occupancy Housing Specific Plan will implement the Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030 in several ways. First, it will fulfill Regional Plan Policy NH.1.7. Develop appropriate programs and tools to ensure the appropriate placement, design, and operation of new student housing developments consistent with neighborhood character and scale. Second, the Specific Plan will further refine the goals and policies related to development of very high density mixed use buildings in activity centers. Third, the Specific Plan will address the preservation of existing neighborhoods and the appropriate tools to ensure that new buildings do not diminish the historic character of Flagstaff’s neighborhoods. In order to achieve these overarching objectives, the High Occupancy Housing Plan also includes amendments to the text of the Flagstaff Regional Plan (outlined in Appendix B).
Chapter 2: Site and Area Analysis

Many specific plans focus on a defined geographic area of the City. This Specific Plan differs in that it will focus on a specific development type, High Occupancy Housing (HOH), that is not necessarily geographically defined within the City of Flagstaff. Therefore, the entire City limits will be a part of this Site and Area Analysis, with a special emphasis on the areas where HOH is currently allowed by right.

This chapter will first give a brief overview of Flagstaff. It will then go into detail on each major component of development that relates to HOH, starting with what Flagstaff already does followed by principles and practices that may be considerations for Flagstaff moving forward, based on peer reviewed research and an examination of peer cities and their practices. These potential principles and practices for moving forward will be a combination of concepts that have proven successful elsewhere, with consideration of situations and constraints that are unique to Flagstaff. This section will not contain concrete conclusions on the next steps but rather its purpose is to illuminate potential ideas, solutions, and/or issues that were used to shape the Concept Plan, Goals and Policies, and Implementation Strategies.

Next, this chapter will compare Flagstaff to other peer cities that are experiencing similar growth challenges. It will also analyze what geographic areas are ready or have the potential to host HOH development based upon the background established in this chapter, Chapters 3, 4, and 5 will lay out our community’s goals, policies, and strategies, which the community has decided to pursue through this planning effort.

Maps in this chapter that are sources from other policy documents, such as the Regional Plan and the Engineering Design Standards and Specifications, are up to date as of the time of this document’s publication. They should not be used in policy analysis without referencing the most up to date source materials.

Demographics

The City of Flagstaff offers a high quality of life and is a very desirable place to call home. Due to a growing population and corresponding development, Flagstaff has been transforming from a quaint mountain and college town to a relatively small vibrant city, while trying to maintain a small town identity. Flagstaff’s rate of population growth has been constant for the last 20 years, averaging approximately 1.6 to 2.2% annually.¹

Flagstaff’s 2016 total population is estimated at 71,000 (U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, 2017) with a young median age of 26 years old. The median age for Arizona is approximately 35 years old. Flagstaff’s young population can be attributed, in part, to the 22,000 students enrolled at NAU’s mountain campus. As such, approximately one-third of Flagstaff’s population is comprised of Northern Arizona University students.

Like many similar communities, Flagstaff has an under-supplied housing market for workforce housing and affordability issues. The 2016 median housing sale price is $315,500 while the median household income is approximately $49,000 (U.S. Census Bureau). Twenty-four percent of the Flagstaff population is living with a household income below the federal poverty threshold.

Flagstaff is a diverse community. It is a community of families as well as a large number of individuals living alone. Nearly 20% of household types are non-family due to the large student population; limited rental vacancies and relatively high rents may contribute to this statistic for the non-student population. The majority of Flagstaff residents rent; 55% of housing is rental whereas 45% of housing is owner occupied (U.S. Census Bureau).

¹ This rate of growth is confirmed by the Arizona State Demographer, the City’s Water Services Division, and the Regional Plan.
Planning and Land Use

Flagstaff

Flagstaff has three levels of policy and regulations that are used to regulate Growth Areas and Land Use. The highest and most comprehensive level is the Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030 (Regional Plan), which serves as the City’s General Plan. The Regional Plan serves as a community vision for the public and private sectors. The Plan also provides community goals and development policies that guide rezoning or annexation applications, and updates to the Zoning Code.

Secondly, in order to ensure the systematic implementation of a general plan, cities in Arizona adopt specific plans that provide more detail about topics in the general plan, or about the general plan should be implemented in a part of the city. Flagstaff has area specific plans for La Plaza Vieja, Juniper Point, Canyon del Rio, McMillan Mesa Village, Lone Tree Corridor, West Side (West Route 66), and Woodlands Village. The City also has adopted one topical specific plan, the Flagstaff Area Open Spaces and Greenways Plan (completed in 1998).¹ The HOH Specific Plan will be the second topical specific plan adopted for Flagstaff.

The third and most detailed level of implementation are the City Codes, especially the Zoning Code. The Zoning Code regulates the use, form, and pattern of the physical development of land within the City to protect the “public health, safety, convenience, and general welfare of the citizens.” The Zoning Code tells a property owner what uses the owner is entitled to and what uses or rights require a decision by the City Council or Planning and Zoning Commission. The Zoning Code includes a map that sets boundaries for districts that have different regulations (For more information see Zoning Code history section). Concerning the Zoning Code, the High Occupancy Housing Plan addresses the commercial zones, which allow commercial mixed use buildings up to 60 feet in height (Community Commercial, Central Business, Commercial Services, Highway Commercial), and the transect zones which allow commercial mixed use.

¹ The City of Flagstaff also has several strategic plans, such as the Utilities Master Plan and the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, that are not specific plans under State authority but do provide a reference for decision making about future development. Likewise the NAIPTA 5 year Plan and the Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Office’s Regional Transportation Plan are regularly consulted.
mixed use buildings of any form (T4, T5, and T6). Residential and industrial zones and the T3, T2, and T1 zones under the Transect Code do not allow densities that meet the threshold for HOH.

The expected outcome of the HOH Specific Plan is to better align all three levels of the City’s planning framework concerning buildings with at least 30 dwelling units per acre, which generally requires the construction of a mixed use building.

**Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030**

Activity Centers are mixed use areas, identified on the Future Growth Illustration (Maps 21 and 22 in the Regional Plan), where there is a concentration of commercial and other land uses typically defined by a commercial core and a walkable pedestrian shed. In the Regional Plan, activity centers are considered the most appropriate locations for HOH, but the Regional Plan does not specify how to address compatibility for each center. Activity Centers are expected to include a high degree of transit, pedestrian and bicycle connectivity. In Flagstaff, achieving HOH requires a developer to include a mixed use strategy, which generally means a commercial front building (horizontal mixed use) or a commercial first floor (vertical mixed use). During the development of the Regional Plan, activity centers were tested using rigorous land use, water, and transportation modeling. The City and Coconino County also held public charrettes to understand the trade-offs and impacts of their placement and scale. The Regional Plan is designed to support the creation and enhancement of activity centers for the good of the community at a regional scale. However, what was left to later decisions is how to make these higher density, transit-oriented, mixed use places a compatible part of Flagstaff’s future.

In the Regional Plan, activity centers are the only locations where rezoning applications for future HOH projects would be supported in the case of a rezoning. The type of activity center (Urban or Suburban) would influence the expected patterns of urban design, connectivity, and appropriate architecture. To achieve the goals of an activity center in an area where HOH is already permitted by right will require the City to update it City Codes for Zoning, Subdivisions, Engineering, Solid Waste and other City services and regulations. The relationship between the site and adjacent neighborhoods and corridors will also influence the nature of these future developments and will need to be taken into account when planning for future City Code updates, neighborhood and corridor plans, and other City Services (see Figure 4).

Neighborhoods are also identified in the Regional Plan as a place type of significance to the social and economic vitality of the community.
The Regional Plan did not explicitly identify where an activity center ends and a neighborhood begins (see Regional Plan Policy LU.18.15). Direction pertaining to neighborhoods identifies several key values: their walkability and connectivity to nearby activity centers and open spaces, preservation of historic buildings, well-designed infill, and housing affordability.

The Regional Plan also identifies commercial corridors (see Map 25: Road Network Illustration for locations) as a place type that can influence the scale and shape of neighborhoods and activity centers. Policy LU.18.10 states “Corridors should increase their variety and intensity of uses as they approach activity centers.” Unlike Activity Centers, corridors do have a defined width in the Regional Plan. Policy LU.18.11 states that policies pertaining to corridors “apply to a depth of one parcel or one and one-half blocks, whichever is greater.”

Activity centers are not a new concept for Flagstaff. The City’s General Plan has encouraged them since 1990. They were identified in understanding that City residents wanted to preserve natural resources and open space while maintaining affordability and an efficient transportation system. The 2001 Regional Land Use and Transportation Plan (RLUTP) goal related to activity centers stated, “Commercial uses in the county will be located in activity centers in specifically designated areas intended to serve as focal points for the community in which they are located, and they will provide opportunities to meet area resident needs locally, while avoiding a strip commercial pattern of development along the region’s major roadways.” The document provided few additional details for identifying the locations of and implementing new activity centers.

The Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030 was the first document to identify locations for activity centers and to try and define their scale and relationship to the rest of the community. Activity Centers are identified on the Future Growth Illustration (Regional Plan Maps 21 and 22), which is called an illustration because it is not a parcel-specific regulation like the Zoning Code. The Regional Plan does not preclude a property owner from using their private development rights, which are determined by the regulations in the City’s Zoning Code. The role of the Future Growth Illustration and other maps in the Regional Plan is to identify where to consider rezoning requests that allow for intensive development like HOH without the additional step of a plan amendment.

**Relationship between Area Specific Plans and Topical Specific Plans**

Concerns about compatibility between activity centers and the surrounding neighborhoods have been one of the fundamental objections raised to HOH proposals. The community has examined this issue through proposed zoning map amendments for the Standard (970 W Route 66) in 2013 and the Hub (215 W Phoenix Ave) in 2016. The Regional Plan discusses this compatibility generally and assumes that specific plans for activity centers, neighborhoods, and corridors will provide site-specific guidance about what compatibility means based on the unique context and distinctive identities of each (Policy LU.10.4. and Regional Plan p. IX-35). Some of the issues each area specific plan needs to address concerning compatibility are:

1. What can a compatible building look like now and in the future (scale and form),
2. How will the built environment transition from a neighborhood to the activity center, and
3. What to do about areas that permit by-right development of high occupancy housing outside of an activity center.

An area plan may provide details about materials, landscaping, and architectural design that the broader HOH Specific Plan would not address. Therefore, when there is a conflict between an area-specific plan that addresses HOH and the HOH Specific Plan, the area plan prevails. For example, La Plaza Vieja Neighborhood Specific Plan was the first area-specific plan to address HOH issues under the 2014 Regional Plan. A map within the plan identified parcel-specific areas of “Commercial Edge” (activity center core), “Transition” (the pedestrian shed), and “Neighborhood Core” (urban neighborhood). La Plaza Vieja Neighborhood Specific Plan also identified area appropriate architecture and mitigations for large buildings to protect neighborhood character. Area specific plans for other neighborhoods, corridors and activity centers may define these as the commercial core and pedestrian shed based on the context and feedback from the public, but should relate them back to the Regional Plan framework.

**Zoning Code**

The City of Flagstaff adopted its most recent Zoning Code in 2011, and has made several updates since then. The Code encourages mixed
use buildings in commercial zoned areas. In four of these zones, the maximum building height is 60 feet and buildings over 60 feet in height can be approved with a conditional use permit. Residential uses located above commercial are not included in the allowed intensity calculations for all of the commercial zones, but do factor into the building heights for commercial zones. Each of the following zones allows for HOH development, by right:

- **Central business (CB) zone** is intended for retail commercial, personal services, governmental, business, financial, professional, and general offices. It allows for residential uses above the ground floor. Buildings and uses in this district should be “grouped so that the shopper or user can park once and visit a number of stores and offices on foot.” There are no setbacks, smaller minimum lot sizes, and no maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR), which is a measure of intensity, in the CB zone.

- **Highway Commercial (HC) zone** is intended to promote a full range of automobile-oriented services and residential development above and behind commercial buildings. This zone permits the widest variety of commercial uses of any commercial zone. The zone allows small setbacks and a FAR of 3.0.

- **Commercial Services (CS) zone** is intended to promote service industries and support activities necessary to maintain viable commercial retail trade centers. It allows for residential development above and behind commercial buildings. CS zone allows small setbacks and a FAR of 2.0.

- **Community Commercial (CC) zone** is intended to provide for commercial services within established neighborhoods. These areas provide dispersed commercial services and retail and a variety of housing choices. This is the only commercial district that allows single-family homes and duplexes by right on lots less than 9,000 square feet. CC zone allows small setbacks and a FAR of 2.5.

- **The T4N.1-O Neighborhood zone** is intended to provide a transitional district between commercial and residential uses in the T4N1 and T3N zones. Along major commercial corridors, T4N.1-O is located behind T5 or along smaller commercial corridors; T4N.1-O fronts the street.

- The **T5 Main Street zone** “provides neighborhood-serving commercial and retail uses in a main street form, and provides a variety of urban housing choices, typically in smaller units.” It runs along major commercial corridors.

- **The T6 Downtown zone** reinforces and enhances “the vibrant, walkable urban downtown core,” and enables “it to evolve into a complete neighborhood.” This zone overlaps within the Central Business (CB) zone.

Transect zones are the districts identified in Flagstaff’s form-based code. The form-based code currently applies only within the Downtown Regulating Plan boundary (See Map 1). Within this boundary, the transect zones are an option, and in order to apply them to a property, the owner must waive their rights under the conventional zones, such as CC or CB. T5 and T6 are the only zones that allow HOH in the form of the commercial block building and some residential buildings types. T4 allows HOH in the live/work building and some residential buildings types. Some policies in this document related to transect zones were developed concurrently to an update in the commercial block and live/work building type standards in the Zoning Code.

Map 1 (page 13) shows the areas of the City that currently allow HOH by right in blue. This entitlement may occur because of commercial or transect zoning standards. Anywhere that is gray on the map would need to be rezoned before a property owner could build an HOH development. Currently, for an area to be rezoned to a commercial zone or a transect zone that would allow HOH development, the parcel must be located in an urban or suburban activity center, regardless of its scale (regional or neighborhood), in order to be found consistent with Regional Plan’s Future Growth Illustration, goals and policies, and any applicable specific plans. Once adopted by Council, this Specific Plan will provide more detailed policies for how to achieve conformance with the Regional Plan.

**Principles and Practices for Moving Forward**

The Regional Plan Vision for the Growth Areas and Land Use Chapter states, “In 2030, our community continues to grow in a smart and connected way, making investments in efficient infrastructure, alternative travel modes, and promoting housing choice while seeking to reduce sprawl. The land use decisions made in the region promote a healthy lifestyle and quality of life desired by many” (page IX-1). The key strategy to achieving this vision is investment in complete and connected places that are anchored by compact development, in other words, the activity...
Some of the data on this map was generated from the Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030 on October 30, 2017. It is included for informational purposes and will not reflect future amendments to the Regional Plan.
centers. The direct benefits of this strategy are that the cost of administering essential services is reduced for the city and utility companies, and land consumption is slowed or reduced from new development. The Great Communities Collaborative, a non-profit that researches affordability and transportation issues, states that in compact development areas, “stores have enough local customers to stay in business, transit systems have enough riders to justify the public investment, and parks have people strolling through keeping the neighborhood safe. Community services including childcare, medical offices, banks and post offices also have branch locations frequented by people living within walking, biking or transit distance” (Great Communities Collaborative 2009). In the Regional Plan, achieving the community goals for open space preservation, housing affordability and choices, mobility and transportation, and economic development are all inextricably connected to our ability to achieve complete, connected, and compact development. The Regional Plan ties all of these together with the concept of compact development on page IX-16, which states:

Encouraging the option of compact development for the region allows for the following to be achieved while still respecting Flagstaff’s scale, character, and design traditions:

• **Support economic vitality**
• **Well connected access for pedestrians, bicyclists, cars, and transit**
• **Appropriate multi-modal thoroughfare design**
• **Medium to high densities in appropriate contexts**
• **Provision of a range of housing options including smaller housing types on small lots and multifamily housing options with shared amenities**
• **A mix of uses, i.e., several types of housing, commercial, and office space are located in close proximity with civic spaces to provide vibrant commercial spaces, quality places for people to live, and to support infill and reinvestment of existing developed areas.**
• **Interconnected streets**
• **Innovative and flexible approaches to parking**
• **Access and proximity to transit**
• **Reduction of sprawl on the periphery of the region**
• **Support of conservation and open space goals as well as watershed protection**
• **Minimize traffic congestion**

---

**Reduced miles of streets and utility infrastructure resulting in lowered City operating costs**

As the Regional Plan states, the key to achieving the goals of compact development is the enhancement of community character and neighborhoods. The Regional Plan defines community character as “the combination of qualities and assets that establishes our unique sense of place and promotes a high quality of life for our residents and visitors” (page VIII-1), and that emphasizes the community’s desire to “build and improve healthy and diverse neighborhoods, while maintaining affordability and connectivity to the greater region” (page XIII-1). These elements represent the aspects of place and community that make Flagstaff unique. This is the most challenging balance to maintain, and the measure of the HOH Specific Plan’s success will be how well it moves the City forward in addressing these trade-offs.

Great Communities Collaborative (2009) suggests the following design elements to help achieve appropriate compact design:

• **Buildings with varied surfaces**
• **Pedestrian friendly design**
• **Well defined open space**
• **Landscaping**
• **Parking hidden from the street**
• **Shared facilities**
• **Mix of uses: retail, housing, office and community services**

In addition, the design of High Occupancy Housing buildings needs to consider the relationship of the building to the street (proximity, orientation, windows), distance of the façade before there is variation or a break, and stepping back upper floors to allow for more light to access the street.

Flagstaff’s Regional Plan, specific plans, and Zoning Code already have policies and standards that address all of these issues to some extent. The HOH Specific Plan will offer refinements that can improve the implementation of these features in activity centers and HOH developments.
NAU Housing

Flagstaff

Even though HOH is not exclusively a student housing issue, the demand for housing by Flagstaff’s rising student population is a major component of the development interest the City has seen so far. So while this report will discuss HOH broadly, this section will focus on its relationship to Northern Arizona University’s housing trends and contributions.

Northern Arizona University’s Flagstaff campus had over 22,000 students in 2017. NAU students therefore account for approximately 30 percent of Flagstaff’s population. NAU has been experiencing steady growth in recent years and is planning for a Flagstaff campus population of 24,000 in 2025. The rate of growth for enrollment at all NAU campuses, including online, has been on average 4% over the last 10 years. The slower projected annual growth expected for the Flagstaff campus, near 1 percent, is primarily attributed to faster online and extended campus growth. All factors used to project the student population are dependent on social and economic factors such as retention rates, the availability of financial aid, and the availability of majors that interest perspective students. These predicted estimates are, therefore, revisited annually by NAU and the Board of Regents. Currently, the total student growth is expected to be from just over 30,000 students in 2016 to nearly 35,000 students by 2025, still a slower annual growth rate than the previous decade, near 1.6 percent.

For comparison, between the years of 2005 to 2016, total enrollment at Arizona State University (ASU) grew at an annual rate around 4.4 percent and has a current enrollment of over 98,000. The University of Arizona (UA) grew at an annual rate near 1.5 percent with a current enrollment of nearly 44,000 on all campuses. Arizona’s population as a whole has been growing at an annual rate near 2 percent for the last 15 years.

NAU is in the top 1 percent of universities nationally for total on-campus housing capacity. The Flagstaff campus of NAU has over 9,000 beds and their on-campus housing stock continues to grow. NAU has 626 new beds available in Fall 2017 and another 630 opening in Fall 2018. 41% of NAU’s Flagstaff campus students have the opportunity to live on campus. For comparison, ASU has over 50,000 more in-person students and only 2,300 more beds while UA has over 11,000 more in-person students and 2,400 fewer beds. Those schools therefore have the ability to house only 16 percent and 15 percent, respectively, of their in-person students on campus.

A bed in a dorm at NAU costs approximately $650 per month and includes utilities. A two-bedroom apartment near NAU costs approximately $1,600 per month, or $800 per person per month plus utilities in 2017. It is understood that Flagstaff is generally more expensive to live off-campus than either Tempe or Tucson. Looking at available apartments, a two-bedroom apartment near ASU is closer to $1,100 while a dorm bed is more expensive than NAU at approximately $750 per month. Tucson has many two-bedroom apartment options below $1,000 and dorm bed costs start near $750 per month. These in-state comparisons show that living off-campus is more expensive than living on-campus in Flagstaff, while it is cheaper to live off-campus in Tempe or Tucson. Such a cost difference between housing markets around a university was one of the common themes seen in other peer cities in Oregon and Colorado (page 52-53).

Principles and Practices for Moving Forward

At most public universities throughout the nation, including at NAU, it is common to live on-campus for a portion of your college career and then live off-campus for the rest. The majority of upper-classmen, graduate students, and non-traditional students do not wish to live on campus. Therefore, at a point, building more campus housing no longer meets the demand for those students. NAU has a history of providing more housing on-campus than most other universities, in part, because of the limited off-campus and affordable rental options within the rest of the City. Both ASU and UA prioritize and encourage freshman to live on-campus citing the substantial benefits to academic success for a freshman that lives on campus but they do not have much housing available for other students. After a student’s first year, ASU’s and UA’s on-campus housing has difficulties competing with private development around their campuses.

The question of housing our college population is not simply “on” versus “off” campus. The distance to campus for those students choosing to live off-campus is an important component. While a graduate student,

1 Apartments.com was used to assess available off-campus housing costs in Spring 2017; NAU, UofA, ASU were contacted directly for dorm rates for the same time period.
The Facts about NAU Enrollment, Housing, and Parking

A recent analysis pointed to a $1.2 billion direct economic impact NAU has on Coconino County; 81% of NAU graduates reside in Arizona after graduation.

Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Online and Extended Campuses</th>
<th>Flagstaff Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6,352</td>
<td>12,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>8,234</td>
<td>22,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>10,909</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NAU in the TOP 1% of universities nationally for total on-campus housing capacity

- **9,853** beds
- **8,781** parking spaces
  - **2,233** faculty and staff permits
  - **5,659** student permits
  - **700** visitors accommodated on average per day

NAU’s online and Extended Campuses program growth is expected to outpace growth on the Flagstaff campus over the next decade

**Additional 630** beds in fall 2018

Transportation

- 1 route (Route 10) through campus (22 stops)
- 8 routes through Flagstaff
- 700K+ riders/academic year
- Mountain Link Route 10 free to students
- NAU purchases 2,700 ecoPasses for faculty and staff

*NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY*

Figure 5: Infographic on NAU Enrollment, Housing, and Parking
for example, likely prefers the freedom of living off-campus, they most often prefer to still be very close in order to have the flexibility to access campus facilities whenever they need, especially with the inconsistency of a class and events schedule. Previous student-oriented development has responded to this location demand. For example, the largest student housing developer in the nation only has one development located more than three miles from campus and 85 percent of their developments are within one-half mile from their respective campus. Flagstaff has been consistent with this overall trend, as it has not received a proposal for HOH at any significant distance from NAU.

The distance to campus is not the only component of a successful location. Most students will also want a mix of amenities near their residence, such as restaurants and entertainment. The right volume and type of amenities may lessen the barrier of distance from campus, if most non-school activities can occur near one’s place of residence. A potential best practice for these amenities is to have them exist as a component of the community as a whole and not as an internal component of a student-centric development, which is also consistent with the Regional Plan direction about activity centers. At many levels, it is important to ensure that a university is a part of the community and does not exist in an enclave apart from its surroundings. A component of this practice should be seen as incorporating students into the everyday fabric of Flagstaff. Off-campus student housing may operate best if it is a stepping stone for a student to become a part of the Flagstaff community with the goal of keeping highly educated workforce in our community, once their degree is completed.

### Property Management

#### Flagstaff

Any multifamily building can serve students, families, retirees, and seasonal residents through its location, interior configuration, and amenities. Fair and professional property management plays an important role to ensure the safety of residents in and neighbors of higher density residential developments. Property managers are responsible for safe, efficient, and effective operation of rental properties, including upkeep and maintenance, tenant screening, enforcing lease provisions, and security. In college towns, student housing management is a particular niche of this field. Even though certain properties or companies market their housing to college students, all HOH developments must adhere to the provisions of the Fair Housing Act and cannot discriminate in the sale or rental of housing based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, familial status or handicap. Therefore, even “student housing” must serve the entire community.

One way that the City and NAU have addressed the issue of off-campus student housing is to hire a Community Liaison that can work with the City, neighborhoods, and students to address education and partnership between students living off-campus and the community. The City of Flagstaff also promotes safety in multifamily housing in the Crime Free Multihousing Program run by the Flagstaff Police Department. The program is voluntary for rental properties, unless the property has had multiple citations under the Nuisance Party Ordinance adopted in 2016. The program’s purpose is to reduce crime, drugs, and organized crime on apartment properties. The program offers training, inspections, and coordination with law enforcements.

#### Principles and Practices for Moving Forward

One of the community concerns about student housing is that the management of these properties will preferentially treat applications from students or will discourage applications from other residents and families. The City provides property manager training currently on the Fair Housing Act and could include sections particularly relevant to providers of off-campus student housing.
Chapter 2: Site and Area Analysis

Map 2: Locations that allow HOH development by right and HOH development that has been constructed or is under City review

Some of the data on this map was generated from the Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030 on October 30, 2017. It is included for informational purposes and will not reflect future amendments to the Regional Plan.

HOH Completed or Under Review

- High Occupancy Housing
- Future Road
- NAU
- HOH Allowed by right
- HOH Not Allowed, Rezoning needed

Activity Centers

- Existing Center
- Future Center
- Neighborhood Scale
- Regional Scale

Locations:
- 111 N. Leroux
- Miramonte at Beaver St.
- The Hub
- Kaizen Mixed Use
- The Village at Aspen Place
- The Standard
- Mill Town
- Fremont Station
As part of the process of developing the HOH Specific Plan, the City also considered the possibility of making the Crime Free Multihousing Program mandatory for HOH buildings. However, there were concerns raised that this could lead to limited housing choices for those who have been in domestic violence situations or have non-violent criminal convictions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project name and Location</th>
<th>Site size (ac)</th>
<th>No. of dwelling units</th>
<th>Dwelling units per acre</th>
<th>Bed-rooms per acre</th>
<th>Ratio of bedrooms to units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miramonte at Beaver Street 320 N Beaver St</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leroux Mixed Use 611 N Leroux</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hub 215 W Phoenix Ave</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>216.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Standard 970 W Route 66</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>154.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont Station 555 W Forest Meadows</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>133.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village at Aspen Place 601 E Piccadilly</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>101.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Town Milton Rd and University Ave</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>113.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Size and density of High Occupancy Housing projects proposed so far

**Essential Services**

This section is organized around the provision of essential services to and from an HOH development. Stormwater runoff needs to be controlled throughout the City. Water needs to be considered from its surface or sub-surface source to its customers. Sanitary sewer needs to be considered from the customer through its ultimate treatment. Trash needs to be disposed-of efficiently and sustainably. Lastly, the privately run energy and communications services need to adequately provide for their customers.

Transportation and safety can also be considered an essential service provided by local government. An analysis of these conditions is provided in the property management and transportation sections of Chapter 2.

**Stormwater**

**Flagstaff**

Stormwater is intended to be adequately controlled by the City of Flagstaff through an infrastructure system containing gutters, storm sewer pipes, dedicated drainage-ways, and naturally occurring washes or rivers. New development is not allowed to build within the floodway (a theoretical compression of the 100-year flood into an area of conveyance) or the Rural Floodplain (areas specifically set aside) of an existing wash or river. Development within the 100-year floodplain is allowed if it is adequately above the expected flood elevation or has a reinforced commercial-only first floor. These floodplain/floodway rules are set by Federal policy.

The addition of roofs, pavement, and other hardscapes to an area increases the peak flow and volume of water to the system since these surfaces do not allow any infiltration, unlike the natural ground. To protect down-stream conveyance structures and surrounding areas from increased peak flow, the additional water created through development is typically held on-site with one or more detention basins that outlet at a rate that existed before the development.

The infrastructure required for treating stormwater is guided by the City of Flagstaff Low Impact Development (LID) policies that also serve to mitigate stormwater volume increases. To clean the water that gathers
Map 3: Floodways and Floodplains in Flagstaff

This map denotes area that are subject to the National Flood Insurance Program, because FEMA predicts that there is a 1% chance annually of flooding. These areas are also subject to additional building regulations, restrictions, and floodproofing requirements based on local zoning and federal policy. This is not the US Army Corps of Engineers delineation of the floodplain, which is used for planning of infrastructure investments for the Rio de Flag Flood Control project. This map is not intended to be used at the parcel level. March 7, 2018.
oils and sediment from a developed site, a series of small retention ponds capture the “first flush” of stormwater runoff and its pollutants. This design approach filters and captures the pollutants on-site. The polluted sediment is then periodically removed from the property during routine maintenance, avoiding a concentration of pollutants downstream. Most new development will need to treat and detain its stormwater while some redevelopment may only need to treat their stormwater. Where land is more limited or costly, mechanical underground systems are often used to clean the first flush.

**Principles and Practices for Moving Forward**

Building within a floodplain will often require a certain economy of scale for profitability. One of the largest impediments for redevelopment in and near downtown Flagstaff is the fact that much of it is in the floodplain. Building in the floodplain necessitates raising the finished floor elevation above the expected flood elevation (averages 5 feet deep within the Southside neighborhood) and/or flood-proof reinforcing a commercial-only ground floor. Many flood-proofing construction measures for commercial buildings, such as adding adequate strength to flood-proof glass can be more expensive, than traditional commercial construction. The expenses associated with “flood-proofing” a structure is a contributing factor toward the consolidation of parcels in order to make the “flood-proofing” pay for itself for each project. The most walkable areas of Flagstaff are composed of finer grain small to mid-scale developments that create a diversity of buildings along a street. Flood proofing and on-site retention of stormwater can affect the scale of development by encouraging developers to build larger projects to offset higher construction costs. Most of the finer-grained, smaller buildings, especially within the Southside neighborhood, pre-date the current flood prevention standards and could not be constructed similarly today.

