

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
1	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/20/2017 23:14	I strongly oppose the use of the three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing, especially on the fort valley location. I can acknowledge the housing shortage that is present in Flagstaff, but what makes Flagstaff such a desirable place to live is the awe-inspiring, beautiful nature that surrounds it. As a Flagstaff native who has seen this city grow right before my eyes, I will not stand for building on such a remarkable and iconic piece of land.
2	Name not available		unclaimed	6/20/2017 21:26	I am fully in support of developing these sites for affordable rental housing.
3	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/20/2017 21:15	I am opposed to having affordable housing built on Ft valley road. Lets remember the beauty and nature that this space provides year round. It would be a great dis-service for the community to have housing built on one of the few open spaces left in Flagstaff.
4	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/20/2017 20:48	We need affordable housing in Flagstaff. These projects are important as more and more families who have lived here for generations are being pushed out due to housing prices. It's really important that the bus reaches these particular spots as well.
5	Catherine Weidinger	inside City Limits	registered	6/20/2017 14:11	As a Flagstaff native of 38 years, I have witnessed the changes this town has incurred. The changes have been welcomed and unwelcomed, some subtle and some harsh. Of all the changes proposed and implemented, the suggested Schultz Pass Meadows project tops the unwelcomed and harsh list. While this feedback could very well lend itself to and support the immense opposition others have stated, Iâ€™d like to focus on something that is often overlooked and displaced. Einstein said, â€œLook deep into nature, and then you will understand everything better.â€ For the thousands who find themselves in a daily commute past the proposed site, I would argue that most find a sense understanding, solace and connection to the meadow and to the mountain. In considering the compromise of this parcel, one must also consider the impact on the heartbeat of Flagstaff and the deep connection to nature that so many of its residents feel. While Iâ€™ve always loved living in Flagstaff, I find myself more frequently contemplating a move due to the encroachment of growth in general, but feel especially disturbed by the consideration of this recent proposal. I absolutely support the type of housing suggested; however, I also recognize that not all locations would appropriately serve the needâ€”there simply are more logical and less intrusive places to build such housing. In reflection of the aforementioned quote, a deep consideration of what makes Flagstaff unique and the other logical objections, I urge you to not only leave this parcel untouched by the proposed project, but also implore you to re-zone it as open space. In turn, you will honor and embolden the heartbeat of Flagstaff.

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
6	Name not shown	inside City Limits	unverified	6/20/2017 13:54	I oppose the use of the proposed site on Fort Valley Road for affordable housing. I would support affordable housing projects elsewhere, where natural beauty is not compromised, and where roadways can manage the increase in residents.
7	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/20/2017 13:19	I do not support the proposal for affordable housing at the Fort Valley location for several reasons-and I am a resident who cannot afford to buy a house in this town and use most of my income to pay the exorbitant price of rent. Certainly, this is an iconic Flagstaff location which is deserving of protection as open space, but more than that there are severe traffic problems along the 180 corridor that this proposal would significantly worsen. There is limited city bus service in this area and hours of traffic, especially in the winter months. Until the city reviews the traffic congestion in this area, this proposal should not be considered. Affordability of housing is a huge concern for this town, of course, but constructing a development far outside of downtown requires reliance on a car to get to all amenities (even if this is a mixed use project, there will be even more parking and traffic issues and still not access to all amenities-unless the plan is to turn 180 into the new Milton). Affordable housing should have a high walk score; residents should be able to walk to grocery stores, town, schools and other public resources easily and not have to burn through gas for every errand. The Brookings Institute authored a report outlining important key issues of creating walkable urbanism versus increasing suburban development, Fostering such walkable urbanism is the key to the revival of any struggling downtown. But doing so can be a challenging process, requiring the development of a complex mix of retail boutiques, hotels, grocery stores, housing, offices, artists's studios, restaurants, and entertainment venues. A critical mass of these pedestrian-scale uses must be established as quickly as possible, before the initial revitalization efforts stall for lack of support. This means making certain that visitors can find enough to do for 4 to 6 hours; that residents daily needs can be comfortably met; and that rents and sales prices continue to justify new construction or renovation. Ultimately, reaching critical mass means that the redevelopment process is unstoppable and cannot be reversed. At that point, an upward spiral begins to create a "buzz," increases the number of people on the streets, raises land and property values, and makes the community feel safer. More activity attracts more people which increase rents and property values creating more business opportunity which means more activity and people on the street, and so on. Simply put, in a viable downtown, more is better. This contrasts starkly with suburban development, where more is worse. The lure of the suburbs is lawns, open space, and the freedom to travel by car. But adding more activity brings a geometric increase in automobile trips, more congestion, pollution, inconvenience, and the destruction of the very features that enticed residents and businesses to the suburbs in the first place. This drives the continuous sprawl which makes yesterday's "edge cities" obsolete, as demand and development marches outward to what Robert Lang calls "edgeless cities." In fact, more suburban development nearly guarantees its decline as demand is pushed continuously toward the ever-expanding fringe. I would suggest that the city look into the recently closed SCA plant as an option for mixed use affordable housing development. That location is a much better option, and a large lot which would ensure access of residents to town, schools, amenities, and bus services. Please consider how we want this town to look in the future. It is hard to live here due to the extremely high cost of living, but the community that does lives here for similar reasons including access to beautiful public spaces for outdoor recreation and a vibrant, community based downtown. Flagstaff could be a leader in environmentally and socially responsible development, let's go down that path and not preserve the status quo. Thank you for soliciting public comments.