Taking downtown and its surroundings out of the floodplain can eliminate the associated design challenges. The City of Flagstaff has been working toward a flood-control solution through downtown and the Southside neighborhood for a number of years. The Rio De Flag and Clay Avenue Wash underground culverts, when constructed, would be able to contain the entire 100-year flood. Therefore, if that project is completed, central Flagstaff will no longer be in floodplain that exceed the Rio de Flag's channel banks. This would greatly reduce the cost of new development in most of the area currently delineated as floodplain and the economic impacts of flood and flood insurance on the Downtown and Southside. The total cost of this project has been its primary hindrance; it is currently estimated over $100 million.

On-site stormwater mitigation requires the dedication of land or expensive underground systems. Every square foot of land used for detention or treatment on a site takes away from space that could be used otherwise. In very low-density suburban environments, this additional space can appear and function as a part of the landscaped area but in denser urban areas, it more directly limits the lot’s potential. This loss of potential is especially true for smaller parcels and is another contributing factor (see Parking discussions) working against a smaller-scale development. A development’s profitability can be increased by consolidating smaller parcels to take advantage of particular benefits that some of the smaller parcels might afford, and by increasing the vertical development since stormwater mitigation is calculated by the impervious surface area that does not change with vertical development. Again, most of the finer-grained, consistent streetscapes throughout central Flagstaff were developed before the current LID and detention standards, and could not be constructed similarly today. Constructing a larger detention basin or LID system that services multiple sites will provide flexibility in how and where mitigation infrastructure is constructed. Large centralized systems can also result in a more efficient use of land and better place-making in the urban environment. A smaller-scale development could then pay into that more efficient and larger-scale system instead of constructing their own, often allowing more flexibility and overall feasibility to their project while saving money. This option would be one contributing factor toward avoiding stagnation on small lots until its underlying value warrants consolidation for a single large project (see Economic Development discussions). These consolidated systems should be seen to detain or treat multiple lots and not be confused with flood-prevention regional detention systems that service multiple square miles.

Because it can be difficult and expensive to find ideal land within a dense commercial district that can be used for stormwater mitigation by multiple sites, other cities have programs that allow for right-of-way to be developed with shared LID facilities when it benefits the public and is paid for and maintained by the adjacent private property owner. The City’s current policy does not allow mitigation of stormwater impacts from private development in public rights-of-way. If the City were to revise this policy, stormwater mitigation could be a component of a
landscaped parkway or underground systems could exist under a wide sidewalk. These alternative ways of managing the issue of stormwater impacts have risks and benefits. LID in a landscaped parkway could enhance the feature while allowing the building to directly interact with the pedestrian realm. Under-sidewalk systems could be more efficient if they service multiple parcels at a time. They would likely exist at a more natural low-point where water already drains than other locations on-site, and the system would more directly connect the public storm drain that commonly exists under the street. However, the cost of maintaining these improvements may eventually fall to the City if a property owner has financial difficulties, and it may not be an appropriate consideration at every site. The City’s Stormwater Division has just begun a “green infrastructure” project to start evaluating the possibility and trade-offs of changing the City’s policy.

Water Supply

Flagstaff

The supply of water in the Southwest is typically a more controversial topic than other utility distribution systems. Theoretically, we can build ourselves out of any other utility challenge but we cannot create more water to use. In response to our region’s potential issues, Arizona is the only state to require specific cities to forecast 100 years in to the future. Flagstaff is not required to but has opted into this methodology as governed by the Arizona Department of Water Resources.

As a component of the land use and transportation modeling for the Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030, a 100-year adequate water supply study was performed to meet the water needs for each land use. Accounting for the projected Flagstaff population growth, water recharge was modeled to match depletion within three percent around the year 2115. The City is essentially mining our water resources very slowly, but is within the definition of safe yield by the Department. The sources of water are diagramed in the City of Flagstaff 100-year Designation of Adequate Water Supply chart and include area surface water from Upper Lake Mary, reclaimed water reuse, and local groundwater. After a population of approximately 106,000 is reached, the groundwater at Red Gap Ranch can sustain Flagstaff up to a build out population of 150,000 people. Water supply and demand conditions are monitored and tracked with a report every year to the Arizona Department of Water Resources. These models are fully updated at least every 10 years. The updates account for changing conditions, including changes in land-use patterns.

Accounting for the projected Flagstaff population growth, water withdrawals and recharge from precipitation, and reclaimed water, the City’s water consumption was modeled using a U.S. Geological Survey groundwater flow computer model. The model was run for about 100 years under various growth scenarios and depletion of the aquifer was as much as three percent of the total volume of the aquifer. The City of Flagstaff is about to launch a study to answer several questions: how much more water savings are available in Flagstaff? What do Flagstaff residents want Flagstaff to look like? Do we value lawns, parks, community gardens,
golf courses, skiing, and industry? At what point does the community over conserve such that there is not enough water to keep the wastewater collection system flowing to the water reclamation plants? How much conservation can be expected if the City does nothing? What can the City incentivize? Getting these questions answered will help the City of Flagstaff better understand future water demand.

Cultural shifts, technology improvements, and national and local water conservation efforts have helped overall water use per capita drop over the past two decades. Since 1989, the City of Flagstaff has grown by 30,000 people yet the total acre-feet of water used has remained constant.

Other water supply options the City of Flagstaff is exploring is to expand water reuse. Currently, a large volume of unused reclaimed water leaves the City of Flagstaff service area and aquifer recapture area downstream of the Wildcat Hill Water Reclamation Plant during all but the summer months when reclaimed water is fully utilized. This volume of water could be recirculated back into the service area and reused in many different ways to either offset withdrawals from the aquifer with passive recharge by piping water and allowing it to flow down the Rio de Flag from Frances Short Pond or the Rio de Flag Water Reclamation Plant, active recharge through injection wells to the aquifer, piping advanced treated reclaimed water to Upper Lake Mary, or even though direct potable reuse that puts purified water directly into the drinking water system.

The expansion of ‘purple pipes’ or reclaimed water to new or existing development is also an option to offset potable water use. In Flagstaff, there are many considerations. First, the existing purple pipe system was constructed only to serve large outdoor users, including parks, commercial sites, and golf courses. In the summer months, all water is fully allocated. To better serve existing customers the City of Flagstaff needs to complete three projects: 1) upsize a bottle neck in the distribution system;
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2) add a several mile segment of pipeline to completely loop the pipeline system; and 3) bolster system water storage. Expanding the reclaimed system requires strategizing whether reclaimed water should only be used outdoors, and whether dual piping to some or all new development is possible for indoor use. In addition, the robustness the reclaimed system would have to be improved in order to meet these objectives.

To evaluate the City’s water supply resiliency, the City of Flagstaff used the USGS computer flow model to produce a Climate Change model attempting to account for a worst-case scenario. The model accounted for no surface water in Upper Lake Mary, a 25 percent reduction in natural recharge and a 25 percent increase in evapotranspiration. Incorporating these changes still provided adequate supply to the City for 100 years but with an additional two percent groundwater depletion from the baseline models.

In order to come to a consensus on future water supply strategies, two things need to occur: 1) community conversations regarding Flagstaff’s values and priorities with water use and demand, and 2) technical studies that address the benefit and cost nuances of all water supplies. Once community values are established a water supply optimization model can be run that will help the City of Flagstaff adopt a plan for navigating Flagstaff’s water future.

Principles and Practices for Moving Forward

Typically, higher density developments use less water per household than lower density developments (City of Flagstaff, 2009). The Regional Plan’s growth assumptions were tested through several multivariate modeling efforts documents in the Land Use Scenario Analysis. This analysis modeled five scenarios of future growth patterns within the Flagstaff Region and considered their impacts across water, transportation, sustainability and other metrics. The Grow In scenario, which accounts for infill development at a higher density being a major component of Flagstaff’s population growth, requires the least water (ADOT, 2013). HOH located in activity centers is in-line with this preferred growth scenario. Further progress can be made toward water conservation within the context of HOH. Within their landscaped areas, HOH could implement more native landscaping or incorporate rain sensing or related technologies within the irrigation systems.

Water and Sanitary Sewer Distribution

Flagstaff

All public sanitary sewer systems within the City of Flagstaff gravity-flow toward the City’s two treatment facilities. The Rio De Flag Water Reclamation Plant (WRP) is near where the Rio De Flag passes under Interstate 40, and the larger Wildcat Hill WRP is located near Picture Canyon. New sewer lines start at eight inches in diameter and increase in size based upon their ultimate upstream uses and resultant expected flows, eventually entering a regional main that flows directly to the WRP. These regional mains, or interceptors, are over 27 inches in diameter. Older and possibly undersized lines exist throughout the City. A development that requires more capacity than the existing downstream system provides is required to upgrade that system as a part of their development. Upgrades can range in cost from a simple single block replacement to potentially replacing existing sewer lines with larger lines all the way to an interceptor line or even constructing private lift stations to get the site-generated sewage into the City’s gravity system.

Adequate potable water distribution to any development functions similarly to the public sanitary sewer system. New public water mains also start-out at 8 inches in diameter and increase in size based upon a network analysis of the surroundings and their demand. Any new development that requires more capacity than currently exists is required to upgrade that system accordingly. All new development shares in the overall cost of these systems when they purchase a new water meter and pay water capacity fees to the City of Flagstaff. This fee is used to reimburse the developer who provides water and sewer improvements upfront.

Private development’s potential sanitary sewer and waterline upgrade projects will often be coordinated with a broader picture need for the City of Flagstaff for a variety of reasons in order to take advantage of the already necessary mobilization, trenching, and/or general disruption.
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Principles and Practices for Moving Forward

There are locations throughout the City of Flagstaff that do not currently have adequate water and/or sewer infrastructure to serve higher densities. Undersized or aging infrastructure may deter future developments, especially the smaller scale developments that do not have the economy of scale to overcome expensive initial utility replacement costs. The Flagstaff community can help direct or incentivize development in preferred locations by providing adequate infrastructure in front of development. However, getting too far ahead of potential development may cost the City money with uncertain returns. While it may not make financial sense to build an entire infrastructure network with no certain development plans, it likely makes financial sense to initially install utilities that can accommodate higher density developments rather than installing the minimum utility infrastructure in certain strategic locations. For example, installing a 12-inch diameter line instead of an eight-inch line will be marginally more expensive since the trenching, labor, and mobilization costs are relatively similar for either size line.

Cities indirectly subsidize the maintenance of infrastructure for low-density suburban style developments. Utility and general infrastructure maintenance costs are easy to overlook when considering patterns for new development. While the initial cost of infrastructure is incurred by the developer, and therefore the user, the maintenance costs are typically borne by the community as a whole, regardless of the pattern of how they specifically live. The life expectancy of water and sewer lines are approximately 80 to 100 years. The replacement of these utilities will cost a city approximately $215,000 per small block. The life expectancy of the surface improvements is closer to 20 years, so every 20 years a city would incur approximately $45,000 per block in maintenance costs. At a residential suburban density, this equates to approximately $600 per year to pay for the maintenance of city-owned infrastructure in front of a single house. Whereas the residential density of townhomes would equate to $200 per year per household, the density of HOH would equate to under $50 per year per household. These numbers should not be seen as exact representations of costs, but they do demonstrate the cost-efficiency gains for infrastructure maintenance at higher densities and the indirect subsidies that people living in sprawling environments currently enjoy.

The Regional Plan recognizes that new development patterns will have an important influence on the cost of providing essential services to the Flagstaff community. Denser infill and redevelopment is much more efficient from the standpoint of water, sewer, and stormwater management, and needs to be balanced and integrated with the place-making principles of the Regional Plan. The following goals and policies recognize this need for enhancing the City’s services:

Solid Waste and Recycling

Flagstaff

Multifamily complexes struggle to divert a significant amount of their waste stream. Together, the multifamily and commercial sectors recycle only 10% of their waste. Unlike the single-family residential sector, multifamily complexes have to opt into recycling when purchasing waste collection service from either the City or a private hauler. State law also requires that private companies be allowed to compete with the City to manage trash and recycling for multifamily and commercial sectors. The City cannot currently require these private haulers to provide recycling service to its customers, because of State law. While many complexes choose not to provide any recycling service, most do not provide an adequate number of recycling dumpsters to reduce the inconvenience of recycling. At complexes that have opted into recycling service, educating residents is often left to property managers who are not required to provide any specific materials to inform residents them regarding how and where to recycle, which leads to contamination of recycling when that option is available.

Principles and Practices for Moving Forward

There is interest in the community to increase our waste diversion rate. Increasing the rate for multifamily buildings will contribute significantly to the City’s overall goals. Currently, City Code does not require certain infrastructure that would enable property managers and residents of HOH to recycle properly, such as dual garbage and recycling chutes, as well as dual enclosures to handle recycling and trash containers. This infrastructure is essential to adequate diversion, as it eliminates inconvenience and makes recycling one’s waste as easy as landfilling it. Even if a property manager does not choose to invest in recycling service initially, the infrastructure would allow them to start an effective recycling program should they choose to make the investment later on. Adding infrastructure, such as garbage chutes or enclosures, is difficult and costly when added after
the initial construction. For existing buildings, the City could still incentivize adding more recycling infrastructure. To reduce the costs of implementing successful recycling programs, peer cities, such as Boulder, have employed grants and rebates to help reduce the costs of building extra enclosures, purchasing indoor recycling bins, and educational materials.

Another challenge to waste diversion and prevention at multifamily or HOH complexes is the frequent resident turnover, which creates a need for ongoing education. In some Peer Cities (pages 52-53), property managers are required to provide specific educational material to help tenants recycle the right items in the correct place.

The City is working on its “Rethinking Solid Waste” Plan concurrent to this plan. The two processes have been conducted in coordination between the Community Development and Sustainability staff members.

**Energy**

**Flagstaff**

The City of Flagstaff does not control the privately run energy and communications services. They have many of the same infrastructure challenges and limitations as water and sanitary sewer. These services often share crowded right-of-way with the City of Flagstaff or exist within their own easements. While the City does not control the infrastructure to provide these services, there is a vested interest in using them efficiently. The City currently uses the 2009 International Energy Conservation Code.

**Principles and Practices for Moving Forward**

Buildings consume approximately 40 percent of all energy in the United States. HOH developments present an important opportunity to reduce community energy use because of the high number of residents and activities that can occur in them. Each HOH project that incorporates greater energy conservation and efficiency measures helps Flagstaff move forward in reducing overall greenhouse gas emissions. Building for efficiency reduces the end user’s energy bills and helps insulate them from energy price fluctuations. Studies have shown that more sustainable buildings have higher occupancy and lease rates, and improve occupant health and productivity (SWEEP, 2010).

The City would encourage all HOH developments to incorporate renewable energy. Pre-plumbing and pre-wiring are often presented as a lower-cost alternative to installing renewable energy features during construction. These up-front efforts make future installation more affordable for future owners or residents, especially as renewable energy technology continues to improve.
Parking

Flagstaff

Parking has been raised as one of the biggest and most complex community concerns regarding HOH developments. Parking is provided in three forms: on street, on-site and off-site. In Flagstaff, new roads except for arterials are typically designed with on-street parking on one or both sides. On-site parking takes the form of surface lots or structures that allow for development-specific parking on each individual development. HOH often includes parking structures that serve commercial customers and residents in a mixed-use site. Off-site parking is public or private parking areas that serve multiple properties and business such as the parking lots in and around Downtown and the Southside.

Off-Site and On-Street Parking

In 2017, the City of Flagstaff implemented a managed parking system for the Downtown and surrounding area that could eventually be expanded to anywhere in the city where parking management is needed. The need for a comprehensive parking system has been a hotly debated topic for over 50 years. Recently, the availability of parking in residential areas in the Southside has become scarcer. A past parking consultant report commissioned by NAU stated, “Residential parking permit programs have been established in many communities across the country to manage neighborhood parking and maintain positive town/gown relations while preserving community vitality in neighborhoods in close proximity to universities.”

Looking into this issue and talking with stakeholders, it became clear that the spillover parking is also occurring in the Southside commercial areas, the Phoenix Avenue parking lot, and in certain areas north of the railroad tracks. Introducing parking management in the Southside would have a predictable impact of pushing the spillover parking into other neighborhoods such as La Plaza Vieja, Townsite, and the North End. This parking program is set up so that it can be expanded at the property owner’s request into these areas. The new core tenets for defining a solution in developing the new parking program were:

1. Parking is a public resource.
2. Limited resources require management.
3. People park where it is advantageous.
4. All parking is paid for ... by someone.
5. No one should have an advantage over another.

In order to achieve these tenets, the Comprehensive Parking Management Plan implemented Employee and Residential Parking permits, pay stations, and eventual construction of new parking lots and structures to increase the availability off-site parking in these areas.

NAU On-Campus Parking

Parking for students, visitors, and employees on NAU’s campus has been managed through a permit system for several years. NAU currently manages 8,827 parking spaces in surface lots and parking garages throughout campus and is adding 706 new spaces this fall semester. Permits range in cost from $351 per semester for students who live on campus and are willing to park in remote lots to $585 per semester for students and employees that want a spot in a more centrally located parking garage with rates in between. On-campus parking demand for students has been low; in 2017, only 37%³ of students who live on campus brought their own car to campus, and only 24%² of students who live off campus have purchased parking and registered a car on campus.

On-Site Parking

Parking strategies in the Flagstaff Zoning Code are varied depending on the zone, type of use, and context. There are tailored minimum and maximum requirements for parking in Flagstaff depending on the site’s context. Each of these requirements is trying to meet different community goals. For conventional zones, parking is determined by factors such as commercial square footage, number of employees, and number of units. Rooming and boarding requires that there be a parking spot for each bedroom leased, while the typical residential parking requirements are close to an average of 0.7 parking spaces per unit. Site-specific calculations are based on the number of bedrooms within each unit and the need for guest and employee parking. In the transect zones, where parking management has been implemented, transit is frequent and readily available, and walking and biking create a “park once” atmosphere, and parking requirements are lower. The Transect requirements are trying

³ 3,622 permits issued out of 9,853 on-campus beds
² 3,040 permits and 12,887 students enrolled who live off campus.
to create a walkable, vibrant central district with a “park once” environment, the conventional zones are trying to ensure that automotive-oriented suburban places have available parking.

Flagstaff’s Transportation Engineering Program conducted a study of parking at multifamily apartment complexes in 2016. The study found that 11 sampled multifamily housing developments had parking lots that were 77% occupied on average. Of the properties sampled, the lowest occupancy was around 67% and the highest around 88%. The percentage of students, whether or not the units were leased by the bed, and the number of parking spaces to bedrooms did not appear to be correlated to the actual occupancy of parking spaces. This demonstrates that not one factor or criterion determines parking demand. In fact, many of the criteria that determine the demand for parking are tied to demographic, macroeconomic or off-site physical conditions, such as employment density, cost of parking, ability to connect trips for multiple purposes into one location, availability of multimodal transportation options, and area type (McCourt, 2004). This is why desired future conditions are often a major consideration in setting parking standards, and the line between convenient and excessive parking is not easy to determine.

Principles and Practices for Moving Forward

Most cities in the United States have minimum on-site parking requirements for new development in their zoning codes. However, in the interest of economics and sustainability, the trend nationally has been to move away from minimums and establish maximum parking requirements or in some cases to eliminate on-site parking requirements for new development in favor of centralized parking garages for urban centers. In fact, the central business district of Phoenix and many areas that have adopted transect zoning have set no minimum parking requirements, coupled with parking management and the provision of public and private parking garage that are centrally located and serve the entire area. The reason for this shift is that “minimum parking requirements subsidize cars, increase vehicle travel, encourage sprawl, worsen air pollution, raise housing costs, degrade urban design, preclude walkability, and exclude poor people” (Shoup, 2012). Free parking is, in fact, not free but a subsidy for one mode of transportation. There are costs to build and maintain it, and there are opportunity costs because parking consumes so much land. These costs are passed on to all residents of a city, not just those that drive cars, either through taxes for the cost of maintaining parking infrastructure or passing on construction related parking costs to homeowners or renter. Additional parking requirements take away space that could be used for more compact development, further increasing the cost per residence constructed, and makes housing less affordable. In areas with smaller lot sizes, parking requirements can also lead to lot consolidation, as a small lot may be cost ineffective to develop. Parking requirements can also reduce the feasibility to re-use existing historic buildings.

When parking requirements are regulated through the zoning code, they must be tied to criteria that can be applied to all parcels within a zone because of the uniformity requirement found in almost every state’s statute. For this reason, parking standards are typically set in a zoning code and then a set of performance-based reductions may be applied based on criteria known to influence parking demand, such as proximity to transit.

What makes the evaluation of new mixed use development unique is that it frequently is located in order to be transit oriented and to take advantage of area types and off-site factors that reduce parking demand. A 2017 study of five transit-oriented mixed-use developments found that they generated “many fewer vehicle trips than Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) publications estimate, and used less parking than many regulations require for similar land uses” (Smart Growth America, 2017). In the future, activity centers from the Regional Plan should have varying degrees of transit-oriented features. Some activity centers currently have them and new development is expected to enhance these features, and some need to transition significantly in order to achieve the plan goals.

Another reason that parking requirements are a difficult policy decision is because they are largely based on assumptions based on the last 70 years of transportation trends. At the same time, new technologies, such as real time parking and traffic data, teleworking, ride sharing, and automated vehicles, are disrupting those economic and behavioral models. Therefore, a parking standard that is adequate today may be too much or too little in the future. As such, parking regulations and management need constant consideration and fine-tuning, not just for High Occupancy Housing but for all uses.

Higher on-campus parking prices have a largely positive impact at the community level when they are combined with programs to promote transit, bicycle, and pedestrian use. This combination can lower the overall personal vehicle trips to and from NAU’s campus and thus off-set...
the need and cost of additional capacity associated with NAU’s growing enrollment. In addition to reduced infrastructure costs and traffic impacts, these policies increase the use of public transit and promote public health through active commuting choices. For instance, transit through NAU’s campus has the highest ridership in the local system, and many bicycle commuters in the City use trails and paths on-campus to get to other destinations. Like the water conservation measures the City used to offset the impacts of population growth, parking management can be one of several tools used in the management of traffic impacts. Therefore, reducing the price of on-campus parking is more likely to increase traffic impacts on the community than to reduce them.
Transportation

The transportation network in Flagstaff exists to facilitate the safe, effective, and efficient movement of people throughout the City. The completeness of connections and the availability of choices is one of several factors that influence travel behavior. Other factors to consider are technology, land use, and economics. The choices that a City makes about its transportation system can create community and wealth or create inequality and hurt public health. This section of the Site and Area Analysis will address how the relationship between these factors have manifested in Flagstaff, and how High Occupancy Housing can influence this system of transportation, land uses, and travel behavior.

Flagstaff

Transportation Network

Roads and Automobile Travel

The network is composed of roads, alleys, trails, and sidewalks. Roads are classified according to their capacity, speed, and the size of the area that they serve, as well as the diversity of uses they collect traffic from and deliver traffic to. Arterials are the largest roads in the network. In Flagstaff, the majority of major arterial roads are built and managed by the Arizona Department of Transportation. These roads are constructed and designed according to the State’s standards and are not subject to local authority or plans. Collectors and local roads in Flagstaff are managed by the City. They collect traffic from smaller roadways and deliver them within the City or to larger roadways for regional travel. Local roads provide direct access to land uses in suburban areas and have lower traffic volumes and often lower connectivity.

Construction and reconstruction of all roads and supporting infrastructure in the City are guided by the standards in the City of Flagstaff Engineering Design Standards and Specifications. In this part of the City Code, Flagstaff has a series of cross sections for use with new development that depend on the planned functional class and setting of each proposed roadway. Cross-sections are illustrations of the uses within the public right of way and how much space each constructed feature takes. Each functional class has a standard location and width for elements such as automobile lanes, bike lanes, on-street parking, landscaped parkway, and sidewalks. These standards can also consider the land use context, such as standards for Transect zones and commercial centers.

The older and/or more constrained parts of the City contain numerous custom cross sections that have evolved over time and do not conform to the current standards due to limited right-of-way or other land use constraints. Compromises are therefore necessary in areas of redevelopment, where the automobile lanes and/or sidewalks may be narrower than the standard, there are blocks without street parking, or there is no dedicated bike lane.

Bicycle, Pedestrian and Transit Infrastructure

Flagstaff invests in all modes of transportation especially walking, biking and transit in recognition that providing a choice of modes for travel and supportive land use patterns serves the most residents in our diverse community.

Flagstaff public streets contain more than 130 miles of bike lanes. In addition to the on-street bike lanes, Flagstaff has an extensive and unique system of multi-use paths called the Flagstaff Urban Trail System (FUTS). Overall, there are 56 miles of FUTS that provide intercity access and recreation opportunities. While the City of Flagstaff continues to make gains in its bicycle infrastructure, there are gaps or areas that are not comfortable for the beginner or intermediate bike commuter. Flagstaff’s challenging terrain can also be a hindrance toward additional bike infrastructure. 74 more miles of FUTS and nearly 50 miles of on-street bike lanes are currently planned or proposed.

The City of Flagstaff has nearly 300 miles of public sidewalks, but has identified 60 miles of missing sidewalks along major streets. Certain neighborhoods and especially the area in and around Downtown Flagstaff are comfortable for pedestrian travel, because sidewalks are often wider, separated from the street by a landscaped parkway, and part of a highly connected street grid. There are pockets of comfortable pedestrian travel outside of Downtown, notably within most residential subdivisions. However, while Downtown’s mix of uses allows many tasks to be accomplished by foot, many other residential areas only facilitate walking as a recreational pursuit. In a 2014 survey of pedestrians, no or missing sidewalks or difficult crossings were the top reason that walking in Flagstaff was considered uncomfortable. Even a short distance of uncomfortable or seemingly unsafe infrastructure can be enough to discourage...
Some of the data on this map was generated from the Flagstaff Engineering Design Standards and Specifications on October 30, 2017. It is included for informational purposes and will not reflect future amendments to City Code.
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walking and biking to or from a nearby destination. This has the indirect effect of increasing short personal vehicle trips.

Flagstaff’s fixed-route transit systems transported approximately 2 million riders in 2016. The Northern Arizona Intergovernmental Public Transportation Authority (NAIPTA) operates Flagstaff’s fixed-route systems of Mountain Line and Mountain Link (Route 10) and the direct-service system of Mountain Lift. There are currently eight different fixed-routes with varying frequencies.

**Travel Behavior**

People traveling by automobile is the dominant form of transportation in Flagstaff, accounting for approximately 95 percent of all miles traveled. According to a 2012 trip diary survey, approximately 25 percent of all trips in Flagstaff do not use a personal vehicle. This is because of the strong infrastructure investment in the core of the City and on NAU’s campus for walking and biking, and the connectivity and comfort of the sidewalk network. The miles traveled overall by personal vehicle are still a high overall percentage because vehicles are still relied on to make longer trips. The fact that infrastructure investments in Flagstaff can influence travel behavior is well documented and is one of the assumptions behind the distribution of activity centers in the community. These two strategies can influence vehicle miles traveled and lower carbon emissions by decreasing the distance one needs to travel for daily errands and work, and by creating more opportunities to walk, bike, and take transit trips.

Vehicle miles traveled is another measure by which the region has seen the shift in travel behavior from personal vehicles to other modes. Vehicle miles traveled per capita per day has dropped from 21 miles in 2007 to under 17 miles in 2016. Within the core of Flagstaff, only 26 percent of trips involve one person driving alone as compared to nearly 61 percent of trips involving someone driving alone within the rest of the City. The percentage difference is primarily comprised of a higher percentage of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian trips (See Figure 9).

Currently, the City, County, and several employers have strategies to reduce the number of trips generated by their visitors and employees and to manage the availability of parking. NAU, by far, has the most sophisticated and comprehensive program in Flagstaff. NAU’s practices include:

1. Provide all employees with an Eco Pass to incentivize ridership of NAIPTA
2. Provide all students access to and financial support for the operation of NAIPTA Route 10 – over 800,000 reduced trips annually
3. Enterprise Car Share Program
This map reflects the bus frequencies and stops on October 30, 2017.
4. Zimride – encourages students to carpool across town or across the country
5. Van Ride program for county residents traveling to campus
6. Bike Library Program – free to all students, faculty & staff
7. Bike registration to assist owner if a bike on campus is lost or stolen
8. Bike Lockers and covered/secured bike storage
9. Arizona Shuttle – Convenient campus stops
10. Parking Permit Pricing incentivizes the use of Travel Demand Management (TDM) strategies (only 20 percent of incoming freshmen bring a car to campus)

In comparison to the cost of a parking permit, NAU provides these services, some of which are free or included in semester fees, to students, faculty, and staff. For instance, bicycle lockers and enclosure are located throughout campus and can be obtained for $15 for an enclosure or $30 per semester for a locker. NAU also has made specific infrastructure changes to promote other modes of transportation, such as managing vehicle access points on campus, having bus only lanes for NAIPTA and LOUIE buses, standardizing the design of its bicycle lanes, and providing secure bicycle storage on campus. The trail system through NAU is also highly connected to the City’s Flagstaff Urban Trail System (FUTS), which benefits students living off-campus and bicycle commuters throughout the City. Because of these practices, NAU has reduced the congestion impact of its growth on the Flagstaff community in a manner that local government and other employers could successfully model. These programs have been expanded for the last 10 years, and have contributed to the growing percentage of walking, biking and transit trips in Flagstaff (see Figure 10).

The introduction of parking management in Flagstaff is also encouraging other employers and the Downtown Business Alliance to take action on reducing the number of vehicle trips generated by employees. For instance, the City issued bus passes to all City employees as a means of reducing the demand for parking at City Hall.

Transportation and Land Use Connection

The Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030 identifies a complete and connected roadway network (Regional Plan Map 25) that can support a compact land use pattern that supports the efficient use of infrastructure and the preservation of open spaces within and around the community. The land uses and transportation maps rely on the assumptions discussed under the Planning and Land Use and Essential Services sections of this chapter. Denser infill, compact development, and investment in providing alternative transportation choices offset demand for vehicle trips and therefore, demand for new infrastructure. If investment and performance of these systems underperforms, the need for new and wider roadways would increase. New roads to increase system connectivity and support new development are essential.

Traffic Impacts of New Development

The City of Flagstaff requires evaluations by a development to have new development pay a “fair and roughly proportional share” for necessary infrastructure improvements related to their transportation impacts. A traffic study is performed before any development can break ground. For developments that generate few new peak-hour vehicle trips, the analysis focuses on existing or anticipated special conditions such as being next to a school, or traffic problems near the site that may be aggravated by the development. These developments typically do not have impacts on the street system that require mitigation. This is typically the case for infill and redevelopment projects with uses similar to previous uses, and for developments that create very little new traffic, regardless of the mass, bulk, and scale of the building. For example, a 3,000 square foot dentist office can be expected to create approximately 11 trips during the PM peak hour per the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual. This spreads out to be approximately one car every fourth signal cycle at the businesses entrance. Therefore, this type of developments only needs to show that it would create little or no new traffic and address any existing or anticipated special conditions or problems near the site. However, when a development creates over 100 vehicle trips during a
peak hour, typically the case for large-scale HOH developments, the City of Flagstaff requires a detailed Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) to evaluate the surrounding transportation network with the new development’s expected trips.

This more detailed study evaluates the existing traffic data to set a baseline for the roadway network. Generally using the ITE Trip Generation Manual, new traffic is predicted based upon the proposed development’s size and uses. This new traffic is assigned to the existing roadway network based upon existing and expected patterns. Then the predicted traffic performance conditions are analyzed and compared to the existing conditions. Roadway performance is primarily evaluated based on Level of Service, which is a measure of delay ranked from “A” to “F,” where an “A” is free-flow traffic, and “F” is forced flow (jammed traffic). Typically, whenever an analysis demonstrates that the Level of Service drops below a “D” for a certain movement or intersection, the development must implement one or more mitigation measures to improve that movement’s rating to at least a “D.” Additionally, mitigation will be required if any hazardous safety patterns are noticed. Common mitigation measures include adding a new travel lane, turn lane, or traffic signal. It is important to note there are legal limits on the type and extent of improvements that can be required from new developments based on a TIA. Mitigation is required when development’s impact caused the need for the improvements requested. The mitigation must also be roughly proportional to the size of the impact.

In urban and mixed-use areas, there will be a significant percentage of trips that are not taken via an automobile. These trips are deducted from automobile trips in order to avoid designing the automobile component of streets unnecessarily large. This saves space and money and prevents an overly auto-centric street that is typically unfriendly to other modes in terms of comfort and safety. While the analysis for some developments includes pedestrian capacity, Flagstaff’s current methodology for TIAs does not require capacity analyses for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit trips, though these are sometimes requested of the developer. The analysis is not typically done because the City lacks the tools and information to do them accurately.

The TIA typically focuses on a more qualitative analysis of access, connectivity, and continuity for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit. For instance, transit trips can only be deducted if transit already exists nearby. The potential for a new development to make a route modification or new
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route feasible is not modeled into the overall transit network as part of a TIA. Even where a new development will add passengers to an existing route, the impact typically is not quantified or mitigation identified in the TIA. Bike trips typically are assessed for access to a connected network of trails and bike lanes, since it is rare that the number of bike trips exceeds the capacity of a lane or trail. A development may be required to eliminate a gap in a bike lane serving the development so long as the TIA demonstrates the need to close the gap is related and proportional to the development’s impact.

**Principles and Practices for Moving Forward**

A primary concern surrounding HOH is additional density’s effect on the City’s transportation network. While many concerns are framed specifically around automobile traffic, transportation needs to be viewed as the efficient movement of people and not just automobiles. It is recognized that bringing more people to any area will bring more demand on the existing transportation network. However, where people live, work, and play within the City, and the overall facilities and infrastructure available to them, will have large effects on transportation choices, thereby, affecting overall automobile traffic in the street network. This section will discuss ways that better organize automobile traffic and ways to make other modes more appealing.

**Transportation Network**

In Flagstaff, traffic congestion, experienced as slower speed and travel delays for automobiles, exists during certain times of the day on arterials near the Downtown area, and on peak tourism weekends. Long-term potential solutions to automobile congestion are evaluated primarily through the Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization’s (FMPO) long term planning documents such as the Regional Transportation Plan. Long-term solutions broadly include increasing the connectivity of the roadway network, such as new freeway interchanges and bridges, and encouraging all other modes of travel besides a personal automobile. The region gets some direct money for these improvements, but the majority of these connectivity improvements are expected to happen through public and private partnerships.

In order to allow or even promote their use, walking, biking, and transit needs to be prioritized within the right-of-way. A complete street is one that allows for all modes of transportation. It is important to create complete streets as a component of the entire transportation network. A wider sidewalk directly in front of a single development can improve the pedestrian environment and provide opportunities for the private realm to interact with the public realm in the form of outdoor café seating or something similar. It is also important that it connects to other comfortable pedestrian infrastructure or else walking does not actually function as a mode of transportation. Similarly, a bike lane needs to connect to other bike lanes and a transit stop or even a dedicated transit lane needs to work with the overall system, otherwise improvements are aesthetic enhancements and not real gains in transportation efficiency.

The City’s current standards for new construction require a complete street be built. However, in a redevelopment scenario, the City will need updated road cross sections, design standards, stronger requirements for public improvements, and preferably a transportation master plan in order for HOH development to contribute to the goals of developing complete and connected activity centers. Staff will also need clear policies and decision-making tools to prioritize modes in areas of constrained right-of-way, and tools to promote high quality improvements. This may require reconsidering incentives used to promote walkability and complete streets. The right treatments for a given right of way, site, or land use context may vary depending on the needs of the system and the desired outcome, and so new standards need to take trends such as shared economies and the ability of technology, such as smartphones and intelligent transportation systems, to create efficiencies in the transportation system.

To facilitate public and private investments in an efficient transit network, NAIPTA has identified a permanent transit network that will be retained in times of budget scarcity, and along which frequency will be increased as additional funds become available. Locating HOH in proximity to NAIPTA’s permanent transit network is important, because transit is an effective means...
of commuting and taking longer distance trips, and can, therefore, reduce the vehicle trip generation of these developments.

A more frequent route will give the rider the convenience of not having to plan when they want to travel, therefore, encouraging increased ridership. However, it will still take over 30 minutes to get across town compared with approximately 15 minutes by a personal vehicle. A 30-minute commute can be seen as normal for most people in larger cities and may be acceptable for commuters once per day. NAIPTA is also considering the need for bus facilities that give transit an advantage to travel more quickly through intersections and other dedicated transit infrastructure.

**Travel Behavior**

In addition to designing the infrastructure to promote alternative modes of transportation, cities and partners can manage the use of existing infrastructure network in a way that reduces its demand. This approach is called Travel Demand Management (TDM). Common TDM strategies include shuttle services, carpools, telecommuting, shifting work hours, car share programs, bike share programs, parking pricing, and anything else that may contribute to fewer vehicles on the road network at any one time. A large HOH development will have the ability to manage a package of these options for their residents.

Travel Demand Management is a series of strategies that are designed to improve the reliability of the transportation system by creating choices for how to travel and incentives to bolster the use of alternative transportation systems (FHWA, 2017). Rather than adding to the supply of travel lanes and signals in response to growth, TDM can coordinate private and public sector efforts to ensure an effective and reliable transportation system for everyone. The Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Blueprint 2040 Plan recognizes that, “The region should invest in more formal and coordinated travel demand management activities.” The City can work with partners to expand programs already in place, and particularly to facilitate expanding the programs implemented on campus to off-campus HOH sites that serve students and the larger community.

The location, mix of services, and amenities at activity centers can also influence transit behavior. Time spent traveling by transit is appealing for long single purpose trips such as a commute. Time spent traveling by transit will be less appealing for trips that combine multiple locations, such as school drop off, errands, or appointments on the way to and from work. Therefore, other daily or weekly amenities also need to be present near activity centers for the HOH development to incentivize alternative transportation choices and reduce the vehicle traffic associated with HOH.

The simplest concept to help lower the burden on the transportation system is to travel shorter distances. When travel distances are short and appropriate infrastructure is in place, walking, biking, and transit become convenient, and are often the best options. The City of Flagstaff’s 2012 Trip Diary Survey of Community Travel Patterns directly shows this convenience in the resultant mode choices of the core of Flagstaff, as discussed in the Flagstaff, Travel Behavior section (see Figure 9). Shorter trips are more likely to be walking trips. In fact, up to 80 percent of trips less than one mile would be walking trips, if safe and comfortable infrastructure exists to support it. Therefore, HOH development when located in a well-served and walkable activity center is more likely to capture walking trips for the day-to-day needs of residents and can help reduce the per capita vehicle miles traveled for the City.
Transportation and Land Use

One idea posed during public meetings about High Occupancy Housing was “downgrading” the activity center for Downtown Flagstaff from a “regional” to a “neighborhood” activity center. In addition to proximity, transportation efficiency is dependent on the system’s overall organization. The downtown or central business district’s intensity, organization, and access can be of particular importance in increasing the efficiency of the entire transportation system. Even with similar overall densities, cities with a more defined and mixed-use center have less traffic. For example, San Diego and Philadelphia have similar overall densities, but Philadelphia has a more defined, intense, and mixed-use central city than San Diego, whose downtown is one of several mixed-use activity centers. Philadelphia has 25 percent less vehicle miles traveled than San Diego, as a result of this difference in the pattern of development (Troy, 2012). There are a couple of major reasons for these efficiency increases. First, even if someone does not live downtown, if it is still the primary activity center for a city, it will often be a destination for work and/or play. Therefore, for those that do not live near a strong downtown, once there they will have opportunities to accomplish multiple tasks. Second, if it is predictable that people living away from downtown will often travel toward downtown for many reasons, roadways and especially transit can orient themselves around this pattern. 30 to 60 percent of commuters to major commercial centers use alternative modes of transport versus 5 to 15 percent elsewhere (Littman, 2014). In fact, the 2016 Flagstaff walking and biking survey showed that Downtown Flagstaff is the location most cited as being a good place to walk (City of Flagstaff, 2016). It was a more popular answer than Buffalo Park or the Flagstaff Urban Trail System. For a City that prides itself on its natural resources, this shows that activity centers have the opportunity to be equally as effective in promoting public health and alternative transportation choices. Therefore, downgrading Downtown would likely result in a net increase in automobile trips, reduced public health, and would negatively impact the City’s transit system which also relies on the centrality of Downtown to make the system functional. Since the city center is usually constrained in its ability to expand transportation capacity, these effects would also be expected to result in increased congestion.

There is a large unmet demand for residential options near high quality fixed-line transit systems. One-fourth of Americans want to live near quality fixed-line transit systems, but currently, only one-tenth of the population has the option to do so (Nelson, 2015). Access to desired locations via transit needs to be fast and convenient. Current and future transit accessibility was a major consideration in the establishment of activity centers in the Regional Plan. They are intended to provide transit oriented development environments, especially in the Regional Centers. This is also consistent with the previous locations chosen by developers of high density, mixed-use projects across the nation and the feedback that was received from NAU students during the public involvement process (see NAU Housing section). Activity Centers also contribute to mode shift and decreased vehicle trips, because of the live-work-play lifestyle that residents of these areas find desirable. When living in smaller apartments or condos, and without constant vehicular access, the neighborhood ideally functions as an extension of one’s residence and, as such, the neighborhood needs to have numerous walkable amenities. A pocket of amenities is the concept of an activity center. Some of these amenities can be realized by the housing development itself, as seen at the Aspen Place development. Others can evolve nearby over time, but isolated pockets of density that are not located in highly walkable and connected neighborhoods will not create enough demand for a full range of services that reduces reliance on personal vehicles. This is because of the ability to access the services comfortably.
and the number and concentration of “rooftops” needed to support a
diverse and active commercial environment.

Overly large blocks can be especially difficult to navigate through or
around while walking or biking. Blocks are typically small within the
center of Flagstaff, making connections between points direct. However,
blocks are often very large in much of the City’s suburban environments.
These larger blocks do not create much inconvenience for automobiles,
but the distance a pedestrian or bicyclist may have to go out of their way
can add significant time to their journey. For example, there are several
half-mile stretches of large roads in Flagstaff that do not have pedestrian
crossings. A person having to go out of their way to cross these streets
will add 10 minutes to their walk, which likely discourages some people
from walking short distances to access services. Maximum effective block
sizes, at least for pedestrian and bike traffic, can greatly increase these
mode’s appeal in these areas. Mid-block crossings of large roads may be
especially appealing if they are grade separated.

Moving forward, an updated process for traffic impact analysis and the
requirements for public improvements for redevelopment projects could
include a level of service requirements that are specific and appropriate
to pedestrian, bike, and transit, and the ability to require redevelopment
projects bring the improvements between the building and the curb
up to standards for that specific road. The key ingredient to all of this
is the completion of a Transportation Master Plan that is developed to
conform to the goals and policies of the Regional Plan, implements the
Active Transportation Master Plan, and meets the needs identified in the
FMPO’s Regional Transportation Plan. This is an area that City staff has
been striving to improve over the last several years. In coordination with
the FMPO, the City participated in a peer review of its TIA practices
and the City has funding for the Transportation Master Plan allocated. These
efforts will need to include how to fairly require HOH development to
contribute to the complete network of infrastructure for pedestrians,
bicycles and automobiles and how they can contribute to meeting the
operational needs for transit. In order to proceed in this manner, there
needs to be clear and consistent policy direction from the City Council,
FMPO, and NAIPTA, and a good understanding of what can and cannot
be required of new developments. TIAs are therefore just one element
of a bigger set of planning needs for the City. They are not a panacea,
and other methods, tools, and funding sources will be needed to achieve
desired streetscapes for activity centers.

Housing Affordability

Flagstaff

The cost of housing in the city of Flagstaff has long been considered
high relative to the rest of the state. National forest lands, the extent of
infrastructure, and natural land formations constrain our current supply
of developable land. This limited supply increases the cost of land and
housing within city limits. When a single family home is built on valuable
land, the home price reflects that, which in turn excludes most first-
time buyers from chasing that home. In the last few years, the price of
single-family vacant lots within the City of Flagstaff has often exceeded
$100,000. When these conditions persist over time, the City is left with
a majority of renter households; 55% rental and 45% ownership as of
2016. Expensive housing conditions seem to exist in Flagstaff regardless
of fluctuations in the real estate market. Even at the peak of the economic
downturn in 2009, Flagstaff’s median home price was less impacted and
recovered sooner than the housing market in the Phoenix Metropolitan
Area.

Flagstaff residents – both students, individuals, and families – are further
challenged with greater housing demand than the market is currently
supplying. Rental prices have risen sharply in the years following the
Arizona Board of Regent’s goal of increasing the student population
at NAU. In the last three years, the average rent for a two bedroom
apartment rose from $1,200 in 2015 to $1,427 in 2017 (HSNA, 2015-
2017). Consequently, Flagstaff experiences year round competition for
single-family homes and apartments at a time when the economy is only
recently capable of producing new units.

Flagstaff’s housing challenges are not necessarily unique. Confronting the
increasing cost of living and housing shortages continue to be a national
issue, with no clear path forward for the nation’s struggling communities.
The City of Flagstaff’s Housing Section works to improve local housing
affordability in several ways, alongside the efforts of several non-profits
and agencies:

1. Providing affordable home ownership opportunities via a Land Trust
   Program;
2. An owner-occupied rehabilitation program;
3. Development incentives that aim to increase the number of new
   affordable rental and ownership units;
4. Administering the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG),
   which historically funds local housing non-profits.
Principles and Practices for Moving Forward

Arizona law prohibits cities in Arizona from requiring affordable housing contributions from new developments (also known as inclusionary zoning). Flagstaff’s current program is voluntary and is most often used in cases that require a discretionary approval like a rezoning as a negotiated benefit to the community. Peer cities in most states do have State-level legislation that permits the requirement of affordable units or at least no prohibition against it. As of 2017, only Arizona and Texas have legislation that outright bans municipalities from adopting a mandatory inclusionary zoning ordinance. Eventually the state of Arizona may look to these communities for guidance in creating such legislation here, but until that shift occurs, Flagstaff must continue to use other methods to encourage affordable housing development.

Asking for infill and redevelopment in Flagstaff’s busy activity centers is one way the City can move forward on affordability. Redevelopment of existing properties into HOH could be an incentive to developers who would forego the high cost of installing new infrastructure in under- or undeveloped areas of the city. As mentioned in the Economic Development section, using HOH as the vehicle to house the city’s workforce is a critical path forward for greater affordability in Flagstaff. Existing and future employment centers will rely on the densities and efficiencies that are possible with HOH development.

Furthermore, increased density allowances are one of the most common and effective ways cities attract affordable units. With the most recent Zoning Code rewrite, density bonuses were uncapped as an incentive to get more mixed-use development in Flagstaff, thereby lessening the impact of the existing affordable housing incentives. This Plan proposes that, with some adjustments to the Zoning Code, the City will regain the effectiveness of our affordable housing incentives. Instituting a density cap on mixed-use developments may lead developers to the unit increases available to them if they provide affordable units.

Historic Preservation

Flagstaff

The goal of the Heritage Preservation Program is to implement the public policy for the preservation of the historic environment of Flagstaff. The work of this program includes historic property inventories, landmark and historic district formation and maintenance, design review, and impact analysis. The program was established in 2001 because of the Vision 2020’s emphasis on Urban Design and the community’s investment in Downtown during the late 1990’s. The current program requires that projects that impact buildings built prior to 1950 and those that could impact archeological or cultural resources produce reports that document the integrity and significance of the structures that may be impacted. The program allows for different levels of detail depending on the resources. These reports are reviewed with the development application by the Historic Preservation Commission. Because of the structure of the program and the qualifications of the staff and Commission members, Flagstaff is one of only a few cities in the State that can conduct its own Section 106 reviews under the National Historic Preservation Act. This saves the City and the property owner time in the development review process and ensures that the community has a voice in the preservation of our historic resources.

In addition, the City has a review process and architectural guidelines for two local historic districts, and provides a landmark overlay option to property owners with the ability to protect individual historic resources. The City also offers a matching grant of $10,000 to owners of historic properties to make repairs that meet the Secretary of Interior’s guidelines for historic preservation. Some properties use this grant to replace windows with historically compatible windows that are more expensive.

Another tool that Flagstaff can use to protect the character of historic resources is to calibrate the form-based codes or Transect Zones as a tool for preserving the context of historic districts. The complication in Flagstaff is that the conventional zoning, which coincides with the transect zoning, has standards that are much more intense and out of scale with the historic districts near Downtown. Therefore for this to be an effective strategy, both conventional and transect zoning need to be amended.
In addition to City programs, there are also county, State and federal programs that incentivize the preservation of historic properties. The County offers a reduced property tax bill for historic buildings, and federal floodplain management policies exempt properties that are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places from flood protection and insurance requirements.

Principles and Practices for Moving Forward

Historic Preservation has evolved to become more than preserving old houses and writing history papers as an act of honoring the past. Historic preservation efforts endeavor to create an urban environment that blends the fabric of old and new buildings. It is also an economic development strategy that supports entrepreneurs and property owners. The National Trust for Historic Preservation has found:

- A higher concentration of creative jobs are found in older smaller-scaled buildings and blocks with diverse building ages.
- Smaller buildings host a significantly higher proportion of jobs in small businesses.
- Neighborhoods with a smaller-scale mix of old and new buildings host a significantly higher proportion of new businesses, as well as more women and minority-owned businesses, than areas with predominantly larger, newer buildings.
- Streets with a mix of old and new buildings have greater population density and more businesses per commercial square foot than streets with large, new buildings (National Trust for Historic Preservation – Preservation Green Lab, 2014).

Historic preservation can take the form of direct intervention to prevent the demolition of historic buildings. Neighborhood Conservation Districts, form based codes, and new historic overlays can incorporate architectural elements that support the overall character of the historic area or promote adaptive reuse and new buildings that are architectural appropriate. Other cities, like Tempe, have developed adaptive reuse programs that focus less on the significance of the buildings past and more on the principle that buildings should be reused over time to support new services and programs for the community. These programs often outline adaptive reuse as a tool for sustainability and historic preservation. They can help retain the eclectic mix of new and old buildings even in places that might not rise to the significance of a National Register designation. Still other communities have adopted policies to deter demolition of buildings by setting the recapture rate for demolition permit fees at 100%.

In addition, the Flagstaff’s transect code can be calibrated to more closely match historic buildings and architecture to enhance the character of the City’s historic districts.

---

¹ Neighborhood conservation districts (NCDs) are a comparatively newer tool used to promote compatible development in established neighborhoods that are worthy of some level of protection but are not appropriate for consideration as historic districts because they lack qualifying historic structures or public support. Conservation districts take the form of either overlays or special planning and zoning districts and are much less restrictive than historic districts. They tend to focus more on preserving overall community character rather than specific historic fabric.
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Parks and Civic Space

Flagstaff

The Flagstaff Regional Plan calls for park and civic space within activity centers that are walkable and “well designed, accessible, and central.” Very few activity centers in the City of Flagstaff currently meet these policies. Only 6 of 27 activity centers have a park within walking distance and only 3 of the 13 current and proposed regional-scale activity centers have a park within walking distance. Not counting Buffalo Park, which skirts the edge and is topographically separated from the activity center at Cedar Ave. and West St., there are 8.4 acres of City park in activity center pedestrian sheds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Center</th>
<th>Current scale</th>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Park acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U1 – Downtown</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Wheeler Park</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Colton Park</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U2 – Sawmill</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Sawmill Multicultural Art and Nature County Park</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U4 – Fourth Street</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Ponderosa Park</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U8 – Five Points</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Guadalupe Park</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Plaza Vieja Park</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1 – Sechrist – Ft. Valley</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Coconino Park</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 – Cedar Ave. and West St.</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Buffalo Park</td>
<td>248.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Currently, the Zoning Code requires that non-residential developments larger than 20,000 square feet in gross floor area and residential developments with 50 or more dwelling units provide a minimum of five percent (5%) of the site in civic spaces that are either privately held and open to the public or publicly owned.

An impediment to achieving these desired outcomes is the Parks Master Plan policy that limits the ability to accept new parks under two (2) acres from new development. This policy exists to control the cost of operation and maintenance, but it is working against the place-making goals of the Regional Plan. Small parks are essential to the urban fabric and for making existing neighborhoods attractive to families. In fact, all but two of the seven parks currently located in activity centers are smaller than 2 acres in size.¹ In order for a new development to meet the Parks Department threshold for making a civic space into a public park, the development site would need to be approximately 40 acres. This means that current redevelopment trends are not set up to increase accessible parks in activity centers. At the same time, parks are missing or inaccessible in many neighborhoods in Flagstaff, including the Southside neighborhood.

Small centrally located parks will be the most expensive to acquire and operate, if the 2 acre threshold is kept in place, and, therefore, increasing the number of public parks means that increased funding for parks and program will be essential. However, small parks also have a large positive economic and social impact on the community. Small urban parks, like Wheeler Park, have many challenges for management and maintenance, but they add to the vibrancy and character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Principles and Practices for Moving Forward

In a study of small urban spaces (3 acres or less) across different types of cities, five design principles were identified that were addressed consistently in successful small parks (Currie, 2017):

1. Accessibility – the park is a central part of a community and is encountered in the course of a normal day’s routine;
2. Specificity - the park is specific to its location and users;
3. Authenticity – the park is more than just a copy of something somewhere else;
4. Adaptability – the park allows upgrades and changes to meet the needs of the community over time; and
5. Functionality – the park is part of the urban fabric and provides what the community wants.

The study also found that small parks were an important strategy to providing greater social equity in the accessibility and distribution of parks to vulnerable populations, such as those with lower incomes, those

¹ For perspective, in an urban setting, two acres is approximately the size of a city block in Downtown Flagstaff.
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with limited mobility, children, and minority populations. The positive influence of parks on the health and well-being of these populations is an important reason why waiting for redevelopment to bring parks to neighborhoods is not a sustainable strategy.

**Economic Development**

**Flagstaff**

The City of Flagstaff’s economic development efforts are generally focused on creating opportunities for individuals and the community, workforce attraction and development, and attraction and expansion of primary sector industries, such as manufacturers and exporters of goods and services, science/bio-science industries, start-ups, and entrepreneurial ventures. Housing costs and choices for the city’s workforce have been a particular concern for the community’s employers for the last several years. Post-recession demand for housing grew faster than the market’s ability to develop land and new housing units, limiting the ability of local firms to attract talented individuals and to retain existing employees. In 2016, the Economic Cooperative of Northern Arizona began a study of these conditions that will be published in the next few months.

Workforce housing and the ability of Flagstaff to retain and enhance a high quality of place and employers can be part of the community benefit provided by High Occupancy Housing developments. First, the shortage of available and attractive housing for the workforce is influenced by the demand for housing for NAU students. These two demographic groups are competing within the same housing market. As long as the supply of land and units are constrained, the costs for both groups will continue to rise. HOH development provides an opportunity to more quickly increase the housing supply in areas of town that are attractive to new residents, because of their proximity to transit and other amenities. This shift can also free up other types of housing to meet workforce demand. Second, HOH development includes new commercial and office spaces that can be harnessed to support economic development. Retail economic development efforts recognize the maxim that retail development follows residential rooftops. An HOH development immediately provides a clientele for new retail spaces. These spaces can also support economic development beyond retail and provide space for arts, cultural, and local food sectors. The City has no connection to recruiting HOH, but it recognizes the opportunity to help guide it in a way that is financially beneficial with other economic development efforts.

**Principles and Practices for Moving Forward**

Primary sector jobs and industries have many indirect connections to HOH. The classic economic development goals revolve around providing quality jobs, and creating individual and community wealth. Quality jobs provide increased earnings for city residents that in turn provide more revenue back to the City. Historically, these jobs are recruited by different cities offering incentives or by selling the amenities that will help those businesses succeed. More recently, companies have also chosen to locate where their employee talent wants to live, and increasingly, this talent is looking for vibrant neighborhoods containing a mix of uses. This concept is referred to as “quality of place.”

Even though Flagstaff has many elements that contribute to a high quality of place, housing supply and lower densities can counteract some of the outstanding values that the City uses to attract and incubate new business and attract higher paying jobs. Many firms in Flagstaff, including city government, have reported that job offers are routinely turned down because of the cost of housing in the community. However, increasing housing at the expense of quality of place is not the community goal. New housing needs to contribute to the housing supply, vibrant neighborhoods, and the economic well-being of the entire community.

Vibrant neighborhoods should not be seen as only an amenity that exists to compliment industry after work hours, but as a component that enhances innovation. Jane Jacobs, the journalist, author, and urban study activist stated that new ideas are formed by combining old ideas, and that urban diversity is the key to innovation. For example, Ford’s most innovative period was while it was still in central Detroit where it could get more immediate feedback. Only after the success of the Model T did it move its production to the suburbs in order to have more land (Glaeser, 2009). Urban environments that have a high “quality of place” provide dynamic and participatory built and natural environments (Florida, 2012) Density is one component of these innovative environments because it increases the diversity of people and vibrancy of place, but density alone does not maximize the agglomeration of ideas. Innovative places need to be walkable, have interactive public spheres, and be connected in order to facilitate the informal passage of ideas, arts, and culture that all build
off one another. These concepts can be seen across history from tech ideas spreading over dinner in Silicon Valley to painting techniques in Renaissance Florence.

Commercial development will accompany most HOH because of the City’s requirements. The commercial components of larger scale developments are often composed of national chains. National chains carefully research their markets and how they can serve communities and their investors. They move into communities when they can find locations and clientele that fit their brand and can be profitable. Some retailers and restaurants have very stringent guidelines for location, size, and orientation of their space when they go into negotiations with a property owner. Other reasons chain stores so often anchor new development is their up-front capital and superior marketing outreach. When HOH developments design their commercial space for large national companies only, it can make it harder for a local business to contribute to the economic vibrancy and place-making of the new development. A local business is more likely to look for smaller, flexible spaces that fit their needs, frequently found in existing buildings. Downtown and other traditionally developed commercial districts offer many opportunities for the re-use of a building for many different types of businesses. On the other end of the spectrum, there are very few businesses that can re-use a Wal-Mart building, and even the Flagstaff Mall has had trouble attracting local businesses because most of their spaces are too large.

As a component of any new larger scale HOH development, one potential practice to promote local businesses is to require or encourage small and flexible spaces that are not leased before construction, but instead are advertised as available during construction. HOH has a unique opportunity to promote this because these developments, while still having measurable retail components, are residential developments at their core. As such, the housing component is more of what is relied upon for overall profitability; the commercial component can often be seen as a bonus.

Creating new commercial space needs to be done with appropriate design, scale, and overall location considerations. A large and famous chain store can attract enough attention by itself to be a destination, but small isolated businesses will not attract enough attention to thrive. Small and local stores can exist next to an already successful attraction or they need to exist at a certain minimum total scale for their aggregate to become a destination. The other option for smaller commercial or mixed-use additions is for them to exist in areas that are already successful commercial areas. Places that already get used incidentally will continue to see use and will, therefore, maintain themselves. They will also more efficiently use the City’s resources for utilities and transit. It is easier and less expensive to increase capacity in an area that already has services than one that needs a complete expansion of a given service.

As much as people enjoy walking on streets activated by ground floor commercial, there is a limit to its demand and it cannot exist everywhere, especially with so much retail moving online. This limit to traditional retail further points to the design of HOH’s commercial component needing to be flexible. It should be able to accommodate retail, food, drink and entertainment, or office-space, as well as non-traditional workspaces that act as incubators for companies, or even facilitate the creation of goods on-site to further promote the local economy.

HOH should be considered as a component of the City’s workforce housing discussion. Flagstaff has a history of losing potential employees at all pay grades because housing costs too much. The lack of affordable workforce housing poses a risk of losing employees with high value skills, even as the City’s overall population grows. Existing employment clusters are likely to benefit from proximate housing and the creation of new employment clusters should be considered with the overall design...
of HOH. Additionally, areas near existing employment centers should be considered as potentially viable locations for high occupancy housing subject to other variables.