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
8	Name not available		unclaimed	6/20/2017 12:45	I support the use of the three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing. However, I also encourage the city to help foster affordable home ownership. While these units will help (and be sure to make them family friendly rather focused on individual renters, i.e. students), it is cheaper for my family and I to own (because rental prices are so high) than it is to rent. Consider a down payment program or something similar to help families be more invested in this town. My husband has a full time teaching position at NAU (and I work part-time for CCC and NAU), it was not easy to cover rent. We were paying over the 30% of our income a month on rent that is recommended. It is disheartening when a professor can almost not afford to live in Flagstaff. Part of the problem resides with the university but we need more solutions. The use of this land is one positive step in the right direction.
9	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/20/2017 12:39	I think this would be a much needed initiative to provide more affordable housing in Flagstaff. I think the city could even step it up further and enact more projects like this or create regulations that would encourage higher occupancy living in new apartment buildings within Flagstaff.
10	Name not shown	outside City Limits	registered	6/20/2017 11:28	The site on Fort Valley Road is great except it's barely even in the city limits-I would think people who need affordable housing would want to be closer to amenities, schools, etc.
11	Name not available		unclaimed	6/20/2017 10:26	The best way to bring about affordable housing for Flagstaff is to insure that all people who work are paid a living wage. Building affordable housing projects would be much less necessary when this happens. We will certainly need housing for those who have handicaps and cannot work but full time workers should be able to afford rent or even to buy a house. Another thing that can be done is to help folks with down payments to buy. When citizens own a home, they are taken out of the demand loop for rent.
12	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/20/2017 10:04	I oppose the development at highway 180 and Schultz Pass Road.
13	Name not available		unclaimed	6/20/2017 9:56	We appreciate your asking for input about the affordable housing project at Hwy 187 and Shultz Pass. We agree with the numerous comments posted that this space should remain an one of the few open, undeveloped areas left in and close to the City. This site offers a rich resource for scenery, wildflowers and wildlife. There must be other options which could be best utilized for housing purposes including infill lots which could be utilized by Habitat for Humanity projects. Gary and Jean Thomas (Mt Eldon property owners)

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
14	James Hasapis	inside City Limits	registered	6/20/2017 9:55	I fully support developing the three city owned parcels into affordable rental housing. There is and has been a huge shortage of affordable housing for Flagstaff residents. Too much private development energy has been placed on high end housing and retail development as well as off-campus student housing. It's about time we take our community's needs into perspective and not those of development speculators.
15	Duffie Westheimer	inside City Limits	registered	6/20/2017 9:11	I will not speak to the locations other than to say that everywhere here was once beautiful open space--where each of our homes, businesses, etc. now stand. That said, we need to be thoughtful about what areas we develop so that we maintain Flag's character and quality of life for everyone. In reference to design, whatever is built needs to support the surrounding character, not change it. People have invested in what exists. Smaller living spaces are proven. Lastly, whatever we invest in needs to be affordable for much longer than 30 years--time flies. The City has a Community Land Trust Program set up that can manage properties for an unlimited period of time, use it! CLTs own and steward rental properties. Flagstaff needs to direct developers: build what Flagstaff needs. If they won't do it, we must do it ourselves.
16	Name not shown	inside City Limits	unverified	6/20/2017 8:20	I want to express my strong opposition to the housing project proposed for Fort Valley Rd. This area should be designated open space, as it is one of the most beautiful, picturesque spots in all of Flagstaff for locals and tourists alike to stop, photograph, and take in the beauty of our wonderful town. To take that away would be a great loss. In addition, the extreme traffic issues around this area and the lack of any nearby resources (shopping, etc. are miles away) make this a poor location for consideration. The city should strongly consider protecting this space from any future building to preserve the beauty of this area.