**Peer Cities**

City Staff researched twenty highly livable college communities by examining planning documents, policies, regulations, zoning codes, and third-party information. Staff also conducted personal interviews with planners and university liaisons from the identified peer communities. Based on findings, six focus cities were selected that are experiencing concerns similar to Flagstaff including growth, density, housing shortages, and affordability. The peer cities include: Ames, IA; Boulder, CO; Bozeman, MT; Corvallis, OR; Fort Collins, CO; and Tempe, AZ.

**Ames, IA**

Ames is a Midwestern college town with a similar population size as Flagstaff and a student body that comprises over 50% of the residents. In 2010, after years of stagnant enrollment, student population at ISU surged by 8,000. Since then, the city has been unable to keep up with housing market demands in spite of the addition of 800 beds per year. High occupancy housing has generally been constrained to the Campustown commercial area directly across from Iowa State University, but there has also been significant redevelopment of small-scale apartments to high density. In light of development, City Staff created a Residential High Density Matrix to help the City Council think about the context of each apartment development and how it aligns with Ames’ General Plan policies and goals.

**Boulder, CO**

Boulder has a booming local economy and a compact downtown, as well as a plethora of newcomers. With little vacant land left in the city limits, most of Boulder’s growth will occur through redevelopment. Twenty percent of new residential development is required to be permanently affordable for low- and moderate-income households because of an inclusionary zoning ordinance adopted in 1999. Boulder recently initiated a 2016/2017 Housing Boulder Action Plan to help mitigate housing problems. The plan includes high-level objectives such as addressing housing issues as part of a comprehensive plan update, developing a middle-income housing strategy, and preserving existing affordable housing.
Bozeman, MT

Similar to Flagstaff, Bozeman is the regional hub, county seat, and is surrounded by National Forests and Parks. Given the limited housing options outside of Bozeman, the city has grappled with near-zero rental vacancy rates and soaring rents in the face of population growth. The city has been adding nearly 2,000 residents a year inside city limits. In recent years, Bozeman’s selected commissioners have tended to take a favorable view of higher-density housing developments and zoning changes to support them.

Corvallis, OR

Corvallis amended their Development Code and created a University Neighborhood Overlay (UNO) in December 2014. The UNO protects the character of neighborhoods within proximity of the OSU campus by limiting the scale of new development in proportion to lot size. Most recently, in June 2016, Corvallis completed an Urbanization Study in order to inform the community’s land use needs and policies over the next 20-year planning period (2016-2036). The four key components of the study include Buildable Lands Inventory, Housing Needs Analysis, Economic Opportunities Analysis, and Land Sufficiency.

Fort Collins, CO

“In 2010, during the planning effort of Plan Fort Collins, it was apparent there was and is a need to address the student/multi-family housing supply. Fort Collins has and is experiencing an increase in population, a limited supply of multi-family housing, very low vacancy rates, and challenges with addressing neighborhood concerns with proposed development projects. These factors drove the need for development of strategies to help facilitate adequate housing supplies while identifying the infill issues upon existing neighborhoods” (City of Fort Collins). As a result, the Student Housing Action Plan (SHAP) was adopted in 2013.

Tempe, AZ

While Flagstaff does not strive to be (a Tempe,) staff thought it important to understand how Tempe and ASU are managing growth and affordability. Furthermore, ASU and NAU are managed by The Arizona Board of Regents and both cities must adhere to state legislation. As of January 2012, Tempe had approximately 4% vacant land remaining, making new multifamily and/or residential development very difficult and expensive. Therefore, the city faces challenges in providing residents with a variety of affordable housing opportunities.

Key Findings

When comparing Flagstaff to peer cities, key findings include:

- A considerably higher percentage of students live on campus in Flagstaff.
- It is common for universities to have growth goals or mandated growth even with an undersupplied housing market.
- Housing and transportation costs are disproportionately high relative to wages in Flagstaff.
- Density is comparatively low in Flagstaff.
- Flagstaff has more land already zoned for large mixed use buildings.
- Lessening density or lowering building height standards is uncommon in peer cities.
- Changes to design criteria and evaluation of projects is common.
- Peer cities advocate multimodal transportation via bike share, car share, and U-Pass.
- Peer cities tend to employ inclusionary zoning which is not legal in Arizona.
Readiness and Potential for HOH Development

The HOH “readiness” and “potential” analysis has been prepared as a means of analyzing how the current regulations, policies, and physical conditions of Flagstaff’s infrastructure are influencing the location of High Occupancy Housing. The readiness analysis shows the areas that currently would allow for HOH development based on their zoning, condition of transportation infrastructure, travel times to employment centers, transit service, walkability, and water and sewer capacity. The potential analysis considered area currently zoned for HOH and areas where the Regional Plan currently supports rezoning cases for HOH style development. The potential analysis also included an analysis of the future transportation system, completion of the Flagstaff Urban Trail System, the constraints and opportunities to expand the City’s water and sewer capacity, and anticipated transit investments.

The readiness analysis correlates strongly to the locations where HOH has been proposed over the last few years. It shows that Downtown, Southside, and the Woodlands Village area have the right combination of factors to support an HOH project. It also shows that Switzer Rd. and Route 66, and Ponderosa Parkway and Route 66 also have adequate potential for new developments. The activity center at Ponderosa Parkway and Route 66 (S16 per the Regional Plan) has several parcels of several acres or more that are vacant and could be rezoned to allow HOH projects in the near term that are not concentrated in the Downtown or west side.

The potential analysis shows that future investment in infrastructure in East and Central Flagstaff have the ability to distribute HOH projects differently in the community. These areas with potential for future HOH projects could be made more attractive by targeted investment in multi-modal and water and sewer infrastructure. If the goal of the City is to prevent too many HOH projects from being concentrated in one part of the City, this analysis demonstrates that there is potential to achieve that goal.

Note: These analyses are not a substitute for site-specific impact analysis. It was developed for the purpose of informing City policies and not for making real estate decisions or evaluating development proposals.
Map 14: HOH Land Use, Transportation, and Utilities Readiness Analysis

Parcel HOH Readiness

- Very High
- High
- Moderate
- Low
- Very Low
Chapter 3: Concept Plan

The Concept Plan is an illustration of the land use and transportation concepts in the document with accompanying descriptive text. The Concept Plan does not encumber private land or limit the ability of a private landowner to develop in accordance with their current zoning or City standards. It is intended to help with the interpretation of this HOH Specific Plan’s goals and policies.

This Concept Plan and the associated goals, policies, and strategies are designed to improve the outcomes of mid-rise buildings in the built environment of activity centers and elsewhere, where they are permitted.

Regional Plan Amendment
Concepts and Context Examples

Activity centers are categorized by type as Urban, Suburban, or Rural to describe the character of their built environment and by scale, either Regional or Neighborhood, to describe their reach in the regional economy. Currently, the language in the Regional Plan supports HOH development of any size in all of the activity centers that are categorized as Suburban or Urban. These changes fall within the parameters of the original Regional Plan Scenario Development, which shows increased density similar to HOH development in all of these areas. The HOH Specific Plan proposes several changes to the Regional Plan to clarify which activity centers are not appropriate for HOH of different scales based on analysis of their readiness, potential, and their context and relationship to historic resources and neighborhoods.

Under Goal 2 of the HOH Specific Plan and the accompanying Regional Plan amendments, Large-Scale HOH development would be supported only in Regional Activity Centers, of which there are currently six. The HOH Specific Plan also recommends changing six additional activity centers from Neighborhood to Regional scale. These activity centers are all located close to I-40, which allows them to take advantage of the transportation capacity of the freeway to access the larger community, and are located along major arterials.

The HOH Specific Plan proposes other changes to the Future Growth Illustration for the purpose of preserving historic neighborhoods and protecting community character. First, the addition of two historic activity centers as a new scale and context for development will improve the interpretation of the existing goals and policies in the Regional Plan related to Community Character (Regional Plan Chapter VIII) and Downtown (Regional Plan Chapter IX). It will also narrow the interpretation of the Five-Points Activity Center (U8 in Regional Plan Map 22) to the commercial frontage along Milton Road and for the redevelopment of those parcels to incorporate the specific recommendations of the Neighborhood Plans for Southside and La Plaza Vieja. This recommendation does not eliminate the possibility of contextually appropriate small and medium HOH development Downtown (U1); it only seeks to manage the scale and compatibility of it to protect the historic features of the central business district. Another proposed change is to move the Sawmill Activity Center (U2) two blocks to the east. This change will clarify the perceived conflict of preserving the Southside Historic District, transitioning the industrial areas along Butler Ave to a future urban environment, and maintaining a viable area that can support Regional-scale economic activity.

The HOH Specific Plan also recommends that the commercial core is the appropriate place for mid-rise buildings and that parcels that do not have frontage on a commercial corridor should not be developed for mid-rise buildings. Concept Maps 2 and 3 show how the commercial core of Downtown, the Five Points area at Butler Ave and Milton Rd., and Sawmill could be interpreted. It is also recommended in the implementation strategies to develop similar maps with public input for all of the activity centers in the City, and to include them in an appendix to the Regional Plan. The proposed boundary of the commercial core for
Downtown and the Five Points area is based on the current Regulating Plan and the boundaries for the T6, T5, and T5.O zones, the “Commercial Edge” from the La Plaza Vieja Neighborhood Specific Plan, and the High Country Conference Center plus the two nearby hotel properties.

Concept Plan 3 shows that there is an existing overlap between several of the National Historic Districts and the Downtown Urban Historic Activity Center (U1). All of these areas currently allow HOH by right in both the conventional and transect zoning. The City will, therefore, need to change the underlying zoning and the transect zone if the City wants to take action to preserve and protect the structures and character of these areas. The implementation strategies (Chapter 5) include changes to the architectural standards for Downtown, work on historic inventories and context reports, more proactive education, and increasing preservation grant funding in order to help preserve the districts that have been established in this area.

The result of these recommendations would provide a balance between concentrating the highest density of housing in one location, and dispersing it throughout the entire community. The locations of the current and proposed regional activity centers take into account traffic, transit access, the water distribution system, sewer impacts, and the proximity of these locations to campus and employment centers throughout the community.
Chapter 3: Concept Plan

The Future Growth Illustration defines the geographic locations of area types and place types. It shows the spatial relationship of existing and future development and is intended to be used in conjunction with the Natural Environment Maps (Maps 6-8) and the Road Network Map (Map 25). This illustration should not be relied upon to determine where specific land uses are allowed; that information is found in City Code Title 10 (Zoning Code) and the Zoning Map. In case of any conflict between the Future Growth Illustration and the Regional Plan’s goals and policies, the goals and policies will prevail.

Future growth illustrations and plans do not preclude private development entitlements. Please see www.flagstaffmatters.com for an interactive GIS map.
Concept Plan 3: Parcel Level Interpretation of Commercial Core in Regional Activity Centers

Approximate Commercial Core
HOH Allowed by right
HOH Not Allowed, Rezoning needed
Existing Suburban Activity Center
Existing Urban Activity Center
Future Suburban Activity Center
Future Urban Activity Center
Historic Activity Center Pedestrian Shed
Regional Activity Center Pedestrian Shed
Neighborhood Activity Center Pedestrian Shed
Historic Area
NAU
City Limits

Disclaimer: This is for illustrative purposes only and is subject to change. It will be further refined through area specific plans and public outreach associated with development cases or Zoning Code updates.
This map is based on the boundaries of the T5 and T6 zones as currently designated. This is subject to changes in the Flagstaff Zoning Code.
This is an illustration of a proposed amendment to the Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030. Please reference Chapter IX: Growth and Land Use for the most up to date version of the Future Growth illustration.
Concept Plan 6: Modern Buildings in Historic Downtown Activity Center

Concept Plan 8: Mixed use building in the transition between the commercial core of Downtown and Five Points

Concept Plan 7: Historic storefronts in commercial core of U1 - Downtown Activity Center

Concept Plan 9: Phoenix Ave is a section of Historic Route 66 and is part of the commercial core for Downtown and Five-Points
Concept Plan 10: Commercial Edge Illustration from the La Plaza Vieja Neighborhood Specific Plan

Concept Plan 11: Example of storefronts, from Aspen Place
Concept Plan 12: New center of Sawmill Activity Center
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High Occupancy Housing
Site Illustrations

The updates to the Regional Plan proposed as part of the HOH Specific Plan are considered in discretionary decisions on rezoning and annexation cases, and changes to the Zoning Code. There are many parcels within the City limits, outside of activity centers, that are already entitled to build High Occupancy Housing developments. Therefore, updates to the standards and guidelines that regulate HOH developments will also be needed in order to achieve Flagstaff’s vision. Changes will be needed to multiple City codes and policies to consistently achieve the illustrations provided in this Concept Plan for HOH sites. However, HOH developers can voluntarily incorporate any of the site development suggestions in these illustrations to better adapt their plans to the built environment in Flagstaff. Therefore, these illustrations assume implementation of the strategies found in Chapter 5 in addition to goals and policies.

Concept Plan Illustrations

The Concept Plan has two- and three-dimensional illustrations that demonstrate the applications of principles from Chapters 4 and 5 in the context of an urban and a suburban regional-scale activity center and in the context of an urban activity center that is designated historic. A topical plan such as the HOH Specific Plan cannot account for every scenario or site consideration. These illustrations take the three types of activity centers, which are considered the most likely to see HOH proposed, and examine how the combination of goals, policies, and strategies may be incorporated into each setting. Variations from these illustrations can be considered in compliance with the HOH Specific Plan without amendment, if the proposal meets all of the requirements of the goals and policies in the Regional Plan and in Chapter 4 of the HOH Specific Plan.

Each set of activity center illustrations starts with a color-coded and annotated “Plan” view which shows the building footprints of a hypothetical site plan (Assumptions are listed in Table 3 and in the Plan View Legend). It is followed by a 3D illustration showing an overview. Buildings are the same color in the 3D view as their roofs appear in the Plan view.

Street level close ups of elements within the 3D view follow to demonstrate the expected character of certain areas within the illustrations.

These illustrations are intended to demonstrate the combined effect of:

1. Current City policies and conditions that are expected to persist and that this plan does not address;
2. Current and proposed Regional Plan goals, policies, and area-place types;
3. New City policies and City Code updates outlined in the implementation strategies; and
4. Scenarios that have been discussed through past development proposals to inform the realistic nature of these illustrations.

All illustrations consider sites that are realistic to Flagstaff and are based on a location where HOH development could reasonably be expected to occur. However, topography was not integrated into the illustrations because of timing and software limitations. In some areas of Flagstaff, topography can significantly limit the connectivity and ability to produce a gridded block system. It is expected that true site conditions may lead to variations in how these illustrations are applied to discretionary land use decisions. Code updates will need to account for these conditions.

Table 3 shows a few of the key assumptions and metrics in the illustrations provided for each type of activity center. The Plan View illustration for each activity center type contains details on the site’s buildings and their uses. The land uses were chosen based on the expected use and performance of the site and the resultant locations that would be the most appropriate for each use. The percentages of each use are expected to vary based on an actual development’s needs and pro forma. Floor Area Ratio (FAR) was similar across all sites and was calculated for the total building area-to-site area (used for Regional Plan evaluation), and without the inclusion of residential units (the way the Zoning Code would evaluate the metric).

The application of these assumptions shows how the mix of parking, traffic, and ownership strategies can lead to different results in the built environment. Some of these strategies may be used on sites in multiple contexts. For instance, a new master planned Urban Regional Activity

\[1 \text{ FAR is an intensity measured as a ratio derived by dividing the total floor area of a building or structure by the net buildable site area.}\]
Center may elect to set up a parking management district by petitioning the City, but that scenario would probably be less common than the one presented, where most offsite parking is shared between different buildings. Therefore, these illustrations should be analyzed and applied within the context of the proposal and the HOH strategies that best fit the site. Likewise, a development of HOH, where it is currently permitted, should consider these illustrations in developing a site plan.

---

**Table 3: Site assumptions for Concept Plan Illustrations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration “Site” size</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Roads and Alleys</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Commercial / Office / Residential mix</th>
<th>Total FAR w/ and w/o residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suburban - Regional</strong></td>
<td>One owner/developer</td>
<td>Combination of public roads and internal driveways</td>
<td>Contained on-site but with additional off-site street parking</td>
<td>10% / 4% / 86%</td>
<td>1.49 / 0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.8 acres site and private acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban - Historic</strong></td>
<td>Multiple owners/developers</td>
<td>Public roads and alleys</td>
<td>On and off-site with parking management district</td>
<td>27% / 13% / 60%</td>
<td>1.90 / 0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 acres “site”/ 11.5 private acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban - Regional</strong></td>
<td>Assumed one master plan and then multiple owners possible</td>
<td>Public roadways preferred but driveways may be part of the network</td>
<td>On- and off-site through shared parking agreements and master planning</td>
<td>33% / 11% / 56%</td>
<td>1.57 / 0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.8 acres “site”/ 13.8 private acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Other Illustration Assumptions**

- Converting square footage (shown on plan view) to dwelling units used the assumption that the average dwelling unit needs 1,100 square feet of building area.
- Converting units to bedrooms assumed 2.5 bedrooms per dwelling unit.

---

Example of multifamily residential with an active ground floor design
Illustration: Suburban Regional Activity Center

This illustration shows the development of a single parcel within the commercial core of a suburban regional activity center. It is generally built around the existing Highway Commercial or Community Commercial zoning with the addition of this HOH Specific Plan’s goals and policies. It is a theoretical site but contains a size and context inspired by real locations in Flagstaff. The development in this illustration occurs on a 12.8 acre site. It is common for a single parcel in this setting to be multiple acres. This size is consistent with the size of parcels that exist in these areas that often contain apartment complexes or big box stores. For context, an urban block in Flagstaff’s existing downtown is only two acres. The following text will discuss how the illustration relates to each proposed goal from Chapter 4.

Goal 1: Promote HOH buildings that connect and enhance existing urban patterns and historic activity centers

- Since the parcel is already approximately the size of six urban blocks, it inherently uncouples many design constraints from each building such as stormwater and parking, and therefore can contain a mix of building sizes.
- By “breaking up the block,” it begins to lessen the scale of blocks to more closely mimic the most connected and walkable areas of Flagstaff.

Goal 2: Promote HOH primarily as a part of complete activity centers

- The majority of the site is active at the pedestrian level through ground floor commercial, residential access points at frequent intervals, and even individual residential access points creating a “front porch” feel. (See Note 15 in Plan View Illustration.)
- The site is broken-up with one full access street and one pedestrian/bike access corridor traveling north-south. Both are designed in order to continue through the adjacent sites in the future. The full access street is designed to current Engineering Standards to allow it to become a public road, but until then, it can function for internal access with a comfortable feel, wide sidewalks and street parking. (See Notes 5, 6 in Plan View Illustration.)
- The site is designed to be a single piece of the activity center. It does not exist as an enclave within itself; it instead interacts with its surroundings, becoming a part of the greater neighborhood. People from surrounding developments pass through major components of the site on their way to somewhere else. This incidental traffic helps make the site a place people already are, using the site does not have to be the destination in itself, and, as such, it will see more trips and this combined activity will help the site self-maintain. Although there is activity internal to the site, there are design features that make this internal activity apparent from the major through-roads surrounding the site. So while a person can enjoy sitting at a café along a quieter street, in a plaza, or along a pedestrian/bikeway, they are still aware of that café from the busy street. (See Notes 1, 2, 3, 4 in Plan View Illustration.)
- This site is served by high frequency transit. (See Note 7 in Plan View Illustration.)
- The site is composed of different buildings that face public, or public feeling, spaces. Providing these different buildings that interact with the overall neighborhood should help provide options for the entire community.

Goal 3: Leverage HOH to create more efficient and equitable transportation

- The site’s proximity to frequent transit, its increased connectivity and its multi-modal friendly design can help increase multimodal performances. (See Notes 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14 in Plan View Illustration.)
- The site is designed around the more vulnerable transportation users. Site entrances are organized and prioritized around pedestrians and bicyclist safety, not just vehicular capacity; as such, no right turn lanes are proposed into the site (see the Engineering Department’s strategy to be implemented immediately in Chapter 5). All internal access points to garages or parking lots travel over the sidewalk to alert the driver that they are passing through the pedestrian realm. (See Notes 9, 17 in Plan View Illustration.)
- Internal streets are narrow to promote slow vehicle speeds so all transportation modes can share the space. This activity will help create a “main street” feel within the site and, importantly, along the edge of the site, adjacent to the surrounding through-streets. The internal streets are designed to be extensions of the adjacent through-streets,
Goal 4: Enhance public spaces where HOH is located

- Wide sidewalks and active ground floors make this site’s streets pleasant places to be and contribute to a quality “front porch” experience. (See Notes 1, 2, 5, 6, 13, 14 in Plan View Illustration.)
- The site’s civic spaces are natural to access and are oriented so that they are publicly facing; you do not have to be a resident to feel comfortable and welcome. This is shown on this site by having the main civic spaces toward the western end of the site adjacent to a major through-street, not internal to the site in a location that may not be obvious to non-residents. These civic spaces are both a site and a neighborhood amenity. They are shown at a scale that should work for events, art, performances, etc., while still feeling inviting for everyday use. (See Notes 1, 2, 3, 4 in Plan View Illustration.)
- The site shows a common/community building and an adjacent green-space as amenities to the residents. It is also oriented to provide the potential to also be greater neighborhood amenities. They exist along the pedestrian/bikeway that is expected to connect to more over time. The pedestrian/bikeway passes through the greenway to help activate the space with additional, compatible uses. (See Note 3 in Plan View Illustration.)

Goal 6: Reduce waste and increase energy efficiency of HOH developments

- The buildings on this site incorporate recycling infrastructure. (See Note 10 in Plan View Illustration.)
- This site shows the concept of including alternative energy production. (See Note 11 in Plan View Illustration.)

Goal 8: Promote economic resiliency through building design in HOH developments

- Most of the commercial space is designed to be small, flexible, and simple. Some of the mixed-use or commercial buildings have enough overall space to provide for primary sector employment. For example, the northwestern mixed-use building has western and southern depths that could allow for second-story office. (See Note 12 in Plan View Illustration.)
Concept Plan 13: Plan View Illustration of High Occupancy Housing in the context of a Suburban Regional Activity Center

- 41,000 s.f. Commercial
- 22,000 s.f. Office
- 236,000 s.f. Residential (=215 units)
- 15,000 s.f. Commercial
- 235,000 s.f. Residential (=231 units (=578 beds))
- 41,000 s.f. Commercial
- 22,000 s.f. Office
- 236,000 s.f. Residential (=215 units)
- 10,000 s.f. Commercial
- 40,000 s.f. Residential (=36 units)
- 7,000 s.f. Commercial
- 7,000 s.f. Office
- 7,000 s.f. Residential
Concept Plan 14: 3D overview of Suburban Regional Activity Center
Chapter 3: Concept Plan

Concept Plan 17: Suburban Regional
3D View From Point C on Plan View

Concept Plan 18: Suburban Regional
3D View From Point D on Plan View
Illustration: Urban Historic Activity Center

This illustration shows an urban historic activity center setting with a variety of modern large, medium, and small scale HOH mixed-use buildings, HOH residential buildings, and commercial buildings interspersed with historic mixed-use, residential, and commercial buildings. It is generally built around the existing T6 and T5 zoning with the addition of this HOH Specific Plan’s goals and policies. It is a theoretical area but contains block sizes, street sizes, and theoretical existing buildings consistent with central Flagstaff. The six block area shown on this illustration is a total of 15 acres including the streets. The overall size of these six blocks is similar to the Suburban illustration’s single parcel, see Concept Plan 12. The following text will discuss how the Urban Historic Activity Center illustration relates to each proposed goal from Chapter 4.

Disclaimer: Large-scale HOH is not favored in historic activity centers under the HOH Specific Plan. However, the City has chosen to illustrate a large-scale HOH building in this area that shows the maximum permitted height for the purpose of informing projects using existing property rights and standards. The maximum footprint assumes the implementation of some strategies per Chapter 5.

Goal 1: Promote HOH buildings that connect and enhance existing urban patterns and historic activity centers

- A variety of new HOH buildings are constructed within the existing framework of streets and alleys of the urban area. (See Note 12 in Plan View Illustration.)
- Parking, civic space, stormwater treatment, and open space all work for the area as a whole, but not necessarily for each parcel alone. This allows the development of more smaller-scale buildings. Traditionally sized lots that exist throughout central Flagstaff are difficult to develop when stormwater, open space, civic space, and especially parking needs to occur on site. This difficulty can promote lot consolidation, and fewer, larger developments that disrupt the traditional patterns. (See Notes 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 in Plan View Illustration.).
- The municipal parking garage supports the urban pattern. Without it, there would have to be larger pockets of parking for most blocks. Wrapping the garage with retail and architectural details maintains a safe and comfortable pedestrian environment along the sidewalk.

Goal 2: Promote HOH primarily as a part of complete activity centers

- Everything is oriented toward the sidewalk with active commercial or residential ground floors. Since this area is built within a grid of real streets that connect and interact with their surroundings, all activity is part of the greater community. (See Notes 1, 4, 5, 13, 14 in Plan View Illustration.)
- The area is well served by high frequency transit. (See Note 9 in Plan View Illustration.)
- A variety of housing choices are shown in this area (example City transect building types include; duplexes, townhomes, mansion apartments, apartment houses, courtyard apartments, live-work apartments, larger apartment buildings, and small, medium, and large-scale HOH buildings) that are intended to meet the needs of any member of the community.
- The large-scale HOH building labeled in the upper central block illustrates a building that maximizes the dimensions for the T6 zone within a one-quarter block. A one-quarter block is also the maximum footprint for a medium-scale HOH building. (Note: The large-scale HOH building illustrated does not reflect the maximum footprint possible on a larger lot.)

Goal 3: Leverage HOH to create more efficient and equitable transportation

- An urban grid is inherently more friendly for multimodal transportation options because of its connectivity and lower vehicular speeds. However, improvements are always possible. This area shows a dedicated bike lane, narrow travel lanes, wider sidewalks, and sidewalk bump outs at busier intersections.
- The narrower rights-of-ways and urban building form will create a “main street” feel for almost every street in the area.

Goal 4: Enhance public spaces where HOH is located

- The area shows the uncoupling of extremely small and poorly functioning civic and pedestrian spaces from the smaller-scale developments and consolidating them into areas that are large enough to function better. These consolidated spaces can, therefore, provide quality amenities and experiences for the area as a whole. This concept is primarily shown via attractive and vibrant sidewalks, a small plaza,
and the one-third block park, all of which are publicly accessible and central to the urban fabric. (See Notes 4, 5 in Plan View Illustration.)

- Views are preserved from locations within the park. (See Note 11 in Plan View Illustration.)

Goal 5: Strongly incentivize historic preservation and adaptive reuse

- The area shows multiple historic structures that are able to be adaptively reused. Connected with Goal 1, allowing the redevelopment of the less historically significant small lots will help preserve the context of the more significant historic structures. (See Notes 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 in Plan View Illustration.)

- Most of the new buildings are of similar bulk, mass, and scale as historic buildings within this area.

Goal 8: Promote economic resiliency through building design in HOH developments

- The area shows a variety of small, flexible, and/or simple commercial and employment components that will be able to adapt over time consistent with Flagstaff’s existing downtown’s history. (See Note 8 in Plan View Illustration.)

- The area shows a variety of housing choices that can exist as workforce housing. This housing is integrated within an environment that contains multiple employment opportunities, including live-work opportunities.

Goal 10: Set legislative priorities for new tools to address HOH

- Greater authority to protect historic buildings is listed as a legislative priority in Chapter 5.

Notes
1. Residential ground floors that interact with street
2. Convenient, shared, parking that is not always on-site
3. Consolidated trash and recycle bins in alleys
4. Central civic space
5. Community pocket park
6. Regional detention serving multiple parcels that is useable space when dry
7. Stormwater amenities in right-of-way
8. Flexible commercial design, shallow parcels that is allow ground floor ADA residential
9. Frequent transit
10. Dedicated car-share parking
11. Preservation of views from specific public spaces
12. Preserve and/or enhance alley network
13. Building set-back from right-of-way to allow cafe space
14. Pedestrian-only alley/civic space
15. Pedestrian bridge
16. Mid-block crossing at highest traffic areas aligned with alley
17. Step-back some buildings after 3 stories on public facing sides
Concept Plan 19: Plan View Illustration of High Occupancy Housing in the context of an Urban Historic Activity Center
Concept Plan 20: 3D overview of Urban Historic Activity Center
Concept Plan 21: Urban Historic 3D View From Point A on Plan View
Illustration: Urban Regional Activity Center

This illustration shows an urban regional activity center setting with a variety of newer large and medium scale HOH mixed-use buildings and commercial. It is generally built around the Highway Commercial or Community Commercial zoning while incorporating some concepts related to T5, with the addition of this HOH Specific Plan’s goals and policies. It is a theoretical area that contains urban block and street sizes consistent with the Regional Plan, acknowledging that most of these areas exist adjacent to an existing large arterial that currently has a “suburban” feel. The four-block area shown in the center of this illustration is a total of 16.8 acres including the internal streets, a size similar to the other two illustrations. The design of this area is built around interacting with the arterial road and breaking-up the area into an urban block pattern. The area is a network of real streets that connects with their surroundings and not a collection of “building pads” within a parking lot network. Instead of showing an exact center of a theoretical activity center, this illustration shows a delineated commercial core. Multiple factors are expected to work together and evolve over time. The location with the most non-vehicular “activity” may exist offset from the busy arterial that may initially define the activity center, and it is expected to shift within the commercial core as the community changes.

Goal 1: Promote HOH buildings that connect and enhance existing urban patterns and historic activity centers

- The area shows an urban grid block pattern. This theoretical area exists as if a new urban grid had been created within this activity center. If an urban activity center exists within or adjacent to an existing urban block pattern, the new area should be made to match, continue, or work with, that existing pattern. (See Note 1 in Plan View Illustration.)
- For most of the area shown, entire blocks and some groups of adjacent blocks work together to uncouple certain design constraints such as stormwater and parking. The ultimate ownership pattern and lot sizes are expected to evolve over time while still taking advantage of the same area-serving lot requirements. This can allow for a greater mix of building types, resulting in a more interesting urban environment. (See Note 2 in Plan View Illustration.)

Goal 2: Promote HOH primarily as a part of complete activity centers

- The area shown is a regional urban activity center. Its core is the most appropriate for large-scale HOH and the areas around the core transition toward smaller-scale HOH.
- The area is active at the street level with a mix of ground floor commercial and residential that interacts with the public realm.
- The area’s urban block structure helps break-up the buildings and ensure transportation connectivity.
- The area’s most interactive spaces are arranged in order to be a part of the surrounding community with public facing civic space. The most pedestrian friendly areas are expected to be more oriented toward the smaller, local streets, but the area shows buildings also interacting with the busier collector and arterial streets. An important aspect of this theoretical area is to take advantage of the pass-through traffic that the busier streets provide in order to better connect to the surrounding community, and in order to increase incidental use for economic and maintenance purposes. (See Notes 3, 6 in Plan View Illustration.)
- This area is shown to be served by high frequency transit. All regional activity centers are expected to be served by high frequency transit.
- The area contains a mix of different buildings in order to provide housing choices to all City residents.
- Even though the shown activity center contains a busy arterial roadway, it is designed in a way that balances the vehicular needs with pedestrian needs. (See Note 7 in Plan View Illustration.)

Goal 3: Leverage HOH to create more efficient and equitable transportation

- Streets in this activity center are designed as complete streets in order to promote the use of and improve the safety for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit. (See Note 7 in Plan View Illustration.)
- The area is designed as if parking is being actively managed on the streets and/or through shared parking agreements. (See Note 2 in Plan View Illustration.)
Goal 4: Enhance public spaces where HOH is located

- Civic spaces are shown at a scale that could work for programmed events and oriented in a way that would not need programmed events to remain active. They are expected to provide quality experiences to HOH residents and all other neighbors and community members by being a component of the public’s space, they are not hidden from incidental activity nor are they private courtyards only assessable by one development’s residents. (See Notes 3, 4, 5 in Plan View Illustration.)

Goal 6: Reduce waste and increase energy efficiency of HOH developments

- The area shown is theoretical new construction. Taking advantage of the density possibilities in a regional activity center will provide opportunities to construct more sustainably, recycle more, and include alternative energy production technologies that still work with a development’s bottom line. (See Notes 8, 9 in Plan View Illustration.)

Goal 8: Promote economic resiliency through building design in HOH developments

- Most commercial components within the activity center are shown to be small, flexible, and simple so that they can evolve over time. An obvious exception to this scale is the full-size grocery store which is a use that serves the neighborhood/activity center, will attract more people to the area from outside, and is complimentary to most other smaller-scale commercial businesses rather than being competitive with other commercial businesses.
- The total commercial volume shown is high enough that the area could support measurable employment with the surrounding residential options supporting workforce housing.

Notes
1. Urban grid pattern throughout
2. Uncoupled (through off-premise or shared) parking, stormwater, and other lot-specific design constraints
3. Public facing civic space that interacts with entire community
4. Programmable civic space for markets and/or other events
5. Neighborhood park
6. Architectural features that make the activity center obvious from major through-streets and bring people further into area in order to be a component of the greater community
7. Complete streets
8. Alternative energy sources
9. Recycling infrastructure
10. Flexible commercial/office space
Concept Plan 24: Plan View Illustration of High Occupancy Housing in the context of an Urban Regional Activity Center

- 104,300 s.f. Commercial
- 243,300 s.f. Residential (≈221 units ≈553 beds)
  - 2.3 F.A.R. for entire block

- 5,800 sf C.
- 5,800 sf O.

- 54,200 s.f. Commercial Grocery
  - 0.4 F.A.R. for entire block
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  - 1.9 F.A.R. for entire block
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- 19,800 s.f. Comm
- 47,000 s.f. Resi.

- 17,800 s.f. Commercial
- 64,200 s.f. Residential

- 21,900 sf Commercial
- 59,600 sf Residential
  - 1.6 F.A.R. for entire block

- 10,600 s.f. Comm
- 31,800 R.

- 10,600 C.
- 31,800 R.

- 9,400 C.
- 18,800 O.

- 6,200 sf C.
- 18,800 C.
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- 6,000 sf C.
- 18,800 C.

- 6,000 sf C.
- 18,800 C.

- 6,000 sf C.
- 18,800 C.

- 6,000 sf C.
- 18,800 C.

- 6,000 sf C.
- 18,800 C.

- 6,000 sf C.
- 18,800 C.

- 6,000 sf C.
- 18,800 C.

- 6,000 sf C.
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- 6,000 sf C.
- 18,800 C.

- 6,000 sf C.
- 18,800 C.

- 6,000 sf C.
- 18,800 C.

- 6,000 sf C.
- 18,800 C.

- 6,000 sf C.
- 18,800 C.

- 6,000 sf C.
- 18,800 C.

- 6,000 sf C.
- 18,800 C.

- 6,000 sf C.
- 18,800 C.

- 6,000 sf C.
- 18,800 C.

- 6,000 sf C.
- 18,800 C.
Concept Plan 25: 3D overview of Urban Regional Activity Center
Chapter 4: Goals and Policies

Goals and policies in the High Occupancy Housing (HOH) Specific Plan are topic specific ways of advancing the goals and policies of the Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030 (Regional Plan). Goals and policies in this chapter are written broadly because they are intended to be viable for a 10- to 20-year planning horizon. During the next 20 years, physical, financial, political, and social environments may change, but the goals and policies should provide consistency in the path forward for the development of activity centers and mid-rise buildings throughout the City.

All City capital projects, code updates, and rezoning, annexation, and plan amendment applications will be reviewed by City staff to determine consistency with the Regional Plan, and must also take into account any applicable specific plans, including this one. Specific plans do not change existing entitlements, and development applications that use their existing rights and comply with City standards are not subject to review for consistency with the Regional Plan. If a Regional Plan goal or policy is highlighted in the blue box in this chapter, then it should be weighted more heavily in future decision-making than Regional Plan goals and policies that are not listed in this chapter. The exception to this is if a neighborhood or corridor plan comes to a different conclusion than this topical specific plan, then that area-specific plan would take precedence (unless otherwise stated in the document).

The Concept Plan and the text of the Specific Plan provides supplemental information for the interpretation of goals and policies. In the case of any conflict between the Concept Plans in Chapter 3 and the Specific Plan’s goals and policies, the Specific Plan’s goals and policies prevail. The Specific Plan is also used to guide decisions related to the expansion of public infrastructure, for example, the building or improvement of new roads and trails, investment in parks or public buildings, and other facilities. Many initiatives to improve the community start at the grassroots level. Thus, the Specific Plan may be used by all citizens in order to advocate for new development that conforms to the Specific Plan and for assistance in implementing actions that will further the Specific Plan’s vision and direction.

Some policies in this Chapter are intended to apply to “areas that support HOH.” This means any area with zoning that allows for High Occupancy Housing, and any area that could be rezoned for High Occupancy housing in accordance with the Future Growth Illustration and policies of the Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030.

The goals and policies of the HOH Specific Plan will be considered in discretionary decision-making by the Planning and Zoning Commission, City Council, and City staff. The Commission and the Council are responsible for making development decisions such as zoning map amendments or annexations. The approval of rezoning requests depends, in part, on a finding of whether the proposed changes are consistent with the Regional Plan and relevant specific plan goals and policies. City staff, the Planning and Zoning Commission, and the City Council will review applicable goals and policies to determine whether a proposed discretionary development is consistent with this Specific Plan, when the proposal meets the definition of HOH in the glossary of this document.
Goal 1: Promote HOH buildings that connect and enhance existing urban patterns and historic activity centers

Flagstaff Regional Plan Goals and Policies to prioritize in evaluating HOH projects

- Policy CC.3.1. Encourage neighborhood design to be respectful of traditional development patterns and enhance the overall community image.
- Policy CC.3.2. Maintain and enhance existing buildings and blend well-designed new buildings into existing neighborhoods.
- Policy LU.10.3. Value the traditional neighborhoods established around downtown by maintaining and improving their highly walkable character, transit accessibility, diverse mix of land uses, and historic building form.
- Policy LU.12.5. Maintain rear alleys for access to mid-block parking spaces to provide an out-of-sight location for utility equipment, and to allow the fronts of buildings to be free of driveways and parking garage entrances.
- Policy NH.1.2. Respect traditions, identifiable styles, proportions, streetscapes, relationships between buildings, yards, and roadways; and use historically appropriate and compatible building and structural materials when making changes to existing neighborhoods, especially in historic neighborhoods.
- Goal NH.2. Look to downtown Flagstaff as the primary focal point of the community character.
- Policy NH.2.3. Continue the tradition of multi-story, multi-use buildings to maintain and increase a stable, mixed-income residential population when planning new structures in the downtown and Southside neighborhoods.
- Policy ED.7.5. Develop urban infrastructure that supports revitalization and redevelopment.
- Policy WR.5.5. Give preference to regional detention facilities that are designed in conjunction with smaller low-impact development features, rather than numerous smaller dispersed basins. Encourage regional detention basins to incorporate natural watershed characteristics as well as offering recreational components.

Policies that apply to HOH projects only

HOH.1.1. Repeat the patterns of streets, alleys, buildings, and civic spaces from within nearby historic districts or neighborhoods¹ in the site planning of HOH developments.

HOH.1.2. Remove policy barriers to new development replicating the patterns of compatible historic districts and historic neighborhoods in order to promote historic context, parking, street patterns, and pedestrian connectivity, through small and medium-scale buildings.

HOH.1.3. Balance the needs of stormwater management and place-making to remove barriers to small and medium HOH development

Policies that should be applied to areas that support HOH

HOH.1.4. Promote development of new alleys, in a traditional pattern for the neighborhood, to provide trash pick-up and parking access behind the buildings where they do not already exist in Sunnyside and Downtown and the surrounding neighborhoods.²

HOH.1.5. Do not abandon public alleys or allow them to be fully enclosed by a building in the Downtown and surrounding neighborhoods.³

HOH.1.6. Plan for regional, neighborhood, and multiple-property scale stormwater retention and detention to support urban place-making, and small and medium HOH infill and redevelopment.

¹ Historic district and neighborhoods are identified on Map 14 in the Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030.
² Do not apply this policy to adaptive reuse projects.
³ The term “Downtown and surrounding neighborhoods” includes the entire area of the Regulating Plan Boundary, which includes Southside, Townsite, and North of Downtown.
Example of scale difference that maintains character
Goal 2: Promote HOH primarily as a part of complete activity centers

Flagstaff Regional Plan Goals and Policies to prioritize in evaluating HOH projects

- Policy CC.4.1. Design streetscapes to be context sensitive and transportation systems to reflect the desired land use while balancing the needs of all modes for traffic safety and construction and maintenance costs.
- Policy CC.4.4. Design streets and parking lots to balance automobile facilities, recognize human-scale and pedestrian needs, and accentuate the surrounding environment.
- Policy LU.7.1. Concentrate urban development in locations that use land efficiently, and are served by roads, water, sewer, and other public facilities and services, and that support transit, reduced vehicle trips, and conservation of energy and water.
- Policy LU.11.6. Strive for a wide variety of activities in downtown to create a healthy mix of housing, employment, shopping, cultural, and civic uses.
- Policy LU.18.1. Design activity centers and corridors appropriate to and within the context of each area type: urban, suburban, or rural.
- Policy LU.18.2. Strive for activity centers and corridors that are characterized by contextual and distinctive identities, derived from history, environmental features, a mix of uses, well-designed public spaces, parks, plazas, and high-quality design.
- Policy LU.18.7. Concentrate commercial, retail, services, and mixed use within the activity center’s commercial core.
- Policy LU.18.8. Increase residential densities, live-work units, and home occupations within the activity center’s pedestrian shed.
- Policy LU.18.9. Plan activity centers and corridors appropriate to their respective regional or neighborhood scale.
- Policy LU.18.17. Mixed use developments over 50 dwelling units per acre should be located in regional-scale activity centers.
- Policy LU.18.18. New development within existing activity centers should enhance the existing street pattern to meet the goals and policies of the Regional Plan related for connectivity and complete streets.
- Policy LU.18.19. New development in future activity centers should create street patterns that implement the characteristics of urban and suburban placemaking within a functional transportation system that minimizes dead ends and offset street and driveway connections.
- Policy LU.18.20. Major streets in urban activity centers should have urban-form buildings with their primary pedestrian entrances facing the major street. Secondary entrances could be located to meet other access needs for the building use.
- Goal NH.2. Look to downtown Flagstaff as the primary focal point of the community character.
POLICIES THAT APPLY TO HOH PROJECTS ONLY

HOH.2.1. Ensure that the proportions and design of HOH projects in terms of architecture, connectivity, and public spaces are tied to the activity centers type (urban, suburban), scale (regional, neighborhood, historic), and proximity of historic districts and neighborhoods.¹

a. Rezoning properties to allow for large-scale HOH² development is appropriate in the commercial core of regional-scale activity centers, when the properties are not located in historic districts and neighborhoods.

b. Rezoning properties to allow medium- and small-scale HOH buildings can be appropriate in neighborhood-scale activity centers when they are centrally located, and can be located in the pedestrian shed of regional centers when they address the transition between larger HOH development and the surrounding neighborhoods.

c. Small-scale HOH is preferred in historic activity centers. Medium scale HOH may be appropriate in the commercial core of Downtown when designed with consideration to the historic context.

HOH.2.2. HOH buildings are designed to be pedestrian oriented at the street level, and to create vibrant and active civic spaces for both residents and neighbors.

HOH.2.3. Break up building footprints as well as their bulk and mass in order to ensure transportation connectivity and a comfortable pedestrian environment across HOH project sites in accordance with the characteristics of urban and suburban areas in the Regional Plan. Allow for modifications that take into consideration site constraints outside the control of the property owner, such as topography, natural and cultural resource protection, etc.

HOH.2.4. The design of HOH buildings creates opportunities for interactive spaces with surrounding neighborhoods and businesses through the location and style of doors and windows facing the street, or the design of other pedestrian environments, such as a courtyard or plaza. These features benefit the HOH and are an enhancement for existing business and cultural opportunities nearby.

HOH.2.5. Discourage HOH locations that are not served by NAIPTA’s permanent transit network, and that do not have multimodal access to Downtown or another major employment or activity center (Milton Rd, NAU, FMC, etc.).

HOH.2.6. HOH buildings in activity centers should add to the diversity of housing choices for the entire community, and provide for the housing needs for multiple facets of the Flagstaff population.

¹ Historic district and neighborhoods are identified on Map 14 in the Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030.
² See the Definitions sections for the distinctions between small-, medium- and large-scale HOH.
Goal 3: Leverage HOH to create more efficient and equitable transportation

**Flagstaff Regional Plan Goals and Policies to prioritize in evaluating HOH projects**

- **Goal E.1.5.** Promote and encourage the expansion and use of energy-efficient modes of transportation: Public transportation, bicycles, pedestrians
- **Policy LU.5.5.** Plan for and promote compact commercial development as activity centers with mixed uses, allowing for efficient multi-modal transit options and infrastructure.
- **Policy LU.10.7.** Invest in infrastructure and right-of-way enhancements as an incentive for private investment in urban neighborhoods and activity centers.
- **Policy LU.18.3.** Redevelop underutilized properties, upgrade aging infrastructure, and enhance rights-of-way and public spaces so that existing activity centers and corridors can realize their full potential.
- **Policy LU.18.14.** Endorse efficiency of infrastructure with compact development within targeted activity centers.
- **Policy LU.18.5.** Plan for and support multi-modal activity centers and corridors with an emphasis on pedestrian and transit friendly design.
- **Policy LU.18.16.** Adopt traffic regulations to increase awareness of pedestrian-oriented design for activity centers.
- **Policy LU.19.4.** Balance automobile use, parking, bicycle access, while prioritizing pedestrian safety along all corridors.
- **Policy T.1.6.** Provide and promote strategies that increase alternate modes of travel and demand for vehicular travel to reduce peak period traffic.
- **Policy T.1.7.** Coordinate transportation and other public infrastructure investments efficiently to achieve land use and economic goals.
- **Policy T.1.8.** Plan for development to provide on-site, publicly-owned transportation improvements and provide adequate parking.
- **Policy T.3.3.** Couple transportation investments with desired land use patterns to enhance and protect the quality and livability of neighborhoods, activity centers, and community places.
- **Policy T.3.4.** Actively manage parking, including cost and supply, to support land use, transportation, and economic development goals.
- **Goal T.4.** Promote transportation infrastructure and services that enhance the quality of life of the communities within the region.
- **Goal T.5.** Increase the availability and use of pedestrian infrastructure, including FUTS, as a critical element of a safe and livable community.
- **Goal T.6.** Provide for bicycling as a safe and efficient means of transportation and recreation.
- **Goal T.7.** Provide a high-quality, safe, convenient, accessible public transportation system, where feasible, to serve as an attractive alternative to single-occupant vehicles.
- **Policy ED.7.5.** Develop urban infrastructure that supports revitalization and redevelopment.
**Policies that apply to HOH projects only**

HOH.3.1. Increase multimodal performance and options with the development of HOH projects, and continue to tie performance to parking and traffic requirements.

HOH.3.2. Prioritize the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists in the vicinity of HOH developments in the design of streets.

HOH.3.3. Develop partnerships to support the increase of bike, pedestrian, and transit trips for High Occupancy Housing developments, employment centers, special districts, and activity centers.

HOH.3.4. Improve communication about transportation impacts to all modes for HOH projects.

HOH.3.5. Encourage property management companies of HOH to offer tenants reduced or free bus passes as part of their rental fees.

**Policies that should be applied to areas that support HOH**

HOH.3.6. Encourage complete streets with a “main street” character throughout activity centers, and driveways through activity centers that continue features of the complete streets network.

HOH.3.7. Improve transportation impact analysis (TIA) procedures for all scales of development to more quantitatively and qualitatively assess pedestrian, bicycle, and transit impacts, and plan for the mitigation of impacts to these modes and the development of their respective facilities.
Flagstaff Regional Plan Goals and Policies to prioritize in evaluating HOH projects

- Policy CC.5.3. Encourage the integration of art into public and private development projects.
- Policy LU.5.7. Encourage the placement of institutional and civic buildings centrally within a neighborhood to promote walkability and multi-use recreation spaces.
- Policy LU.10.9. Civic spaces must be well designed, accessible, and central to the urban fabric.
- Policy LU.13.8. Locate civic spaces, parks, and institutional uses within neighborhood pedestrian sheds.
- Policy LU.18.2. Strive for activity centers and corridors that are characterized by contextual and distinctive identities, derived from history, environmental features, a mix of uses, well-designed public spaces, parks, plazas, and high-quality design.
- Policy NH.1.6. New development, especially on the periphery, will contribute to completing neighborhoods, including interconnecting with other neighborhoods; providing parks, civic spaces, and a variety of housing types; and protecting sensitive natural and cultural features.

Policies that apply to HOH projects only

HOH.4.1. Provide high quality “front porch” experiences in civic and pedestrian spaces that enhance cultural and social activity for high occupancy housing residents and neighbors.

HOH.4.2. HOH development should provide a visual analysis of its impacts to views of the San Francisco Peaks, Mt. Elden, and/or Observatory Mesa from major intersections on Great Streets (per the Regional Plan), and public parks and open space. Allow neighborhood plans to identify smaller scale views to be considered in rezoning cases.¹

HOH.4.3. Civic spaces associated with HOH are encouraged to include spaces for public art, performances, and events that activate the space.

Policies that should be applied to areas that support HOH

HOH.4.4. Civic and pedestrian spaces should be oriented to provide publicly accessible, and welcoming spaces, with views of the San Francisco Peaks, Mt. Elden, and/or Observatory Mesa.

HOH.4.5. Promote centrally located and public facing civic space in every activity center commensurate with the character and scale of the area. Where possible, include transit facilities in civic spaces.

¹ This analysis could not limit the exercise of existing private property rights without compensation, but can inform the design and development of the site. In discretionary decisions, it may be used to determine conditions of approval and regional plan conformance.
Goal 5: Strongly incentivize historic preservation and adaptive reuse

Flagstaff Regional Plan Goals and Policies to prioritize in evaluating HOH projects

- Policy CC.2.2. Formally recognize heritage resources through designation as local landmarks and historic districts.
- Policy CC.2.3. Mitigate development impacts on heritage resources.
- Policy CC.2.4. Support restoration and rehabilitation of historic housing, buildings, structures, and neighborhoods.
- Policy CC.2.5. Provide incentives for heritage and cultural preservation.
- Policy CC.2.6. Expand a program to educate the owners of historic resources of the heritage value of their properties.
- Policy CC.2.7. Protect existing historic districts from encroachment by land uses that compromise the historic characteristics of the district.
- Policy CC.2.8. In “Historic” activity centers (Downtown and Five Points), prioritize Community Character (CC) and Downtown (LU.11 and LU.12) goals and policies over the Activity Center goals and policies found in LU.18, when considering cases for rezoning.
- Policy CC.2.9. Strengthen the City’s historic preservation and adaptive reuse programs by increasing funding for further inventories, grants to property owners, and education campaigns, especially, where the underlying Zoning for the historic resource put it at risk.
- Policy CC.2.10. Educate the community and developers on the benefits of adaptive reuse and create policies to incentivize the reuse of historic buildings to maintain their integrity.
- Policy CC.2.11. Assist businesses and residents, who are caretakers of historic resources, maximize the economic value of their property without damaging the integrity of the historic resource.
- Policy CC.2.12. Advertise the economic impact of historic resources and history-related tourism on the Flagstaff community.
- Policy CC.2.13. When the demolition or removal of a historic structure cannot be avoided, encourage the developer to make the building available for relocation and provide assistance in moving the building the purchaser’s property, if possible.
Goal 6: Reduce waste and increase energy efficiency of HOH developments

Flagstaff Regional Plan Goals and Policies to prioritize in evaluating HOH projects

- Goal E.1. Increase energy efficiency.
- Goal E.2. Expand production and use of renewable energy.
- Goal PF.2. Provide sustainable and equitable public facilities, services, and infrastructure systems in an efficient and effective manner to serve all population areas and demographics.
- Policy PF.2.1. Prioritize infrastructure upgrades to encourage redevelopment and infill and meet land use goals.
- Policy WR.5.6. Implement stormwater harvesting techniques to support water conservation strategies by collecting and using local precipitation in the vicinity where it falls to support both human and overall watershed health needs.
- Policy ED.4.5. In an effort to promote the sustainability of resources, the City will encourage all new and expanded commercial and industrial development to be energy and water efficient.

Policies that apply to HOH projects only

HOH.6.1. Promote materials management strategies in HOH buildings that increase recycling rates and extend the life of the Flagstaff landfill.

HOH.6.2. Remove obstacles and create incentives to include alternative energy production and energy conservation technologies into new HOH developments.

Goal 7: Improve NAU and City programs and tools for managing off-campus student housing

Flagstaff Regional Plan Goals and Policies to prioritize in evaluating HOH projects

- Policy NH.1.7. Develop appropriate programs and tools to ensure the appropriate placement, design, and operation of new student housing developments consistent with neighborhood character and scale.
- Policy NH.1.8. Prioritize the stabilization of a neighborhood’s identity and maintain cultural diversity as new development occurs.

Policies that should be applied City-wide

HOH.7.1. Ensure continued and improved coordination between the City and NAU to collaborate on projects of concern to NAU and the wider community, including concern related to off-campus conduct and housing.

HOH.7.2. Continue to evaluate opportunities to coordinate parking and transportation programs and infrastructure between the City, NAU and nearby neighborhoods.

HOH.7.3. Coordinate programs, policy-making, and infrastructure projects at the elected, administrative, faculty and staff levels to ensure excellent communication and efficient decision-making.

HOH.7.4. Educate students moving off campus about “good neighbor” expectations.

HOH.7.5. Create resources for students and new residents to find out about neighborhood programs and services.

HOH.7.6. Continue to engage with NAU in opportunities for mentorship, community service, and neighborhood engagement.

HOH.7.7. Require every HOH development to have a safety plan and review on file with the Flagstaff Policy Department Crime Free Multihousing program.
Goal 8: Promote economic resiliency through building design in HOH developments

Flagstaff Regional Plan Goals and Policies to prioritize in evaluating HOH projects

- Policy ED.1.3. Use economic best practices to promote quality and fiscally sound developments.
- Policy ED.3.2. Strengthen the arts, culture, and education sectors as important economic drivers in the community.
- Policy ED.3.5. Advocate the economic sustainability and growth of businesses with opportunities for transitional commercial space, leased space, and property ownership.
- Policy ED.3.6. Foster entrepreneurialism and start-up businesses with incubator and accelerator programs in sectors that demonstrate considerable growth potential.
- Policy ED.4.2. Promote variety and flexibility in land use and development options within the urban growth boundary.
- Goal ED.7. Continue to promote and enhance Flagstaff’s unique sense of place as an economic development driver.

Policies that apply to HOH projects only

HOH.8.1. HOH’s commercial components should be small, flexible, and simple in order to promote local business that can adapt over time, provide spaces for art and community gatherings, and primary sector employment that is compatible with the residential setting, such as professional and government services, entrepreneurs, and offices.

HOH.8.2. Conserve resources associated with the construction and management of buildings by designing for flexibility and ease of future adaptation and for the service life of components and assemblies.

HOH.8.3. Integrate HOH developments with employment uses in order to attract appropriate talent and support workforce housing.

HOH.8.4. Encourage HOH property owners to support entrepreneurship and local business.

Hoh.8.5. Promote open advertising of available commercial space so that local businesses have more opportunities to get into the development.

HOH.8.6. Encourage live-work opportunities within small and medium scale HOH redevelopment projects, especially near historic districts and neighborhoods.

HOH.8.7. Promote flexible use of commercial spaces so that vacant retail spaces can be activated with pop-ups, performing arts, public meetings, and other temporary uses in order to create an interesting pedestrian environment and promote new economic opportunities.
Goal 9: Promote affordability and sustainability incentives

Flagstaff Regional Plan Goals and Policies to prioritize in evaluating HOH projects

- Goal E.1. Increase energy efficiency.
- Goal E.2. Expand production and use of renewable energy.
- Goal WR.3. Satisfy current and future human water demands and the needs of the natural environment through sustainable and renewable water resources and strategic conservation measures.
- Goal NH.3. Make available a variety of housing types at different price points, to provide housing opportunity for all economic sectors.
- Policy NH.3.5. Encourage and incentivize affordable housing.
- Policy NH.4.4. Encourage green practices in housing construction and rehabilitation that support durable, healthy, and energy efficient homes.
- Policy ED.4.5. In an effort to promote the sustainability of resources, the City will encourage all new and expanded commercial and industrial development to be energy and water efficient.

Policies that apply to HOH projects only

HOH.9.1. Pursue affordable housing opportunities in HOH buildings because of their access to work, transit opportunities and services to meet the daily needs of residents.

HOH.9.2. Provide more effective incentives in the Zoning Code to favor housing affordability and sustainability in a way that expands their use in HOH developments.

Goal 10: Set legislative priorities for new tools to address HOH

Flagstaff Regional Plan Goals and Policies to prioritize in evaluating HOH projects

- Goal CC.2. Preserve, restore, and rehabilitate heritage resources to better appreciate our culture.
- Goal LU.11. Prioritize the continual reinvigoration of downtown Flagstaff, whose strategic location, walkable blocks, and historic buildings will continue to be a vibrant destination for all.
- Policy NH.3.5. Encourage and incentivize affordable housing.

Policies that should be applied City-wide

HOH.10.1. Advocate for changes to the current State and federal laws and programs to find future opportunities to reach the Regional Plan’s goals and to maintain and enhance a vibrant community of strong, stable, and connected neighborhoods.
Chapter 5: Implementation Strategies

Implementation strategies are actions recommended for the City and its partners to take in order to move forward in achieving the goals and policies in the HOH Specific Plan. Strategies are organized by anticipated timeline, but work may be done faster or slower depending on the allocation of resources, the speed of redevelopment, or demographic changes described in Chapter 2, and the overall City priorities. These strategies are recommendations, and future City staff or Council seeking may reconsider their content or priority through an appropriate public process. Aside from those strategies being adopted immediately, the same outcome as a listed strategy may be accomplished through another method, if it meets of the goals and policies of the HOH Specific Plan and the Regional Plan.

Strategies implemented immediately

This is a summary of short term changes. See Appendix B for details.

Community Development

Planning and Development Services

- The Regional Plan identifies an ideal block size in urban area types but is silent on the same parameters in suburban areas. Establishing desired block sizes is necessary to setting connectivity standards for new development and encourages unusually larger parcels to be broken up by roads, sidewalks and pedestrian places. The Regional Plan amendment that accompanies the HOH Specific Plan adds desired block sizes and frequency of bicycle and pedestrian connections to Suburban Activity Centers’ Regional Plan descriptions (page IX-46 and IX-47) to increase connectivity.
  - In Suburban Activity Centers: “Block Size: 600 to 1,000 x 600 to 1,000; Lot size is variable; Across any lot or block in an activity center, bicycle, and pedestrian connectivity is generally 300 to 600 x 300 to 600” (see Map 17 for scale examples)
  - In Suburban Neighborhood: add “Block size is variable in Suburban Neighborhoods. Blocks are well organized, with few bicycle and pedestrian dead ends. Cul-de-sacs are minimized in the design of new neighborhoods.”

- Update Maps 21, 22, and 24, and the “Location of Activity Centers” table on Pages IX-66 and 67 to be consistent and:
  - Change designation of some neighborhood-scale activity centers to regional-scale (Yellow): 2 on South Milton (S8, S9), Ponderosa Parkway (S19), Little America (U5), 4th Street and Butler Ave (S18), and Juniper Point (U6).
  - Change Downtown (U1) and Five Points (U8) from a regional-scale activity center to a “historic” activity center to better identify its unique character and integrate its historic significance and add corresponding text to the Flagstaff Regional Plan to explain this new category and its intended effect.
  - Move the center of the Sawmill (U2) activity center to the intersection of Picadilly and Regent (see Concept Plan 4 for illustration.)