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
17	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/19/2017 15:28	<p>We oppose the affordable housing rental complex at Fort Valley and Shultz Pass Road for the following good reasons. The Mayor has stated that to approve this development it "must fit" with the surrounding neighborhood. It is clear that the proposed structures will not since the surrounding neighborhood is comprised of single family homes. The exception is the group of townhouses next to Cheshire Park. The affordable housing rental complex is still not a fit since the proposal is for rental units where the townhomes are privately owned. The maintenance of the rental units will be compromised from the beginning in order to keep the monthly rental "affordable." The buildings will soon dilapidate like all the other subsidized housing units in Flagstaff resulting in a drop of property values in the surrounding area. This is not fair to the surrounding property owners. Additionally the local residents may experience a rise in the local criminal incidents. Simply search "Siler Homes" on the Daily Sun web site. The City has been promoting in-fill development for the past several years. Now when it's their call they pick a piece of property nearly at the edge of the city limits? Families that need affordable housing may have to rely on walking to stores for their daily needs. Hopping on a bus for an hour (round trip) to get a gallon of milk does not sound practical. The City recently squelched a proposed development near the Elks Club for the reason of preserving the view shed. Why should this be any different? The view from the corner of Fort Valley and Shultz Pass Roads toward the Peaks may be one of the most photographed scenes in Flagstaff. Thousands of locals and tourists stop each year to take pictures of the wildflowers back dropped by the Peaks in autumn color. This view is why parts of the Cheshire (proper) neighborhood are called Peak View Meadows and Peak View Estates.</p>

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
18	Julianne Hartzell	outside City Limits	registered	6/19/2017 14:10	<p>Finding appropriate locations for affordable housing in our community has been going on for many years. Thanks for trying again to take the necessary action to find appropriate places for this housing. Many thoughts and ideas have already been offered as to why not to place this housing in the Fort Valley corridor. This includes traffic and the necessary access to the services usually associated with the location of affordable housing. In doing my research and talking with others, it seems that NIMBY has come up several times. All of Flagstaff is my backyard. This entrance to our community needs to be preserved no matter where one lives. It is now the only place where one can stop and look at the mountain we are known for and enjoy the beauty that it holds as you enter Flagstaff. I strongly support turning this piece of our history into open space. While adding again the thoughts that someone else has submitted: "A contemplative open area that leaves the land largely untouched, with a low-impact walking path and low-key interpretive information about the ecosystem, would be a wonderful way for visitors to make a connection to the Flagstaff setting." My hope would be that if it is decided that this is to be preserved as open space for the community and visitors to enjoy, that in some way it is protected from any future development. I would support the other two suggested pieces for affordable housing because they are within the city and are both close to the necessary services. Traffic problems seem to have also been addressed in those two areas. Though I don't know where this would be, I have often heard in-filling the city. I am aware of pieces of land owned by the city where this might be such a possibility. In closing, please continue to maintain at least one portion of our community where when entering the city we find that beauty that we are known for. Thanks for providing the opportunity for input.</p>

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
19	Emily Musta	inside City Limits	registered	6/19/2017 14:09	Thank you for asking for our feedback about these developments. I will speak to the site that I know the best and have lived close to for most of my life. The Fort Valley site is home to a population of Gunnison's Prairie Dogs (<i>Cynomys gunnisoni</i>) that I have spent time observing with my high school biology classes. We learned about the complex group dynamics of these small mammals, including their vocalizations and keystone aspect in the ecological community. Over the course of observing this population for several years, we watched the site disrupted for pipeline activity. These prairie dogs have persisted despite these disruptions and I hope that the City will consider their habitat as they develop housing plans. A legitimate translocation of these prairie dogs by a trained group is necessary if the area is to be developed. I appreciate this site for the beauty it offers to me as an individual, and yet I acknowledge that a broader plan is not all about me. I hope that the City of Flagstaff can also acknowledge that this site is already home to a population that deserves its consideration.
20	Richard Brown	inside City Limits	registered	6/19/2017 13:54	I oppose the development at highway 180 and Schultz Pass Road. This is a tourist stop when the wild flowers are in bloom and the first view of our town. This parcel of land is bordered on the north side by four natural gas lines, yes 4 natural gas lines, one being a 36" line (three feet in diameter).