- Delineate the commercial core of Downtown (U1) as any properties in the T6 or T5 transect zones (see Concept Plan 3 for map). This delineation would be subject to change if the Transect Zones are remapped.

- Delineate the commercial core of the Five Points (U8) activity center as the Commercial Edge of the La Plaza Vieja Neighborhood Specific Plan, the parcels directly adjacent to the intersection of Butler, Clay, Milton, and Mike’s Pike, and the T5 transect zone. (see Concept Plan for map.) This delineation would be subject to change if the Transect Zones are remapped or if any clarification

---

1 Similar to desired Urban block size, already in the Regional Plan
is provided in a neighborhood specific plan for La Plaza Vieja or Southside.

- Correct inconsistencies and omissions in language throughout Chapter IX: Growth Areas and Land Use related to area and place types (pages IX-1, IX-16, IX-17, IX-33, IX-63, and IX-69.)
- Delete Regional Plan Policy LU.1.8. “Encourage voluntary land assemblage in an effort to create better utilization and opportunities for development.” Replace it with clearer language on block size and connectivity in Chapter IX.
- Update descriptions of characteristics of Urban Neighborhoods (page IX-35), Urban Activity Centers (pages IX-36 and IX-37), Downtown (page IX-42) Suburban Neighborhoods (page IX-46), and Suburban Activity Centers (page IX-47) for clarity and to address the policy and implementation strategy recommendations of the HOH Specific Plan. Examples include:
  - Setting a maximum density for Urban neighborhoods and Suburban neighborhood scale activity centers.
  - Language calling out appropriate locations for HOH and the scale preferred.
  - Add language about historic urban activity centers.
  - Language on block sizes, connectivity, and the character of residential, employment, and commercial activities.
  - Direct HOH to locations that are acceptable to the community; emphasize that HOH is preferred in Regional-scale Activity Centers (Red).
- Add Urban Policy LU 10.10. “Future urban activity centers and neighborhoods are designed based on gridded street systems, considering constraints on connectivity, such as topography, the railroad and highways.”
- Edit LU.10.3 and 10.7 for clarity about historic neighborhoods and infrastructure priorities.

- Add Activity Center Policy LU.18.17. “Mixed use developments over 50 dwelling units per acre should be located in regional-scale activity centers.”
- Add a Policy PF.1.7. to the Regional Plan about extending the life of the landfill.

**Engineering**

- For HOH development in activity centers, the City Engineer’s authority to process modifications for site-specific turn lanes and urban areas may be used when they would be detrimental to bicyclist and pedestrian safety and comfort.
Strategies to be implemented by 2019

Community Development

Planning and Development Services

☐ Remove commercial block building type from the Zoning Code in the T4N.1 zone and recalibrate the live-work building type.

☐ Replace the rooming and boarding permit with a standard for the maximum number bedrooms per acre in addition to the dwelling units per acre density calculations for Medium Density Residential, High Density Residential, and mixed use projects in commercial districts. Staff initial proposal is:
  • Medium Density Residential density: 7 to 13 dwelling units per acre with a maximum 32.5 bedrooms per acre.
  • High Density Residential density 10 to 29 dwelling units per acre with a maximum of 72.5 bedrooms per acre.
  • Mixed-use developments outside of regional activity centers have a maximum of 2.5 bedrooms per dwelling unit when averaged across the project.
  • Mixed-use development within regional activity centers – no maximum bedrooms.

☐ Adjust parking regulations based on bedrooms per unit for residential units in the conventional and transect zones.

☐ Consider context-appropriate frontage types and modifications for development within the Transect Zones to reduce the cost of flood proofing without sacrificing design of the public realm.

☐ Amend the Zoning Code to lower the building height in the conventional Community Commercial (CC) zone to 45 feet (see Map 18).

☐ Adopt the most recent version of International Energy Conservation Code for all new construction in the City of Flagstaff.
Establish design standards to beautify buildings that are elevated above the Rio de Flag and Clay Avenue floodplains. For example:

- No blank walls
- Murals and mosaics
- Sloped berms and large foundation landscaping
- Stoops
- Street furnishings and planters

Establish a petition process for historic neighborhoods to petition staff for Zoning Code changes, including signature and application requirements, timeline, resources, fees, and the minimum size and characteristics of the area to be considered.

Report accomplishments and trends related to this Specific Plan in the Regional Plan Annual Report.

Clarify in the Zoning Code what circumstances warrant the Conditional Use Permit for additional height to be considered, such as roof pitch, topographic issues, etc.

**Engineering**

Update Engineering Design Standards and Specifications to:

- Require a plain English summary and visuals or microsimulations to explain findings as part of the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) submittal in order to facilitate the public’s understanding and access to this public information for the TIA process.
- Implement the Priority and Levels of Service policies for bicycles, pedestrians, and transit (see Regional Plan amendments to Chapter X: Transportation in Appendix B).
- Set maximum block sizes and connectivity standards for new development per the characteristics of urban, suburban, and rural areas types and activity center and neighborhood place types (see Regional Plan pages IX-35 and IX-46 in Appendix B).
- Change the language related to street cross-section to more accurately reflect the Regional Plan area-place types where they should be applied. For example, change Commercial Center to Activity Center and vary the standard for the suburban and urban contexts.

Have NAIPTA and the City jointly create transit development standards to determine transit stop improvements, locations, and funding.

**Public Works**

Update the City Code to more clearly restrict parking in alleys that blocks the removal of solid waste.

**Parks**

Update the Parks Department policy to not accept parks smaller than 2 acres, and, in the future, allow for the acceptance of smaller parks under certain conditions, along with a discussion of parks funding impacts and mechanisms. Route this policy update to Planning and Zoning Commission, Beautification and Public Arts Commission, Historic Preservation Commission, and the Parks and Recreation Commission.

**Sustainability**

Find annual funding for mitigating the solid waste impacts of university move in and move out weeks to off campus neighborhoods and communities.

**City Manager’s Office**

Create a Master Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with NAU to help facilitate shared interests and projects throughout the community.

NAU and the City will provide education and support to property managers and students who live off-campus through the Good Neighbor Coalition, Community Liaison, Crime Free Multihousing, and Code Compliance programs.

Continue to collaborate on the production and distribution of the off-campus student Good Neighbor Guide.

Build a more comprehensive and interactive neighborhood services webpage and include resources for students moving off-campus and information about how the City and NAU coordinate services and public projects.
Community Commercial Zoning:

- Community Commercial (CC), Allows HOH by right
- Other Commercial Zones that allow HOH by right
- HOH Not Allowed, Rezoning needed

Some of the data on this map was generated from the Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030 on October 30, 2017. It is included for informational purposes and will not reflect future amendments to the Regional Plan.
Strategies to be implemented by 2023

Community Development

Planning and Development Services

□ Recalibrate the mapping, development standards, and building characteristics for T5 and T6 to better reflect the illustrations for historic activity centers, especially in the Southside neighborhood.

□ Update the Zoning Code to be more specific about the kind of civic spaces desired by the City, including urban and suburban distinctions.

□ Allow for flexibility in the dimensions of commercial space required in the Zoning Code to allow mixed-use buildings that are three stories or less to provide ADA accessible units on the first floor and avoid the cost of building an elevator.

□ Develop standards in the Subdivision and Zoning Codes for the preservation and/or creation of alley networks throughout Downtown and the surrounding neighborhoods, regardless of zoning applied. Alleys should be designed for pedestrians and motorized vehicles, through amenities such as enhanced pavement materials, street furnishings, and public art.

□ Update Architectural Design Guidelines and Engineering Standards to create a separate character for urban and suburban place types, as well as neighborhoods and activity centers. Add step backed or “wedding cake” design for urban contexts to replace the vertical and horizontal offsets of the suburban context. This update should include building massing, materials, architectural styles, streetscapes, sidewalk widths, and how to address adaptive reuse and infill projects in these settings.

□ For Downtown (U1) and the Five Points (U8) Activity Centers, address streetscapes and civic spaces, and building types and façade types in the transect zones to better reflect the desired environment for urban activity centers.

□ In the Zoning Code, create a conditional use permit (CUP) that looks at transportation, nuisance, public safety, and lighting for mixed use buildings in Highway Commercial, Community Commercial, and Commercial Services zones that:
  • Have a density of more than 50 dwelling units per acre or
  • Have a bedroom density that is more than 125 bedrooms per acres, or
  • Have a building footprint is larger than one half acre.

□ Develop parcel-scale maps of each Regional Activity Center’s commercial core and pedestrian shed through a process involving public meetings with surrounding neighborhoods and a review by the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council.

□ Amend the Zoning Code to change how building height is measured to ensure height limitations are interpreted consistently.

□ Continue evaluating changes to height standards as part of area and corridor plans.

□ Require that structures for multifamily buildings include chutes, and/or enclosures to allow for the option of recycling in initial construction. Create accurate signage that can be used to inform residents of multifamily buildings about what can be placed in trash or recycling.

□ Require that improvements between the building and curb meet enhanced public improvement standards in activity centers, including parkways, wider sidewalks, furniture zones, etc. Allow an in lieu contribution and ways to address areas with limited right-of-way.

□ Adjust criteria in the Zoning Code to require better multi-modal transportation performance in order to receive a parking reduction. Only apply the parking reduction allowed in the Zoning Code for proximity to transit stops (in both directions), when there are “complete” ADA accessible bicycle and pedestrian paths between the location and the stop. “Complete” is defined by continuity of an improved path, crossing, or sidewalk between the project location and the bus stop. (Currently, any development within ¼ mile of a transit stop can request this parking reduction, regardless of the connecting infrastructure’s condition).

□ Require more short-term bike parking for all commercial development and multifamily residential.

□ Require new HOH developments to provide enough covered, enclosed, and secured bike parking for a certain percentage of residences in the development. (Currently, a development can receive an parking reduction for installing a standard bike rack).

□ Offer an incentive for providing more than the minimum amount of covered, enclosed and secured bicycle parking within a multifamily development in addition to short-term bicycle parking.
- Explore providing a parking reduction or other incentives for providing a car share service or services and dedicated parking.
- Implement the Zoning Code civic space strategy for the Downtown Regulating Plan by developing a civic space/park plan, as permitted, and then allow the City to collect fees to reimburse the City for purchasing property for consolidated parks and gathering spaces in the Downtown and surrounding neighborhoods.
- Allow codified sustainability techniques to be used in any zone based on performance and the conditions of the site.
- Rewrite Residential Sustainable Building Incentives in the Zoning Code in order to:
  - Make them applicable to HOH projects.
  - Allow standards to set a bar that is not reached by standard construction methods alone and that is based on performance of the building.
  - Delete the relationship to FUTS trails because of their ubiquity in the community.
  - Implement effective incentives that can be provided after performance of the building is proven, such as grants and rebates, in coordination with the County’s Sustainable Building program.
  - Include energy efficiency, transit accessibility, waste management, sustainable water use (including reclaimed water and on-site water reuse), alternative energy production, and other sustainability features.
- Incentivize new HOH construction to perform at a certain percentage (such as 20%) over the current City of Flagstaff Energy Code energy efficiency requirements.

**Engineering**

- Develop a Transportation Master Plan for the City of Flagstaff that shows the final street design for all major streets and conforms to the Regional Plan, neighborhood, area and corridor plans, and the Active Transportation Master Plan.
- Update the Engineering Design Standards and Specifications to:
  - Update guidelines for road cross-sections to address infill and redevelopment projects where the available right-of-way is not sufficient to meet new construction standards (see Regional Plan amendments to Chapter X: Transportation in Appendix B related to use priority).
  - Design new road cross-sections in the Engineering Standards to achieve the quality of connections needed to create functional activity centers and more walkable urban neighborhoods.
Implement green infrastructure policies that allow infill and redevelopment projects of small and medium scale in urban areas to meet some of their LID (low impact design) or detention requirements in the public right-of-way, with proper financial assurances.

Public Works

Parks

- Create guidelines about how linear parks or park-like spaces that are organized along roads, streams, and alleys can serve activity centers.
- Identify locations within or near activity centers in West Flagstaff that would be desirable for parks and civic spaces, since this is the area of greatest need according to the Master Parks Plan.

Sustainability

- Create engineering and public works standards for new recycling technology including compactors and enclosures, so developers do not have to go through a special approval process to construct a custom enclosure.
- Require HOH management to educate all new tenants on their waste management infrastructure.

Economic Vitality

- Fund and complete new historic context reports and inventories for all historic districts and neighborhoods identified in the Regional Plan, and report on the loss of historic structures within those neighborhoods.

Long Term Strategies

Community Development

Planning and Development Services

- The City may fund a viewshed analysis for public spaces within the City in order to identify priority views that the City should preserve and enhance (funding and consultant would be needed). This study could inform open space purchases and strategic changes to City Codes that can better protect viewsheds. It may be included as part of the next Regional Plan update.
- Allow parking requirements to be met through shared parking agreements, off-site parking contributions, and other methods to promote the feasibility of developing smaller parcels.
- Encourage a portion of open space within activity centers to be publicly accessible and usable.
- Set a base residential density for mixed-use development in all or certain commercial zones (such as Community Commercial and Commercial Services) and only allow densities above the base with certain thresholds of affordable housing contribution.
- Establish design guidelines for new buildings in historic districts based on the inventory and historic context.
- Formalize flexibility for historic preservation projects in development standards and guidelines.

Engineering

- Prioritize partnerships that create improved crossings of S. Milton Road, especially grade separated ones, in order to support HOH developments in the Woodlands Village area. Other arterial road crossings should be prioritized around pedestrian and bicycle travel, and be frequent enough to discourage unsafe mid-block crossing.
- Plan for equitable and appropriate public investment in infrastructure upgrades for new activity centers that can support HOH, such as the JW Powell Boulevard and Butler Avenue areas.
- Adopt a coordinated Travel Demand Management (TDM) Plan for the City, NAIPTA, and other agencies that includes strategies

¹ Per the Zoning Code definition, this includes setbacks, resources, and landscaping areas.
that provide operational supports for transit, walking, and biking, such as bike share, real-time transit data displays, etc.

- Once the overarching TDM Plan is adopted, require HOH development that seek a rezoning to include property-specific TDM strategies in their design. This would allow them to select from a menu of TDM options to achieve a minimum score or offset trip generation in the TIA.
- Require that HOH developments integrate TDM strategies into their site to compensate for parking reductions.
- Hire a TDM education, outreach, and enforcement program manager to monitor and run the program for property managers and regional employers who want to participate.

**Economic Vitality**

Provide a larger grant for repair of historic structures if the structure is listed on the National Register as an incentive to protect historic structures, especially those in the flood plain.

- Consider creation of neighborhood compatibility overlays or local historic district overlays for the national districts and historic neighborhoods identified on Map 14 of the Flagstaff Regional Plan.

**Public Works**

- Consider ways of allowing on-street parking between snow events, such as requiring cars to be removed from the street 48 hours before and after a snow event.

**Stormwater**

- Complete the Rio de Flag flood control project as a top City priority.

**Sustainability**

- Require all larger building projects over a certain size, including HOH developments, to divert at least 50% of the total construction and demolition material, so it does not end up at the landfill.
- Create a financing mechanism or incentive system to increase solar and other renewable energy production on HOH sites (i.e. grant or PACE-style program).
- Create incentives and assistance for electric vehicle infrastructure at new multifamily housing developments and for retrofitting them into existing complexes.

**City Council**

- Recommend that the City Council set legislative priorities at strategically appropriate times that explicitly support giving local governments the ability to:
  - Require affordable housing contributions from new development (inclusionary zoning).
  - Prevent demolition of historic structure of significance and integrity in Historic Districts.
  - Support legislation to authorize a Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) program in Arizona.
Definitions

Activity Center: Mixed-use areas where the City promotes a higher intensity of use that is well connected to its surroundings. Activity Centers are identified on the Future Growth Illustration, and are considered the most appropriate locations for high occupancy housing. Centers are expected to include a high-degree of transit, pedestrian and bicycle connectivity. Activity Centers are made up of a commercial core and a pedestrian shed. They are also identified by type (Urban, Suburban, and Rural) and scale (Regional and Neighborhood).

Regional scale: An activity center that attracts people at a citywide or regional scale either by containing more overall or more specialized attractions.

Neighborhood scale: A smaller-scale activity center that primarily attracts the surrounding neighborhoods.

Commercial Core: The center of each activity center that allows and encourages commercial, institutional, high-density residential, mixed-use development and transit opportunities. These cores are encouraged to be designed around the pedestrian.

Pedestrian Shed: In the context of an activity center, it is the area within a quarter-mile radius of the commercial core, which is an approximate five-minute walk. Areas within the pedestrian shed are intended to be very well connected to the commercial core by foot.

Adaptive reuse: Fixing up and remodeling an existing building or space, and adapting it to fit a new use.

Affordable Housing: Housing that is affordable to those who cannot afford market priced housing locally to either rent or purchase. It may be provided with either public and/or private subsidy for people who are unable to resolve their housing requirements in the local housing market because of the relationship between housing costs and local incomes.

Civic Space: An outdoor area dedicated for civic activities, such as art, culture, education, recreation, government, transit, etc.

Code: The law of the City of Flagstaff, passed by ordinance in accordance with Arizona State Law and the City Charter. The City of Flagstaff has several codes that regulate the construction of new development, including the Zoning Code, the Engineering Design Standard and Specifications, the Building Code, the Solid Waste Code, etc.

Commercial Corridor: A roadway that has primarily commercial uses along its side. Commercial corridors in the Regional Plan are designated on Map 25: Road Network Illustration.

Complete Streets: Streets, roadways, and highways that are designed to safely and attractively accommodate all transportation users (drivers, bus riders, pedestrians, and bicyclists). Travelers of all ages and abilities can safely move along and across a complete street.

Conditional Use Permit (CUP): A permit granted by the Planning and Zoning Commission to establish a use on a property that may require mitigation of associated impacts, but which is permitted provided that all mitigation measures and performance standards and requirements of the Zoning Code are met. Conditional Use Permits require a public hearing; however, Arizona law limits the types of conditions that may be considered for a use permit in many cases.

Conventional zoning: The traditional or Euclidean method of zoning that focuses on controlling land-use types, permissible property uses, and the control of intensity by height limits, dwelling units per acre, and setbacks.

Downtown: Downtown is mapped differently for several different purposes. It is sometimes considered only the central business district zoning; other times the entire area of the Downtown Regulating Plan is referred to as Downtown. In addition, there is a historic district, a special sign district, an activity center, and a Business Improvement and Redevelopment District (which has specific taxing and quasi-governmental authorities), all of which are identified as “Downtown.” For the purposes of the HOH Specific Plan, if a policy or strategy is not specific
enough to determine which “Downtown” boundary is appropriate, the Downtown Regulating Plan should be used.

**Downtown Regulating Plan:** The set of maps that show the transect zones, special districts, and special requirements of the form-based code for the Downtown, Townsite, North End, and Southside neighborhoods. It also shows street and public open spaces, and designates where various building form standards (based on intensity of urbanism) for building placement, design, and use will apply. The Regulating Plan graphically shows, applies, and places the regulations and standards established in a form-based code.

**Floodplain:** Any land area susceptible to being inundated by floodwaters from any source. Federally designated floodplains are subject to a program of corrective and preventive measures for reducing flood damage.

**Floor Area Ratio (FAR):** An intensity measured as a ratio derived by dividing the total floor area of a building or structure by the net buildable site area.

**Inclusionary zoning:** Policies that require developers to set aside a certain percentage of housing units in new or rehabilitated projects for low- and moderate-income residents.

**High density:** The current high-density residential zone in Flagstaff allows heights up to 60 feet and between 10 and 29 dwelling units per acre. Densities greater than 29 dwelling units per acre are allowed in most commercial zones for mixed-use projects.

**High Occupancy Housing (HOH):** Buildings that have more than 75 bedrooms per acre or have more than 30 dwelling units per acre in dormitory or apartment-style units.

- Large-Scale HOH describes a project that has either: (1) one or more buildings with a footprint larger than half an acre or one-fourth of an urban city block, or (2) exceeds a density of 50 dwelling units per acre or 125 bedrooms per acre.
- Medium-Scale HOH describes a project that has: (1) one or more building with a footprint greater than 5,000 square feet but no more than half an acre or one-quarter of an urban city block, and (2) is less than or equal to a density of 50 dwelling units per acre and less than 125 bedrooms per acre.
- Small-Scale HOH describes a projects that has: (1) all buildings with footprints of 5,000 square feet or less, and (2) a density of less than or equal to 50 dwelling units per acre and less than 125 bedrooms per acre.

**Historic Districts and Neighborhoods:** Areas of town that are identified on Map 14: Historic Districts in the Regional Plan. Some of these areas are national or local historic districts, and others are neighborhoods that have historic resources in them but lack the integrity or significance to be designated as a formal district.

**Incentivize** A system to get a certain outcome that cannot be required. For example, the State of Arizona does not allow cities to require a percentage of new homes be affordable, but a city can incentivize the construction of affordable units by giving the developer the rights to additional densities or lessening their parking requirements.

**Mixed Use:** The development of a single building containing more than one type of land use or a single development of more than one building and use including, but not limited to, residential, office, retail, recreation, public, or entertainment, where the different land use types are in close proximity, planned as a unified complementary whole, and shared pedestrian and vehicular access and parking areas are functionally integrated.

**Neighborhood:** Includes both geographic and social components, it may be an area with similar housing types or an area surrounding a local institution patronized by residents. In the Regional Plan, any area not within one-quarter mile of an activity center or designated Employment or Special District is considered a neighborhood. Within one-quarter mile of an activity center, neighborhoods are distinguished from activity centers per the applicable specific plan.

**Overlay Zone:** A zone applied by the City Council to a property, at the request of the property owner, that grants additional development rights and/or restrictions and is used in combination with the Specific to Uses and Supplemental to Zones sections of the Zoning Code.

**Policy:** An aspirational statement within the Regional Plan or other City document adopted by resolution, which should be followed by City staff in implementing plans and programs. Changes to the Zoning Code and to property rights must comply with the Regional Plan by State law. For example, if a development wants to change their existing rights, they would have to prove that the changes meet the Regional Plan’s policies.
**Require:** Something that must be completed before the City can approve a development. For example, a new building is required to provide a certain amount of parking. Specific Plans cannot create requirements without additional code updates.

**Regional retention and detention:** A system for storing and slowing (attenuating) the runoff from impervious surfaces such as rooftops or pavement with basins that collect from a large area. A detention, or dry, basin has an orifice level with the bottom of the basin so that all of the water eventually drains out and it remains dry between storms – hence, a dry basin. Retention basins have a riser with an orifice at a higher point so that it retains and treats a permanent pool of water. (Source: https://sustainablestormwater.org/)

**Transect zoning:** A zoning approach that is more concerned with the look or form of the buildings than their use. Flagstaff’s transect zones contain more aesthetic details than the conventional zones with the intent of improving the building’s appearance and its connection/interaction with its surroundings.

**Travel Demand Management:** A program of information, encouragement, and incentives provided by local or regional organizations to help people know about and use all their transportation options to optimize all modes in the system and to counterbalance the incentives to drive embedded in subsidies of parking and roads. These are both traditional and innovative technology-based services to help people use transit, ride-sharing, walking, biking, and telework. (Source: https://mobilitylab.org)

**Waste diversion:** The process of keeping waste out of landfills to extend their operating lifetime and prevent the need for new landfills.
References


Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and Kimley-Horn and Associates Inc. (2013). Final Documentation Summary of Support Activities for the Flagstaff Regional Plan Update.


Smart Growth America (2017). Empty Spaces: Real Parking needs at five TODs.


**Photo Credits**

Unless listed below, photos belong to the City of Flagstaff and are available for use in the public domain. Exceptions:

- Page 41, Caption: “NAIPTA’s Mountain Line Fixed Route Service”, Photo credit: NAIPTA
- Page 102, Caption: “Example of a small-scale HOH building in an urban context”, Photo credit: Jennifer Boren
- Page 102, Caption: “Example of a medium-scale HOH building in an urban context”, Photo credit: Live the Rockies! Real Estate
Appendix A: Constraints in Arizona

Private Property Rights Act of 2006 Passed by Proposition 207 (A.R.S.§ 12-1134)

The Private Property Rights Act of 2006, also known as Proposition 207, allows private property owners to seek compensation if the value of his or her property is reduced by the enactment of a land use law. A land use law regulates the use or division of land, such as municipal zoning laws. Compensation can be an expensive option for local governments. Examples of land use laws that may reduce the value of property include:

- Removing a use from a particular zone
- Reducing the density allowed in a particular zone
- Reducing the maximum allowable building height from 65’ to 35’

Why can’t we implement inclusionary zoning?

A.R.S.§ 9-461.16, passed in 2015

Prohibits requiring affordable housing in a zoning code, but does not limit the use of an incentive, density bonus, or other voluntary provision or condition designed to increase the supply of moderate or lower cost housing.

Why is it hard to pass Moratorium legislation?

Standards for enactment of moratorium; land development; limitations; definitions. A.R.S.§ 9-463.06

Aside from moratoriums based upon a shortage of water, sewer, or street improvements a moratorium can only be enacted where there is a lack of other public facilities (police/fire/etc.) causing a clear and imminent danger to the health and safety of the public. In this case, the City must make a number of findings, including that there are no reasonable alternatives, that the supply housing types is not unreasonably restricted, and that the public harm outweighs the other adverse effects.
Appendix B: Proposed Amendments to the Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030

Proposed Regional Plan Amendments

Any specific plan adopted by the City must be in conformance with the Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030. Because the impetus for the High Occupancy Housing Plan included issues that lack clarity or have conflicting information in the Regional Plan, Regional Plan amendments are needed to adopt the HOH Specific Plan. Chapter 3 of the Flagstaff Regional Plan allows for amendments to the Regional Plan that accompany a specific plan to be processed without a separate amendment process. Therefore, the 60-day review and other relevant process steps can be used for the purpose of meeting the regulatory requirements of both the plan amendments and specific plan adoption process.

The proposed plan amendments are included in this appendix in a track changes format. They are intended to clarify and assist in accurate cross-referencing between the Regional Plan, the HOH Specific Plan, the Zoning Code, and the Engineering Design Standards and Specifications. The amendments will fill gaps in some policies. For instance, there is a measure for the Regional Plan to extend the life of the landfill and no corresponding policies. This gap hinders the ability of staff to move forward policies related to materials management and HOH developments. There are also policies that were developed to be part of the HOH Plan that were deemed to have broader application by the City Council and Planning and Zoning Commission (LU.18.18 to LU.18.20 and CC2.7 to CC.2.13). The proposed plan amendments include changes to several chapters of the Regional Plan:

- Chapter VIII: Community Character changes: add new policies CC.2.7 to CC. 2.13
- Chapter IX: Growth Areas and Land Use changes:
  - Clarification of area and place types language and definitions constituted the majority of the changes proposed in Chapter IX. One policy is proposed to be deleted (LU.1.8), five policies are proposed to be added (LU.10.10 and LU.18.17-18.20), and two policies are proposed to be modified (LU.10.3 and LU 10.7). Major topics addressed in these changes are:
    - The interpretation of the Plan concerning rezonings and development in Downtown (U1) and Five Points (U8) activity centers through a new designation as “Historic” activity centers.
    - Move the Sawmill (U2) activity center to reduce overlap with Southside National Historic District and increase overlap with the Future Urban pedestrian shed along Butler Ave. Added 3D illustrations
    - Clarification of density ranges and connectivity requirements for area-place types
    - Further definition and revision of Neighborhood and Regional scale activity centers, including reassigning six activity centers from Neighborhood to Regional, and disfavoring rezoning for large scale HOH in neighborhood-scale and historic activity centers and historic districts and neighborhoods (Regional Plan Map 14)
    - Better definition of the commercial core and commercial corridors in urban and suburban settings.
- Chapter X: Transportation changes: During the process of understanding how the City can achieve better outcomes for High Occupancy Housing projects. Staff reviewed what types of decisions were not being made consistently or for which the plan provided unclear direction for decision-makers. The table in Chapter X that described area-level “Levels of Service” was not providing all the information needed to inform updates to the Engineering Design Standards and Specifications, and ultimately, the adoption of a Transportation Master Plan for the City. The information on the updated tables is intended to inform decisions about changes to standards and does not directly change any City policies or ordinances without further action by the City.
- Chapter XII: Public Facilities: Added Policy PF.1.7. to make the purpose of sustainability and solid waste practices clearer.
- The term major streets was added to the Glossary.
The following are proposed pages for Chapters VII, IX, X, and XII in the Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030. Replacement pages will not include track changes.

Changes to the text are in orange or blue and explanations of the rationale behind these changes are in blue boxes next to the updated Regional Plan pages. Only pages that might change have been included in this appendix. To obtain replacement pages for the Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030 see www.flagstaffmatters.com or contact the Comprehensive Planning Manager.
Outside the City limits, heritage preservation efforts primarily have been completed by land management agencies such as the U.S. Forest Service, Arizona State Land Department, National Park Service, and local Native American tribes. Coconino County is not a Certified Local Government, and is not required to be such to recognize historic structures or seek their protection. The County does not have dedicated historic preservation staff, so individuals and small groups who focus on specific properties or local landmarks undertake most of the efforts occurring on private lands.

“Knowing that these cultures are close by, cultures for which dance is vital and integral to their being, also anchors the dancer in me here. [...] Gropping for words to describe how Flagstaff affects my desire to dance, I begin to understand why the explanation is elusive.”

- Kari Morehouse, “The View from Here: Contemporary Essays by Flagstaff Authors”

### HERITAGE PRESERVATION GOALS AND POLICIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal CC.2. Preserve, restore, and rehabilitate heritage resources to better appreciate our culture.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy CC.2.1.</strong> Actively locate, identify, interpret, and preserve historical, archaeological, and cultural resources, in cooperation with other agencies and non-governmental organizations, as aspects of our society for future generations to retain, understand, and enjoy their cultural identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy CC.2.2.</strong> Formally recognize heritage resources through designation as local landmarks and historic districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy CC.2.3.</strong> Mitigate development impacts on heritage resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy CC.2.4.</strong> Support restoration and rehabilitation of historic housing, buildings, structures, and neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy CC.2.5.</strong> Provide incentives for heritage and cultural preservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy CC.2.6.</strong> Expand a program to educate the owners of historic resources of the heritage value of their properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy CC.2.7.</strong> Protect existing historic districts from encroachment by land uses that compromise the historic characteristics of the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy CC.2.8.</strong> In “Historic” activity centers (Downtown and Five Points), prioritize Community Character (CC) and Downtown (LU.11 and LU.12) goals and policies over the Activity Center goals and policies found in LU.18, when considering cases for rezoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy CC.2.9.</strong> Strengthen the City’s historic preservation and adaptive reuse programs by increasing funding for further inventories, grants to property owners, and education campaigns, especially where the underlying Zoning for the historic resource put it at risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy CC.2.10.</strong> Educate the community and developers on the benefits of adaptive reuse and create policies to incentivize the reuse of historic buildings to maintain their integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy CC.2.11.</strong> Assist businesses and residents who are caretakers of historic resources, maximize the economic value of their property without damaging the integrity of the historic resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy CC.2.12.</strong> Advertise the economic impact of historic resources and history-related tourism on the Flagstaff community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy CC.2.13.</strong> When the demolition or removal of a historic structure cannot be avoided, encourage the developer to make the building available for relocation and provide assistance in moving the building the purchaser’s property, if possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Growth Areas & Land Use component of the Flagstaff Regional Plan is a community vision of how land use in the region should occur for the next 20 years. It also sets the legal framework for more specific planning and zoning regulations. It is important to recognize that this is a diverse community that demands land use options while recognizing private property rights. To promote a balanced land use pattern, consideration will be given to the following concepts:

Growth
Future growth will be concentrated in reinvestment areas and will include a balance of infill and redevelopment in existing neighborhoods as well as the development of “Greenfields” within the growth boundary.

Area Types
This chapter is organized around three area types: urban, suburban, and rural. Flagstaff enjoys existing urban, suburban, and rural areas as neighborhoods, shopping areas, roadways, and other spaces. Within each area type, there are distinct areas called place types. Employment and Special Planning Area area types exist within all place types to provide for the economic vitality of the Region. The Parks/Open Space area types are also identified throughout the community.

Place Types
Place types include activity centers, neighborhoods, and corridors, and provide the framework around which our community is built. Land uses that occur within the different place types are further designated into categories such as residential, commercial, and institutional, which define the type of use and zoning for those place types. The land uses appropriate for each activity center are listed on the urban, suburban, and rural area character tables. Employment Centers can exist within all place types, but along with Special Planning areas, they need special consideration.

Our Vision for the Future
In 2030, our community continues to grow in a smart and connected way, making investments in efficient infrastructure, alternative travel modes, and promoting housing choice while seeking to reduce sprawl. The land use decisions made in the region promote a healthy lifestyle and quality of life desired by many.
GROWTH

Historically, growth areas in the Flagstaff region have clustered around jobs, from the earliest railroad stop and lumberyards, to the University and downtown Flagstaff. Within the region, the City of Flagstaff is surrounded by public lands, and thus the supply of private land for development is somewhat limited. For these reasons, and because Flagstaff residents value the protection of the natural forests and public lands surrounding the City, planning in Flagstaff for the last 25 years has encouraged (but not mandated) development in more central areas, thereby preserving more of the outer areas of the region and reducing sprawl. This concept of “compact development” was included in the Flagstaff Growth Management Guide 2000 adopted in April 1987 and continued within the former Flagstaff Regional Land Use and Transportation Plan adopted in November 2001. Both of these documents included goals and policies in support of the principles of reduced sprawl and compact development, while also allowing for many developments to occur under existing zoning and land entitlements. The principle of compact development may be viewed and described in three tiers. Compact Development in Flagstaff can be provided in multiple contexts and settings:

1. **City-wide:** At the city-wide scale, compact development can encourage infill and reinvestment in existing urban, suburban, and rural area types, thereby allowing for the preservation of open space and natural resources toward the periphery.

2. **Activity centers and corridors within neighborhoods:** At the local level, such as in activity centers and along commercial corridors within neighborhoods, compact development allows for increased intensity and density of residential, commercial, or mixed-use activities through creative and intensive site design within activity centers at urban, suburban and rural contexts, and along corridors. Typical residential densities in compact developments are higher than in adjoining areas and encompass residential and commercial developments, and single family houses, townhomes, apartments, and live-work units so that residents have a choice in the type of housing they desire. In commercial areas, two and three story buildings are typical, with building fronts right up to the sidewalk, and parking arranged behind and to the side of buildings. A range of housing and transportation options are supported, with an emphasis on improving pedestrian and bicycle circulation within a complete street, reducing necessary additional vehicle trips. Civic spaces are typically included, providing opportunities for civic participation, shopping, recreation, and socializing outdoors in all seasons.

3. **Neighborhoods** within walking distance of activity centers provide denser housing choices, such as townhomes, apartments, and live-work units, and provide a transition to diverse residential neighborhoods.

4. **Employment centers** also provide important opportunities for compact development and incorporate multi-modal and mixed use principles to reduce vehicle trips.

5. **Cluster development:** Within a development site, residential and commercial uses may be clustered closer together as a means of preserving natural resources and open space, and minimizing infrastructure costs.

Support for the concept of more compact growth does not, and has not, precluded new suburban development from occurring away from the center of the City, such as the Ponderosa Trails subdivision. It does, however, speak to a desire to encourage some future development to be more inwardly focused while ensuring freedom of choice for developers to satisfy market demand for various housing types. The discussion of growth areas is paramount in reducing sprawl, protecting open space, and promoting efficiencies in infrastructure and services.

### Why Compact Development?

Encouraging the option of compact development for the region allows for the following to be achieved while still respecting Flagstaff’s scale, character, and design traditions:

- Support economic vitality
- Well connected access for pedestrians, bicyclists, cars, and transit
- Appropriate multi-modal thoroughfare design
- Medium to high densities in appropriate contexts
- Provision of a range of housing options including smaller housing types on small lots and multifamily housing options with shared amenities
- A mix of uses, i.e., several types of housing, commercial, and office space are located in close proximity with civic spaces to provide vibrant commercial spaces, quality places for people to live, and to support infill and reinvestment of existing developed areas.
- Interconnected streets
- Innovative and flexible approaches to parking
- Access and proximity to transit
- Reduction of sprawl on the periphery of the region
- Support of conservation and open space goals as well as watershed protection
- Minimize traffic congestion
- Reduced miles of streets and utility infrastructure resulting in lowered City operating and maintenance costs.
Activity Centers are mixed-use areas where there is a concentration of commercial and other land uses typically defined by a pedestrian shed. Activity centers are the appropriate locations for higher-density residential development, such as mid-rise and apartment buildings, live-work units and home-based businesses. They include a high-degree of pedestrian and bicycle connectivity.

Commercial Cores are the most important location for placemaking in each activity center. They allow and encourage commercial, institutional, high-density residential, mixed-use development and transit opportunities. These cores are designed to have active public realms including outdoor cafes, public art, comfortable pedestrian facilities, parks, street trees, and furniture, and include housing above and behind commercial uses.

Pedestrian Sheds are the basic building block of walkable neighborhoods. A pedestrian shed is the area encompassed by the walking distance from an activity center, and is often the area covered by a 5-minute walk (about 1/4 mile). They may be drawn as perfect circles, but in practice pedestrian sheds have irregular shapes because they cover the actual distance walked, not the linear (as-the-crow-flies) distance. In practice, it is common for people to walk farther than a 1/4 mile to access an activity center; when there is a diverse mix of activities and comfortable pedestrian infrastructure.

Commercial Corridors are roads that allow for commercial and mixed use development. They often intersect and connect nearby activity centers.

Block Size is an area of land bounded by a street, or combination of streets, and other land uses with defined boundaries. Block sizes vary, with smaller blocks in walkable urban areas, larger blocks in suburban areas, and large tracts of land in rural areas.

Coconino County Assessor's on-line tool is a way to determine current land use, zoning, lot description, property tax history, and other information about any piece of property within Coconino County: http://assessor.coconino.az.gov/assessor/web/login.jsp.

Density (dwelling units per acre) is the number of homes (single-family, townhouses, apartments, live-work units, etc.) per acre. Many community resources and recreational facilities use density to calculate facilities needed to serve the growing population.

Intensity of commercial development describes the concentration of development on a site, or the degree to which land is occupied. There is no single measurement of the intensity of land use; it is usually conveyed by dwelling units per acre, amount of traffic generated, or FAR.

Land Measurements – acres and square feet.

Floor-area-Ratio (FAR) is the total floor area of all buildings or structures on a lot divided by the gross area of the lot. See the illustration below.
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REINVESTMENT GOALS AND POLICIES

Goal LU.1. Invest in existing neighborhoods and activity centers for the purpose of developing complete, and connected places.

Policy LU.1.1. Plan for and support reinvestment within the existing city centers and neighborhoods for increased employment and quality of life.

Policy LU.1.2. Develop reinvestment plans with neighborhood input, identifying the center, mix of uses, connectivity patterns, public spaces, and appropriate spaces for people to live, work, and play.

Policy LU.1.3. Promote reinvestment at the neighborhood scale to include infill of vacant parcels, redevelopment of underutilized properties, aesthetic improvements to public spaces, remodeling of existing buildings and streetscapes, maintaining selected appropriate open space, and programs for the benefit and improvement of the local residents.

Policy LU.1.4. Attract private investment by reinvesting in transportation infrastructure improvements as well as public utilities infrastructure for desired development size.

Policy LU.1.5. Maintain and upgrade existing infrastructure and invest in infrastructure to make redevelopment and infill an attractive and more financially viable development option.

Policy LU.1.6. Establish greater flexibility in development standards and processes to assist developers in overcoming challenges posed by redevelopment and infill sites.

Policy LU.1.7. Consider creative policy and planning tools (such as transfer of develop rights or transfer of development obligations) as a means to incentivize redevelopment and infill.

Policy LU.1.8. Encourage voluntary land assemblage in an effort to create better utilization and opportunities for development.

Policy LU.1.9. Provide public education regarding the sustainability and beneficial economics of redevelopment and infill.

Policy LU.1.10. Consider adaptive reuse possibilities when new big box developments are proposed.

Policy LU.1.11. Ensure that there is collaboration between a developer, residents, and property owners in existing neighborhoods where redevelopment and reinvestment is proposed so that they are included, engaged, and informed.

Policy LU.1.12. Seek fair and proper relocation of existing residents and businesses in areas affected by redevelopment and reinvestment, where necessary.

Regional Plan Page Edits:
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The Future Growth Illustration defines the geographic locations of area types and place types. It shows the spatial relationship of existing and future development and is intended to be used in conjunction with the Natural Environment Maps (Maps 6-8) and the Road Network Map (Map 25). This illustration should not be relied upon to determine where specific land uses are allowed; that information is found in City Code Title 16 (Zoning Code) and the Zoning Map. In case of any conflict between the Future Growth Illustration and the Regional Plan’s goals and policies, the goals and policies will prevail.

Regional Plan Page Edits:
Corrected omission of Future Employment area type from last plan amendments on Map 21. No other changes to areas types.
Future growth illustrations and plans do not preclude private development entitlements. Please see www.flagstaffmatters.com for an interactive GIS map.

As amended March 22, 2018

Future Activity Centers
- Suburban Activity Center (S1) 'x' symbol identifies existing center
- Urban Activity Center (U1) 'x' symbol identifies existing center
- Rural Activity Center
- Regional Scale Pedestrian Shed
- Neighborhood Scale Pedestrian Shed
- Historic Pedestrian Shed
- Rural Pedestrian Shed
- Rural - Existing
- Rural - Future
- Suburban - Existing
- Suburban - Future
- Urban - Existing
- Urban - Future
- Special Planning
- Existing Employment
- Future Employment
- Historic District
- State Lands
- Areas in white retain their existing entitlements

The Future Growth Illustration defines the geographic locations of area types and place types. It shows the spatial relationship of existing and future development and is intended to be used in conjunction with the Natural Environment Maps (Maps 6-8) and the Road Network Map (Map 25). This Illustration should not be relied upon to determine where specific land uses are allowed; that information is found in City Code Title 10 (Zoning Code) and the Zoning Map. In case of any conflict between the Future Growth Illustration and the Regional Plan's goals and policies, the goals and policies will prevail.
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The Future Growth Illustration defines the geographic locations of area types and place types. It shows the spatial relationship of existing and future development and is intended to be used in conjunction with the Natural Environment Maps (Maps 6-8) and the Road Network Map (Map 25). This illustration should not be relied upon to determine where specific land uses are allowed; that information is found in City Code Title 10 (Zoning Code) and the Zoning Map. In case of any conflict between the Future Growth Illustration and the Regional Plan’s goals and policies, the goals and policies will prevail.

As amended March 22, 2018
Area Types

The following pages contain a series of development standards characteristics for new projects. These standards characteristics are broken down according to area type: urban, suburban, and rural. The character within each area type is different, therefore development standards characteristics will vary depending where development is taking place.

The three area types (urban, suburban, and rural) have several tables that describe the place types within each: neighborhoods, activity centers, and corridors. Activity centers occur in many parts of the City and County—they are not exclusive to the most urbanized places. Since activity centers are encouraged in any area type, they can take the role of a regional or neighborhood activity center, as the graphic shows.

The Plan uses this hierarchy of area and place types to better categorize the eventual look of a place. Activity centers, corridors, and neighborhoods are encouraged in all area types, whether they are urban, suburban, or rural.
Flagstaff’s historic urban neighborhoods were primarily developed prior to the 1920s surrounding the Downtown, and generally including Southside, La Plaza Vieja, Flagstaff Townsite, and Northside. These neighborhoods developed in a traditional compact urban pattern where a person could live with limited reliance on the automobile. They were conducive to walking and cycling for daily needs such as groceries, retail shopping, and entertainment.

Many of these walkable characteristics are still evident today as these historic urban areas are still supported through a network of interconnected tree-lined streets laid out in a grid pattern with small block sizes, on-street parking, and a diversity of housing types. These areas also support public transit due to their compact nature. Unfortunately, neighborhood-serving commercial uses are now limited in many of these historic neighborhoods by larger grocery stores which developed later in the peripheral corridors that are not within walking distance. The historic neighborhoods average 6-8 units per acre.

Most of Flagstaff’s residents and visitors agree that Flagstaff’s unique historic urban areas contribute to the City’s local character and identity, and are strong proponents of protecting and preserving this special urban form and character. Future urban regional and neighborhood scale activity centers will emulate elements of these historic patterns of architecture, form, and public spaces in a modern context.

To develop a project in an urban area type, refer to the Urban Neighborhood Characteristics Table (pg. IX-35), the Urban Activity Center Characteristics Table (pg. IX-36), and the Urban Corridor Characteristics Table (pg IX-37). See also Illustration of Urban Character (pg IX-38) and Urban Area Goals and Policies (pg. IX-40).

### A Vision for Our Urban Areas

Flagstaff’s existing urban areas should be preserved, especially within designated historic districts. New development should be built to appropriate scale and design, perpetuating this unique sense of place. Moderate increases in density and intensity within the activity centers and respective pedestrian sheds of these neighborhoods is appropriate.

Walkable urban development can be integrated into older, less walkable neighborhoods to create new urban neighborhoods and centers. This walkability could be achieved through a variety of reinvestment activities, and establishment of densities supportive of alternative transportation modes and through greater connectivity.
# Urban Neighborhood Characteristics

Urban areas have a higher density of people, residences, jobs, and activities; buildings are taller and close to the street; streets and sidewalks are in a grid pattern of relatively small blocks; the area is walkable and a variety of services and goods are available; served by public transportation and with various forms of shared parking (lots, garages, etc.) and street parking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Pattern</th>
<th>Mix of missing middle housing, such as apartments, townhomes, live-work units, and triplexes, and single family housing on smaller lots. Minimum 2 stories within a commercial core and on urban corridors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block Size</td>
<td>300 X 300 to 300 x 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density Range</td>
<td>Minimum 8 to 29 units per acre. Increased density within the ¼ mile pedestrian shed; exception for in established Historic Districts; consider the scale and context of historic resources when establishing new property rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>(FARs) of 0.5 + for new urban neighborhoods. Higher range of intensity within the commercial core of activity centers and corridors. Intensity within exception for established Historic Districts and Historic Neighborhoods is similar to historic structures within one block of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Consider long-term impacts to air quality by proposed development. Refer to Air Quality Goal E&amp;C.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar Access</td>
<td>Consider solar access for all development, allowing passive/active solar collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridors</td>
<td>Refer to Urban Corridor Characteristics table, pg. IX-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use</td>
<td>Urban mixed-use includes supporting land uses such as neighborhood shops and services, residential, business offices, urban parks and recreation areas, religious institutions, and schools. A full range of urban services and infrastructure is required as well as high pedestrian, bicycle, and transit connectivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Residential uses in urban neighborhoods may well be incorporated into mixed-use projects. A variety of rental and ownership opportunities are encouraged. Affordable housing is highly valued in urban neighborhoods. This includes apartment complexes, condominiums, townhomes, and other forms of attached housing and single-family housing, which is subdivided into smaller lots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Commercial development is to be located within activity centers and along corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Institutional</td>
<td>As part of mixed-use development – vertical preferred. Make centrally accessible to urban neighborhood and connected with transit and FUTS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment/Research &amp; Development/Industrial</td>
<td>Industrial not appropriate for urban context. Research and Development offices, medical, services, professional offices, retail, hotel, and restaurants as part of urban form and within mixed-use development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Urban Parks can be publicly or privately owned and designated for recreation use, allowing for both active and passive activities, as well as special use functions. May include special facilities and swimming pools, neighborhood and community parks. Future park development is contingent upon density and intensity of proposed development; and this Plan’s policies outline the need for recreational opportunities for all residents and visitors. Refer to Chapter XV - Recreation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Open Space in urban areas include greenways, streetscapes, waterways, cemeteries, floodplains, riparian areas, corridors, boulevard viewsheds, and public plazas and squares and are used for passive activities. These spaces may be restored for their aesthetic value, vistas, and archaeological and historic significance. Refer to Chapter IV - Environmental Planning &amp; Conservation and Chapter V - Open Space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Space</td>
<td>Refer to Natural Resources Maps 7 and 8, and ‘Considerations for Development’ in Chapter IV - Environmental Planning &amp; Conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>Refer to Natural Resources Maps 7 and 8, and ‘Considerations for Development’ in Chapter IV - Environmental Planning &amp; Conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Urban food production – potted vegetables, greenhouses and conservatories, rooftop gardens, animal husbandry, and community gardens.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### URBAN ACTIVITY CENTER CHARACTERISTICS

An area typically located at the intersection of two main thoroughfares. Urban activity centers include mixed-use, mix of housing type, mixed price range, walkable, transit-oriented-design; can include regional commercial or neighborhood commercial.

#### Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic Urban Activity Centers</strong> - Downtown (U1) and Five Points (U8)</td>
<td>Bounded by multiple historic districts. In these activity centers, specific plans and community character and downtown goals and policies will supersede activity center goals and policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Urban Activity Centers</strong> - Larger, mixed-use centers at intersections of Regional Travel and Circulation Corridors; with direct access of multiple residential developments; with entertainment and cultural amenities; public spaces; with transit-accessible employment opportunities; serves regional residents and visitors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Urban Activity Centers</strong> - smaller, mixed-use centers at intersections of Circulation Corridors and Access Roads; with access to surrounding neighborhood; with local goods and services; public spaces; serves local residents; transit and FUTS access.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Activity Center is unique with contextual and distinctive identities, derived from environmental features, a mix of uses, well-designed public spaces, parks, plazas, and high-quality urban design. In the commercial core of all urban activity centers, the first floor of the building is primarily commercial with storefront windows built to the back of sidewalk. The building facade and type change frequently. Vertical mixed use is strongly preferred. The pedestrian shed is made up of a variety of residential housing types. In historic neighborhoods, the activity center is anchored by historic buildings and new buildings in the pedestrian shed mimic historic buildings types and patterns. They are well-designed for the purpose of maintaining a unique sense of place and to attract the residents/clients desired. Refer to A Vision for Our Urban Activity Centers on pg. IX-63.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Desired Pattern

#### Minimum 2 stories within a commercial core of an activity center and on urban commercial corridor.

#### Density Range

- Residential Only: 13+ units per acre; Residential mixed-use: 8+ units per acre

#### Intensity

- **Regional scale and design**: Floor area ratios (FARs) of 1.0+
- **Neighborhood scale and design**: Floor area ratios (FARs) of 0.5+

#### Mix of Uses

- **Within commercial core**: Government, services, education, offices, retail, restaurant, and tourism-related. Residential opportunities, residential mixed-use, public spaces, place-making.
- **Within the pedestrian shed but not in a commercial core**: Higher-density residential, live-work units, home-based businesses, educational, greater connectivity to a commercial core.

#### Commercial/Employment

- Vibrant and diverse mix of commercial uses. Commercial space is oriented towards civic spaces, the pedestrian and sidewalk. Office and employment opportunities in Regional Activity Centers are oriented towards professional fields, such as medical, government, real estate, finance, and service sectors.

#### Residential

- Regional activity centers provide mainly loft and apartment-style living in the commercial core that is bike, pedestrian, and transit oriented to support workforce and student housing. Neighborhood activity centers can provide a wide variety of housing choices from medium to high density. Activity centers that overlap Historic Districts and neighborhoods borrow heavily from the surrounding historic architecture and scale.

#### Transportation

- Easy-to-access parking available via garages, shared lots, and on-street parking. Transit stops and routes centrally located. Bicycle access and parking abundant. Pedestrian-oriented design. Very high road and pedestrian infrastructure connectivity. Block sizes are smaller; gridded street networks preferred where not prohibited by topography.

---
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URBAN CORRIDOR CHARACTERISTICS

Corridors are where commercial development is encouraged; local streets and residential access are not considered urban corridors. Great Streets are corridors with the greatest potential for reinvestment, beautification, and appropriate land uses. Refer to page IX-62 for more discussion of Activity Centers (Map 24) and Corridors (Map 25), and the Great Streets and Gateways (Map 12.)

Characteristics of an Urban Corridor

Serves larger capacities of vehicles and people, with more intense land uses. These corridors will be wider with faster speed limits, yet street parking is encouraged and pedestrian safety is a priority. Provides well designed signage, landscaping, and public spaces, with shops and services in buildings that front the street. More frequent intersections with local roads. Local roads in an urban area type carry more through traffic than suburban local roads. Thoroughfares and boulevards may be applied in the context of Traditional Neighborhood Design (TND) and the use of transect zones.

Footnote: Block/Lot Size, Air Quality, Solar Access, Employment, Parks/Open Space, Conservation information about activity centers from page IX-35 all apply to Urban Activity Centers and Corridors.

Character of an Urban Activity Center
## URBAN AREA GOALS AND POLICIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal LU.9</th>
<th>Focus reinvestment, partnerships, regulations, and incentives on developing or redeveloping urban areas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy LU.9.1</strong></td>
<td>Reinvest in urban areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal LU.10</strong></td>
<td>Increase the proportion of urban neighborhoods to achieve walkable, compact growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy LU.10.1</strong></td>
<td>Prioritize connectivity within all urban neighborhoods and activity centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy LU.10.2</strong></td>
<td>Support on-street parking, shared lots, and parking structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy LU.10.3</strong></td>
<td>Value the traditional <strong>Historic Neighborhoods</strong> established around downtown by maintaining and improving their highly walkable character, transit accessibility, diverse mix of land uses, and historic building form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy LU.10.4</strong></td>
<td>Develop specific plans for neighborhoods and activity centers to foster desired scale and form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy LU.10.5</strong></td>
<td>Consider vacant and underutilized parcels within the City’s existing urban neighborhoods as excellent locations for contextual redevelopment that adds housing, shopping, employment, entertainment, and recreational options for nearby residents and transit patrons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy LU.10.6</strong></td>
<td>In mixed use developments, encourage residential uses located above and behind commercial uses within urban areas as well as a variety of housing types where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy LU.10.7</strong></td>
<td>Invest in infrastructure and right-of-way enhancements that favor the pedestrian and transit as an incentive for private investment in urban neighborhoods and activity centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy LU.10.8</strong></td>
<td>Include institutional uses, such as schools, within the urban context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy LU.10.9</strong></td>
<td>Civic spaces must be well designed, accessible, and central to the urban fabric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy LU 10.10</strong></td>
<td>Future urban activity centers and neighborhoods are designed based on gridded street systems, considering constraints on connectivity such as topography, the railroad and highways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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While downtown is unique (it is defined on the Zoning Map with the Commercial Business (CB) zoning designation), it functions as the focus of a larger core area anchored by Northern Arizona University to the south and the Flagstaff Medical Center’s campus to the north. This is generally what is known as the Flagstaff Central District as mapped in the Zoning Code. Most of this area has been designated with optionally-applied transect zones as illustrated in Map 23, Downtown Regulating Plan, and it includes a number of historic neighborhoods such as Flagstaff Townsite, North End, Southside, and parts of La Plaza Vieja. As these historic neighborhoods are highly valued by Flagstaff residents, appropriate goals and polices to support their preservation are included in Chapter VIII - Community Character.

The commercial core of Downtown Flagstaff is generally considered the T6 and T5 properties from the downtown Regulating Plan. The Downtown is a Historic Activity Center. Preservation of its historic character is the top priority for the City. To develop a project in downtown, consider the vision, goals, and policies for Downtown and Community Character first. Then incorporate any information from Urban Neighborhood and Activity Center goals and policies and the Tables describing Urban Activity Center Characteristics refer to the Urban Neighborhood Characteristics Table (pg. IX-35, IX-36, and IX-37), the Urban Activity Center Characteristics Table (pg. IX-36), and the Urban Corridor Characteristics Table (pg. IX-37). See also Illustration of Urban Character (pg IX-38) and both Urban and Downtown Goals and Policies (pgs. IX-40 and IX-43).

Regional Plan Page Edits:
Language reflects changes to Maps 21 and 22 to designate U1 as a Historic Activity Center.
## SUBURBAN NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTERISTICS

Suburban areas have medium to low densities of people, residences, jobs and activities; the streets and sidewalks vary in pattern; the area is drivable to access homes and jobs, yet walkable by special pedestrian facilities like the Flagstaff Urban Trail System (FUTS); some services and goods are available to the residents; the area may have access to public transportation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Pattern</th>
<th>Well-connected neighborhoods, designed around an Activity Center.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block Size</td>
<td>Block size is variable in Suburban Neighborhoods. Blocks are well organized, with few bicycle and pedestrian dead ends. Cul-de-sacs are minimized in the design of new neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density Range</td>
<td>Residential lots 2 to 10 units/acre. Increased density is preferred within pedestrian shed of 6 units/acre. For a change of density range, a specific plan or development master plan must be developed for the pedestrian shed. Residential Mixed-Use: 6 to 20 units/acre, outside of the pedestrian shed. Increased density closer to transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>Floor area ratios (FARs) of 0.2 and above. Suburban commercial, offices space, medical facilities, and institutional in commercial core of an activity center and along commercial corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Consider long-term impacts to air quality by proposed development, see page IV-10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar Access</td>
<td>Consider solar access for all development, allowing passive and active solar collection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Residential

Quiet residential neighborhoods, consisting of single-family homes, duplexes, townhouses, and low-rise apartments, located toward the periphery of developed areas of the City. In or near activity centers, including a mix of single-family homes, duplexes, townhouses, and low-rise apartments, would also be suitable. This classification may also include such supporting land uses as parks and recreation areas, religious institutions, and schools. A full range of services and infrastructure is required, including public transit and bike trails.

### Commercial

Commercial development in suburban neighborhoods is minimal, such as home-based businesses and childcare. Refer to Suburban Activity Centers table on the following page for more commercial development options.

### Public/Institutional

Uses like schools and churches create a central and well-connected neighborhood. Refer to Illustration of Suburban Character on pg. IX-48.

### Employment

Home-based businesses are appropriate in Suburban Neighborhoods. Industrial uses and Research and Development are not appropriate outside of activity centers.

### Parks

Suburban parks and recreation facilities are either publicly or privately owned and allow both active and passive activities, as well as special use functions like recreation centers, golf courses, and swimming pools. This category is inclusive of neighborhood parks, community parks, conservation parks and special purpose facilities. Future park development is contingent upon the density and intensity of proposed development. Refer to Chapter XV - Recreation and the City of Flagstaff and Coconino County Parks & Recreation Master Plans.

### Open Space

Suburban open space areas are for public or private use. Open spaces include natural areas, greenways, trails, streetscapes, waterways, cemeteries, drainage ways, floodplains, corridors, wildlife refuges, wetlands, riparian areas, and preserves. They are used for passive recreation such as hiking, picnicking, bicycling, horseback riding, and fishing. Open space areas also may be preserved or restored for their aesthetic value, scenic areas and vistas, ecological value, archeological and historical significance, and wildlife habitat. Refer to Chapter IV - Environmental Planning & Conservation and Chapter V - Open Space.

### Conservation

Refer to the Natural Resources maps in Chapter IV - Environmental Planning & Conservation.

### Agriculture

Food production – yard gardens, community gardens, fruit trees, greenhouses and conservatories, animal husbandry.

### Special Districts

Airport Business Park – Specific Plan needed; Flagstaff Cultural Center – Specific Plan needed; Coconino Community College campus; Innovation Mesa

### Master Plans

Canyon del Rio

---

**Regional Plan Page Edits:**

Add suburban block language. Consistency with Urban Tables content and order. Filled in blank fields. Set maximum density for suburban neighborhoods for residential only. Better defined commercial core for suburban neighborhood activity centers. Employment text moved from Neighborhood to Activity Center Characteristics table.
### Suburban Activity Centers Characteristics

An area typically located at the intersection of two collectors or neighborhood streets, with vertical or horizontal mixed-use (mix of any: businesses, retail, residential, offices, medical services, etc.), serving the surrounding neighborhoods. A suburban activity center can serve a Regional Commercial or Neighborhood Commercial scale.

| Map Symbol | Regional Suburban Activity Center: Larger, mixed-use centers at intersections of Regional Travel and Circulation Corridors; with access of large residential developments; with entertainment and cultural amenities; public spaces; serves regional residents and visitors. Large-scale high occupancy housing and transit oriented development is appropriate in this scale of activity center.
| Desired Pattern/Block Size | Suburban Activity Center Block Size: 600 to 1,000 x 600 to 1,000
| Density Range | Residential Only: 6 - 13+ units per acre.
| Intensity | Residential mixed-use: 6 - 29 units per acre (Neighborhood scale) and 14+ units per acre (Regional scale)
| Mix of Uses | Within commercial core: Services, offices, retail, restaurant and tourism-related. Residential opportunities, residential mixed-use. Public spaces, place-making. Within pedestrian shed but not in commercial core: higher-density residential, live-work units, home-based businesses, educational, greater connectivity to a commercial core.
| Commercial | Regional Commercial is intended for all commercial and service uses that serve the needs of the entire region, those which attract a regional or community-wide market, as well as tourism and travel-related businesses. While uses located in this category typically tend to be auto-oriented, the regional commercial category emphasizes safe and convenient personal mobility in many forms, with planning and design for pedestrian, bicycle and transit access and safety as an activity center.
| Employment | Neighborhood Commercial is intended for all commercial retail and service uses that meet consumer demands for frequently needed goods and services, with an emphasis on serving the surrounding residential neighborhoods. These areas are typically anchored by a grocery store with supporting retail and service establishments. Development in this category may also include other neighborhood-oriented uses such as schools, employment, day care, parks, and civic facilities, as well as residential uses as part of a mixed-use development activity center. The commercial core is generally one block deep from the commercial corridor frontage and transitions quickly into a medium to high density residential setting. It may stretch along the corridor for several blocks or merge with an adjacent activity center.
| Transportation | Easy-to-access parking available via shared lots, shared parking structures, lots and on-street parking with pedestrian paths through and around parking areas. Transit stops available. Suburban block sizes may be larger than urban areas but must have highly connected bike and pedestrian infrastructure across the block and not solely around the block edges. Backage roads and collectors occur more frequently in suburban activity centers than in suburban neighborhoods.

#### Desired Pattern/Block Size

**Suburban Activity Center Block Size:**

600 to 1,000 x 600 to 1,000

**Lot size is variable. Across any lot or block, bicycle and pedestrian connectivity is generally:**

300 x 300 to 600

**Regional Suburban Activity Center:**

Larger, mixed-use centers at intersections of Regional Travel and Circulation Corridors; with access of large residential developments; with entertainment and cultural amenities; public spaces; serves regional residents and visitors. Large-scale high occupancy housing and transit oriented development is appropriate in this scale of activity center.

**Neighborhood Suburban Activity Center:**

Smaller, mixed-use centers at intersections of Circulation Corridors and Access Roads; with access to surrounding neighborhood; with local goods and services, public spaces; serves local residents; transit and FUTS access.

---

**Regional Plan Page Edits:**

Set suburban block size. Consistency with Urban Tables content and order. Filled in blank fields. Set maximum density for suburban neighborhoods for residential only. Better defined commercial core for suburban neighborhood activity centers. Employment text moved from Neighborhood to Activity Center Characteristics table.

---

**Footnote:** Block/Lot Size, air quality, solar access, Employment, Parks/Open Space, Conservation information about activity centers from page IX-35 all apply to Urban Activity Centers and Corridors.
A Vision for Our Activity Centers

Existing activity centers have great potential for increased activities, densities and mixed-use with focused reinvestment by both the public and private sectors. These are ideal locations for optimal transit connectivity, increased pedestrian and bicycle use, and infrastructure improvements. For example, activity centers around Northern Arizona University could also meet the demand for more multi-family housing units, and student-oriented services and goods.

Potential new activity centers have been located where the future road network intersects, and future development has been proposed. This Plan encourages future development to be focused on, and planned around activity centers.

Every activity center works at its own scale, serving the needs of the surrounding community. That scale is directly related to the road types serving the center and surrounding development.

Regional centers – the biggest centers – are located at the intersection of major roads and have multiple large residential developments with direct access to it. They are the most appropriate location for mixed use housing with densities over 29 units per acre.

Neighborhood centers are smaller areas that have commercial and mixed use typically established at the intersections of circulation and access roads and close to the corridor. They transition quickly to neighborhoods that have easy access to them.

An urban activity center holds the greatest densities of housing and intensities of commercial and retail space, yet it is still appropriately designed for the region, contextual in scale and form, and architecturally compliments the environment and views. Even the most urban areas of Flagstaff have amazing views of the mountains, and respecting those views maintains our unique sense of place. Higher densities and maintaining views may seem like a contradiction, but it is a matter of thoughtful and sensitive design. Urban activity centers have the densities that make transit work while providing the creative places and where the social interactions desired by today’s and tomorrow’s workforce can occur.

Suburban activity centers provide nodes for a neighborhood’s schools, parks, local restaurants, and grocery stores. They are located next to higher-density residential developments easily accessible by walking or biking. They may provide an opportunity for medium-density mixed-use.

Rural activity centers are appropriate in scale to the rural community and may be two or three stores in height, in which one additional activity is considered “growth.” These are strategically located to provide amenities.
Regional Plan Page Edits: Map updated to reflect new scale and location of activity centers.
### Location of Activity Centers

Refer to the Map 24: Activity Centers

**PLACE TYPES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION OF ACTIVITY CENTERS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>RURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest in appearance, cleanliness, etc. Business Improvement District</td>
<td>U1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Points (Milton Rd.-Butler-Clay-Mike’s Pike)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaPlaza Vieja, Southside, Milton Rd. Plans</td>
<td>U8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawmill – Picadilly Dr./Regent St.</td>
<td>U2</td>
<td>Flagstaff Mall</td>
<td>S4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan, Southside Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth St. - Fourth St./6th Ave./7th Ave.</td>
<td>U4</td>
<td>Milton Rd./Rte. 66</td>
<td>S7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyside Neighborhood and 4th Street Corridor Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Little America – Butler Ave./Harold Ranch Rd.</strong></td>
<td>U5</td>
<td>Milton Rd./University Dr. (new alignment)</td>
<td>S8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Juniper Point – JW Powell Blvd./New Lone Tree Rd.</strong></td>
<td>U6</td>
<td>Milton Rd./Forest Meadows St. - potential GATEWAY.</td>
<td>S9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlands Village Blvd./Rte. 66</td>
<td>S13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Road Corridor Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlands Village Blvd./University Ave.</td>
<td>S14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Rd. Corridor Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlands Village Blvd./Beulah Ave.</td>
<td>S15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Rd. Corridor Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Butler Ave./Fourth St. (Canyon del Río)</strong></td>
<td>S18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ponderosa Parkway/ Rte. 66</strong></td>
<td>S19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regional Plan Page Edits:**

Track changes do not show in this table for ease of reading. All errors on the table from the previous version were corrected and the scale of activity centers has been updated to reflect the amendments to Maps 21, 22 and 24.
# Location of Activity Centers

Refer to the Map 24: Activity Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Scale</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>RURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plaza Shopping Center – Humphrey’s St. &amp; Beaver St.</strong></td>
<td>Ft Valley Cultural Corridor – Ft Valley Rd.</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Townsend Winona Rd. / I-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rte. 66 and Woody Mountain Rd.</strong></td>
<td>Cedar Shopping Center – Cedar Ave. / West St.</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Townsend Winona Rd. / Slayton Ranch Rd. (Doney Park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Flagstaff Civic Center – Cedar Ave. / Fourth St.</strong></td>
<td>Silver Saddle Rd. / Koch Field Rd.</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country Club Center - Country Club Dr. / Soliere Ave.</strong></td>
<td>89 N / Campbell Rd.</td>
<td>S5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Butler Ave. / Walnut Hills Dr.</strong></td>
<td>89 N / Silver Saddle Rd.</td>
<td>S6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W Rte. 66 / Flagstaff Ranch Rd.</strong></td>
<td>89 N / Burris Ln. (Doney Park / Timberline)</td>
<td>S10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Woody Mountain Rd. / FS 532 (South of Kiltie Ln.)</strong></td>
<td>89 N / South of Townsend-Winona Rd.</td>
<td>S11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JW Powell Blvd. / future road</strong></td>
<td>Ft Valley Rd. / Peakview (Chesire)</td>
<td>S12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purple Sage Trl. / FS 532 (Villagio Montano)</strong></td>
<td>Bellemont</td>
<td>S16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JW Powell and Harold Ranch Road Extension</strong></td>
<td>Kachina Village</td>
<td>S17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purple Sage Trl. / FS 532 (Villagio Montano)</strong></td>
<td>Bellemont</td>
<td>S16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JW Powell and Harold Ranch Road Extension</strong></td>
<td>Kachina Village</td>
<td>S17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td>Specific Plan or Development Masterplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mountainaire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** means that this is a Future Activity Center

---

PLACE TYPES

BUILT ENVIRONMENT | Land Use | IX-67
---

Appendix B 141
ACTIVITY CENTERS AND COMMERCIAL CORRIDORS GOALS AND POLICIES

Goal LU.18. Develop well designed activity centers and corridors with a variety of employment, business, shopping, civic engagement, cultural opportunities, and residential choices.

Policy LU.18.1. Design activity centers and corridors appropriate to and within the context of each area type: urban, suburban, or rural.

Policy LU.18.2. Strive for activity centers and corridors that are characterized by contextual and distinctive identities, derived from history, environmental features, a mix of uses, well-designed public spaces, parks, plazas, and high-quality design.

Policy LU.18.3. Redevelop underutilized properties, upgrade aging infrastructure, and enhance rights-of-way and public spaces so that existing activity centers and corridors can realize their full potential.

Refer to Chapter XI - Cost of Development for the potential of public-private partnerships.

Policy LU.18.4. Encourage developers to provide activity centers and corridors with housing of various types and price points, especially attached and multi-family housing.

Policy LU.18.5. Plan for and support multi-modal activity centers and corridors with an emphasis on pedestrian and transit friendly design.

Policy LU.18.6. Support increased densities within activity centers and corridors.

Policy LU.18.7. Concentrate commercial, retail, services, and mixed use within the activity center’s commercial core.

Policy LU.18.8. Increase residential densities, live-work units, and home occupations within the activity center’s pedestrian shed.

Policy LU.18.9. Plan activity centers and corridors appropriate to their respective context and scale.

Policy LU.18.10. Corridors should increase their variety and intensity of uses as they approach activity centers.

Policy LU.18.11. Land use policies pertaining to a designated corridor generally apply to a depth of one parcel or one and one-half blocks, whichever is greater.

Policy LU.18.12. Corridors should focus commercial development to the corridor frontage and residential to the back.

Policy LU.18.13. Promote higher density development in targeted areas where economically viable and desired by the public.


Policy LU.18.15. Actual pedestrian-shed boundaries will be established considering opportunities and constraints posed by natural and man-made barriers like terrain or the interstate, road networks, and existing development patterns.

Policy LU.18.16. Adopt traffic regulations to increase awareness of pedestrian-oriented design for activity centers.

Policy LU.18.17. Mixed use developments over 50 units per acre should be located in regional-scale activity centers.

Policy LU.18.18. New development within existing activity centers should enhance the existing street pattern to meet the goals and policies of the Regional Plan related to connectivity and complete streets.

Policy LU.18.19. New development in future activity centers should create street patterns that implement the characteristics of urban and suburban place-making within a functional transportation system that minimizes dead ends and offset street and driveway connections.

Policy LU.18.20. Major streets in urban activity centers should have urban-form buildings with their primary pedestrian entrances facing the major street. Secondary entrances could be located to meet other access needs for the building use.
**Goal LU.19. Develop a manageable evolution of the main corridors into contextual place makers.**

Policy LU.19.1. Develop a specific plan for each “Great Street” corridor.

Policy LU.19.2. Establish the context and scale of each corridor prior to design with special consideration for those intended to remain residential or natural in character.

Policy LU.19.3. Enhance the viewshears and frame the view along the corridors through design.

Policy LU.19.4. Balance automobile use, parking, bicycle access, while prioritizing pedestrian safety along all corridors.

Refer to Chapter VIII - Community Character for the discussion of “Great Streets.”
Neighborhoods and **Commercial Corridors**

**Neighborhoods** - Neighborhoods are defined by mostly residential areas that are knitted together with connections of roads, trails, and sidewalks. Each neighborhood defines itself differently in the way of age, development patterns, architectural style, and other elements. Refer to Chapter VIII - Community Character and Chapter XIII - Neighborhoods, Housing, & Urban Conservation for more information about neighborhoods in the Flagstaff region.

**Commercial Corridors** - Commercial corridors are identified on Map 25: Road Network Illustration in Chapter X - Transportation. The “Great Streets” discussion in Chapter VIII - Community Character identifies a number of corridors in the Flagstaff region that could benefit from reinvestment, revitalization, and retrofit efforts. Refer to Map 12: Great Streets and Gateways.

Policies promote corridors as community and neighborhood connectors, transportation routes, and energetic places that are a magnet for mixed-use development and residential uses. Corridors are defined by pedestrian-oriented streetscapes, and frequented as local gathering places (i.e., cafes, restaurants, and plazas). These areas support surrounding neighborhoods and contribute to a more compact and consistent pattern of development. Development adjacent to established neighborhoods will transition from higher to lower intensities to mitigate impacts on residential areas.

Regional Plan Page Edits:
The additional text on previous pages bumped this portion of IX-69 to another page. Added “commercial” to corridors and a clarification of where they are identified.
The region's transportation system strives to improve mobility and access for people and goods by providing efficient, effective, convenient, accessible, and safe transportation options. The focus is on moving people. Integrating convenient mode choices into more compact and urban future development ensures necessary linkages between our urban, suburban, and rural areas. Economic development, community character, and environmental and health objectives will be advanced with a multi-modal system inclusive of roads and streets, transit routes, bicycle lanes, trails, and sidewalks.

**Use Priority and Level of Service**

This Plan's goals and policies for mobility and access include prioritizing travel modes using context to prioritize uses within the entire right-of-way (from back of sidewalk to back of sidewalk) and to set level of service standards, usually within urban, suburban, and rural areas. Whereas measures for vehicular levels of service are well established, multimodal levels of service will require further research and adaptation to Flagstaff regional conditions. Each type of road or street has a use-priority that is stratified based on context and its expected desirability and activity level for each use. Use the tables to decide what features to enhance and what features to moderate when right-of-way is scarce or when different uses hinder the functionality of each other. For example, on a suburban arterial, the efficient movement of automobiles (the high use priority), may not allow the space necessary to also park on the street (the low use priority).

The tables also describe relative levels of service for each mode with high (H), medium (M), and low (L) set for expectations of service. The service standards for automobiles apply to intersections and for all other modes, apply the area-place type on the Future Growth Illustration. These service levels are calibrated to the goals and policies of the area-place types. For instance, in urban activity centers, a higher level of automobile congestion is expected as a trade-off for safer and more comfortable pedestrian environment. Level of service standards in the Engineering Design Standards and Specifications are needed for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit operations. For the pedestrian and bicycle modes, the standards should go beyond space available on the road to include characteristics of the adjacent automobile traffic, density of the network, connectivity, system completeness, and crossings. In the case of transit, considerations of service frequency and bus stop accessibility will also be important. For example, providing for bicycle and pedestrian use along arterials in urban areas would be a high priority, while those uses are not applicable on freeways and therefore no designation is made there.

### MOBILITY AND ACCESS GOALS AND POLICIES

**Goal T.1. Improve mobility and access throughout the region.**

Policy T.1.1. Integrate a balanced, multimodal, regional transportation system.

Policy T.1.2. Apply Complete Street Guidelines to accommodate all appropriate modes of travel in transportation improvement projects.

Policy T.1.3. Transportation systems are consistent with the place type and needs of people.

Policy T.1.4. Provide a continuous transportation system with convenient transfer from one mode to another.

Policy T.1.5. Manage the operation and interaction of all modal systems for efficiency, effectiveness, safety, and to best mitigate traffic congestion.

Policy T.1.6. Provide and promote strategies that increase alternate modes of travel and demand for vehicular travel to reduce peak period traffic.

Policy T.1.7. Coordinate transportation and other public infrastructure investments efficiently to achieve land use and economic goals.

Policy T.1.8. Plan for development to provide on-site, publicly-owned transportation improvements and provide adequate parking.

**Regional Plan Page Edits:**

During the process of understanding how the City can achieve better outcomes for High Occupancy Housing projects, Staff reviewed what types of decisions were not being made consistently or where the plan provided unclear direction for decision-makers. The table in Chapter X that described area-level “Levels of Service” was not providing all the information needed to inform updates to the Engineering Design Standards and Specifications, and ultimately, the adoption of a Transportation Master Plan for the City.

The information on the tables is intended to inform decisions about changes to standards and does not directly change any City policies or ordinances without further action by the City.
### Urban Use Priority and Level of Service (LOS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeways</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>(n/a)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area LOS</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterials</td>
<td>M-H (L)</td>
<td>H (H)</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M-H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H-M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L-M</td>
<td>M-M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectors</td>
<td>M (M)</td>
<td>M (M)</td>
<td>M-H</td>
<td>M-H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H-H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L-H</td>
<td>M-L</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoroughfares</td>
<td>L (M)</td>
<td>L (H)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locals</td>
<td>L (H)</td>
<td>L (H)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H = High Use Priority, M = Medium Use Priority, L = Low Use Priority**

### Suburban Use Priority and Level of Service (LOS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeways</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>(n/a)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area LOS</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectors</td>
<td>M (M)</td>
<td>M (M)</td>
<td>M-H</td>
<td>M-H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H-H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L-H</td>
<td>M-L</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoroughfares</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locals</td>
<td>L (H)</td>
<td>L (H)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rural Use Priority and Level of Service (LOS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeways</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>(n/a)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area LOS</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterials</td>
<td>H (H)</td>
<td>H (H)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H-L</td>
<td>H-L</td>
<td>H-L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectors</td>
<td>H (H)</td>
<td>H (H)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoroughfares</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locals</td>
<td>M (H)</td>
<td>M (H)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H = High Use Priority, M = Medium Use Priority, L = Low Use Priority**

(H) = High LOS, (M) = Medium LOS, (L) = Low LOS

*The H, M, and L ranking show use priority. If the H, M, or L is in parentheses it shows a relative level of service. The LOS for the Automobile category is applied at the intersections or street level; therefore, no Area LOS applies. Area LOS for bicycle, pedestrian, and transit modes is evaluated not on a street by street basis but on an area-wide basis. Consideration of truck traffic is included in the automobile and transit levels of service.*

---

Regional Plan Page Edits:
Changes to this page were made to improve decision making for road improvements and service standards.
RESILIENCY PLANNING GOALS AND POLICIES

**Goal PF.1. Work across all government operations and services to prepare for the impacts of natural and human-caused hazards.**

**Planning**
Policy PF.1.1. Consider climate resiliency and preparedness in community planning and development to be better prepared for changing conditions.

**Operational**
Policy PF.1.2. Allocate available public resources necessary for the City and County to prepare and adapt for natural and human-caused hazards so that all government operations support community resiliency.

Policy PF.1.3. Support evidence-based, ongoing assessment of the region's vulnerability and risk to changes in local climate. Incorporate future climate projections and historic data into emergency operations and hazard mitigation planning efforts.

Policy PF.1.4. Build, sustain, and leverage partnerships with local and regional stakeholders for collective investment, efficient action, and shared responsibility in the building of local resiliency.

**Community Engagement and Education**
Policy PF.1.5. Support proactive communication and education aimed at both residents and governmental operations as a means to build individual, organizational, and community resiliency to weather-related impacts and climate-caused or natural disasters.

Policy PF.1.6. Educate and inform the community about how to cope with climatic variability and what the local government entities are doing on a systemic level.

**Solid Waste**
Policy PF.1.7. Develop strategies and take meaningful steps towards extending the life of the landfill.

The City and County have the opportunity to manage natural and built infrastructure and services to reduce the adverse impacts of a changing climate on government operations. Moreover, the City and County can explore comprehensive strategies to address multiple vulnerabilities. Supporting regional collaborations and adopting a policy that enhances internal preparedness initiatives are possible ways for the City and County to increase its capacity to respond across multiple infrastructure, services, and facilities.

Regional Plan Page Edits:
There are no policies for solid waste even though there is a Regional Plan metric (Appendix D in Regional Plan) for solid waste.
Glossary

Amendments

Major Streets - streets with a functional classification of commercial local, collector, or arterial.

Mixed-Use Development - any urban, suburban, or rural development, or even a single building, that blends a combination of residential, commercial, cultural, institutional, or industrial uses, where those functions are physically and functionally integrated, and that provides pedestrian connections.

Mobility - the degree to which people and goods may move safely, efficiently, and effectively between origins and destinations.

Mode - a means of travel such as pedestrian, bicycle, transit, or truck.

Mountain Link - direct, high-frequency transit service between Woodlands Village, the Northern Arizona University campus, and downtown Flagstaff.

Multi-modal - travel or transportation systems characterized by more than one means or mode of transport.

NAIPTA - Northern Arizona Intergovernmental Public Transportation Authority.

Native American – a member of any of the indigenous peoples of the Americas.

Natural Areas – are open lands left in a primarily natural state that contain significant natural, cultural, aesthetic, or recreational features that warrant protection.

Natural-Caused Hazards - hazards resulting from natural events, such as flooding, subsidence, earth faults, unstable slopes or soils, or severe climatic conditions (e.g., drought, snow, rain, wind) that present a threat to life and property and may necessitate costly public improvements.

Neighborhood – includes both geographic (place-oriented) and social (people-oriented) components, and may be an area with similar housing types and market values, or an area surrounding a local institution patronized by residents, such as a church, school, or social agency.

Noxious Weeds - a legal term applied to plants regulated by state and federal laws. Arizona Administrative Codes (Arizona Department of Agriculture) define noxious weed as “any species of plant that is detrimental or destructive and difficult to control or eradicate and includes plant organisms found injurious to any domesticated, cultivated, native or wild plant.”

Obstruction - any structure or tree that exceeds permissible height limitations or is otherwise hazardous to the landing or taking off of aircraft.

Offices - premises available for the transaction of general business and services including but not limited to professional, management, financial, legal, health, social, or government offices, but excluding retail, artisan, and manufacturing uses.

Open Space - undeveloped or minimally developed lands that have been designated to remain undeveloped, be preserved to protect natural resources, serve as a buffer, and provide opportunities for recreation that requires no facilities. Such recreational uses include walking, trail running, biking, photography, and sitting quietly. Open spaces differ from parks in that open spaces do not have the developed facilities that are traditionally associated with city parks, such as stadium-style lighting, bleachers, playground equipment, and competitive sports fields.

Parks and Recreation Areas – are urban green spaces generally dedicated to active recreational uses.

Regional Plan Page Edits:
Added missing definition to glossary.
Appendix C: Participating Organizations and Individuals

Project Team

**City of Flagstaff:**
- Alan Sanderson
- Alaxandra Pucciarelli
- Brian Kulina
- Carlton Johnson
- Chris Kirkendall
- Christina Rubalcava
- Daniel Folke
- David McIntire
- David Wessel
- Dylan Lenzen
- Elaine Averitt
- Erin Young
- Jeffrey Bauman
- Jennifer Mikelson
- Jenny Niemann
- Jim Janecek
- John Saltonstall
- Joseph Bogart III
- Justyna Costa
- Karl Eberhard
- Kevin Fincel
- Kim Istok
- Margaret Neff
- Mark Sawyers
- Martin Ince
- McKenzie Jones
- Michael Russell
- Neala Krueger
- Neil Gullickson
- Rebecca Sayers
- Reid Miller
- Rick Barrett
- Ryan Darr
- Ryan Roberts
- Samantha Dinning
- Stephanie Sarty
- Steve Zimmerman
- Tamara Lawless
- Tiffany Antol
- Tim Harrington

**Northern Arizona Intergovernmental Transit Authority (NAIPTA):**
- Alicia Becker
- Anne Dunno
- Erika Mazza
- Kate Morley

**Coconino County:**
- Amy Young
- Monique Adakai
- Theresa Kulpinski

**Private Consultant:**
- Marty Rozelle

**City Council**
- Mayor Coral Evans
- Vice Mayor Jaime Whelan
- Councilmember Celia Barotz
- Councilmember Jim McCarthy
- Councilmember Charlie Odegaard
- Councilmember Scott Overton
- Councilmember Eva Putzova

**Planning and Zoning**

**Commission**
- David Carpenter
- John Stigmon
- Ed Dunn
- Margo Wheeler
- Marie Jones
- David Zimmerman
- Kyle Anticevich
- Dr. Alex Martinez

**City Boards and Commissions**
- Bicycle Advisory Committee
- Beautification and Public Art Commission
- Disability Awareness Commission
- Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization Board
- Historic Preservation Commission
- Housing Authority Board
- NAIPTA Board
- Parks and Recreation Commission
- Pedestrian Advisory Committee
- Sustainability Commission
- Transportation Commission
Community Participants

No community planning effort can be successful without the important input from members of the community who take time from their day-to-day lives to participate online, in person and through correspondence. The City of Flagstaff extends our sincerest appreciation for the civic leadership of the individuals listed below and the dozens of other individuals who participated anonymously.

Adrian Skabelvin
Alan Novack
Amy Smith
Andrew Campos
Angel Diaz
Anne Hart
Annie Lutes
Anthony Garcia
April Smith
Ben Koch
Bob Laikin
Brittain Davis
Caleb Alexander
Chad Dragos
Charlie Silver
Connie Kim
Corina Vanek
Crystal Dehoag
CV Wells
Cynthia Mackin

Dana Cesar
Dave Carlile
Dave Rudakewich
David Madrid
David McCain
David Monihan Jr.
David Thompson
Dawn Gardner
Dawn Tucker
Deanna Collins Pelton
Deb Harris
Debbie Shepard
Debra Block
Devonna McLaughlin
Duffie Westheimer
Elisha Dorfsmith
Elsie Jorajuria
Emma McVeigh
Eric Weidinger
Garrison Garcia
Georgia Duncan
Glenn Valdez
Hannah Jane Frost
Hill Hough
James Foulks
Jan Carlile
Janice Sgambelluri
Jeff Goulden
Jen Blue
Jennifer Duis
Jesse Dominguez
Jessica Lazar

Jillian Farrell
Jim Newberry
John Bachrach
John Bower
John McCulloch
Joyce Browning
Kathy Flaccus
Konnie Lawhorn
Krystal Pierce
Kurt Brydenthal
Laura Bustamonte-Myers
Leslie Connell
Lisa Leap
Lisa Mortensen-Hammoudeh
Lynne Corbin
Maddy Sinclair
Marc Murison
Matthew Mitchell
Maury Herman
Maile Adler
Marilyn Weissman
Matt Caskey
Monica Lane
Monika Bentley
Monique Acedo
Morgan Barnes
Nancy Branham
Nicholas Sexton
Peggy Sheldon-Scurlock
Peter Van Wyck
Ramon C Soto
Rick Lopez

Rick Moore
Rick Resnick
Roabie Johnson
Rob Caskey
Roberta Motter
Rodger Sheldon-Scurlock
Rose Houk
Ryn Shuster
Sallie Kladnik
Sean Ryan
Shane McMurphy
Sharon Edgar
Sherman Stephens
Star Kelley
Stephanie Smith
Stephen Irwin
Steve Dorsett
Steve Hallum
Sylvia Colmeneno
Sylvin Breakey
Tia Turs
Tina Caskey
Tish Bogan-Oxmun
Tom Olsen
Tory Syracuse
Tyler Williams
Vanessa Pomeroy
Vicki Granade
Walter Crutchfield
Appendix D: Historic Preservation and HOH

Preservation of historic resources, districts, and neighborhoods was a primary concern raised during public involvement for the HOH Specific Plan. HOH development by its nature will rarely involve the restoration of a historic resource because Flagstaff has few historic buildings of the size that would be required to create the minimum density. However, HOH will be incorporated into areas where there are other historic resources and so its effect on historic context is important. The HOH Specific Plan addresses historic context in a number of ways:

• In Goal 1, addresses the context of Flagstaff’s historic activity centers, which is set by the urban pattern of alleys, blocks, buildings, and civic spaces. This can be protected by removing policy barriers to the reuse of historic buildings, including stormwater and parking requirements, and by requiring new development to preserve and enhance these patterns.

• In Goal 2, the proportion and design of HOH developments and the desire to break up building footprints is highlighted as another tactic to preserve the historic context. In addition, new goals and policies to address the scale of activity centers and their patterns of development were added to the Regional Plan under Goal LU.18.

• In Goal 4, viewsheds and their accessibility from public spaces are emphasized as a way to preserve historic and highly-valued views that set the context for Flagstaff’s development and desirability as a tourist destination.

• In Goal 5, the Regional Plan was amended to add:
  • Policy CC.2.8. In “Historic” activity centers (Downtown and Five Points), prioritize Community Character (CC) and Downtown (LU.11 and LU.12) goals and policies over the Activity Center goals and policies found in LU.18 when considering cases for rezoning.
  • Policy CC.2.9. Strengthen the City’s historic preservation and adaptive reuse programs by increasing funding for further inventories, grants to property owners, and education campaigns, especially where the underlying Zoning for the historic resource put it at risk.
  • Policy CC.2.10. Educate the community and developers on the benefits of adaptive reuse and create policies to incentivize the reuse of historic buildings to maintain their integrity.
  • Policy CC.2.11. Assist businesses and residents, who are caretakers of historic resources, to maximize the economic value of their property without damaging the integrity of the historic resource.
  • Policy CC.2.12. Advertise the economic impact of historic resources and history-related tourism on the Flagstaff community.
  • Policy CC.2.13. When the demolition or removal of a historic structure cannot be avoided, encourage the developer to make the building available for relocation and provide assistance in moving the building to the purchaser’s property, if possible.

• Under Goal 10, the need for greater authority from the State to preserve historic resources was identified.