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
21	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/19/2017 13:35	I agree Flagstaff needs affordable housing; I agree we need to find a way to ensure all those that are working here in Flagstaff can afford to have a place to call home and not in their car in the woods. Having said this though I don't agree that the Fort Valley lot should be developed. For starters every late summer there is a magical event that happens in that lot that causes countless people to stop and enjoy the colors and views. There are locals and visitors who stop for this view to take pictures and paint. The other concern is how is someone supposed to use a bus system that only comes out to the area 1x every hour and ends by 10PM. This area is not walking distance to shopping or other amenities. I also wonder how this development is going to help the traffic issues that are constantly a concern out in this area. There are no plans to widen 180 so really how can putting more drivers on the road going to help the congestion. The city council allowed the housing that went up across the road from the proposed spot on Fort Valley to go up and approved the 2 story homes against the road which ended the ability to enjoy the iconic view. We all have stayed in or moved to Flagstaff for the reason of beautiful Peaks and open spaces for all of us to enjoy. Honestly there are other pieces of property in this city that would seem to be more appropriate keep this one as open space for all to truly enjoy the view as there is no other location we all can go to and enjoy the beauty within the city limits. I am sure the city has other land they can use instead of this one, let us look at the best interest of the all of Flagstaff and be smart about planning.
22	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/19/2017 13:31	I am a resident of Chesire and I would like to express my thoughts on the Schultz Pass Meadows Project. I would like to see the city re-zone the land for Open Space and not develop the property. There is a high need for affordable housing options in Flagstaff but this is not the location for it. It is not accessible for residents to business services (grocery stores, regular bus service) and has been deemed as having Open Space Value by the Open Space Commission. There are already major traffic issues on the 180 corridor and this would only add to that problem. Thank you for taking the concerns of residents seriously.

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
23	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/19/2017 13:14	Although I do agree that the City of Flagstaff is in desperate need of affordable housing, I strongly oppose any development on the Fort Valley parcel. Others have mentioned the issues of traffic congestion and the reduction of public space and open views, but my main concern is the remote location for potential inhabitants. The Fort Valley parcel is miles away from the nearest grocery store, and even further away from restaurant and entertainment options - many of which are undoubtedly the main source of employment for those seeking affordable housing. The bus line that goes out to Fort Valley & Cheshire only runs once per hour, and service stops relatively early in the evening. As a result, residents of the potential housing complex would be forced to drive (a luxury some will be unable to afford), contributing even more to the poor traffic conditions on Highway 180, or walk. Walking from that parcel to the downtown area takes over an hour. I live in Cheshire, and the public response to this idea has been overwhelmingly negative. I fully support the development of the West St. and Sixth Ave. parcels, but once again, strongly oppose any development on the Fort Valley parcel.
24	Name not available		unclaimed	6/19/2017 12:59	This project would be a great idea. I think flagstaff needs to get more affordable housing options for students because the available housing now is horrendous. The pricing is completely out of range for many and makes it very hard to afford to live up here. I know many people who have had to move back to the Phoenix area and couldn't finish their education because the cost of living is ridiculous up here.
25	Joseph Weidinger	outside City Limits	registered	6/19/2017 12:12	Dear City Council, Thank you for the opportunity to contribute my thoughts regarding the building of affordable housing. There are two reasons that the Schultz Pass Meadows would not be a proper place for affordable housing. 1. There are no services provided in the area for this type of housing. Grocery stores, retail stores, or places of entertainment are not in close proximity to the proposed housing. 2. Traffic. The traffic on highway 180 is dangerously congested already, especially during snow season, adding more traffic because of new housing will put people's lives at great risk. Schultz Pass Meadows should be used for open space. The other two sites for affordable housing are excellent choices for this project. Sincerely, Joe Weidinger

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
26	Marie Jones	inside City Limits	registered	6/19/2017 11:31	<p>I wanted to also support the Fort Valley proposal, but the many thoughtful comments on this webpage make that support harder to give. I think the strongest arguments against it are it's distance from services like grocery shopping and the value of the land to the community as open space. If it were developed at the density recommended, it doesn't seem that traffic would be a significant issue.</p> <p>Specifically regarding the open space issue: if memorializing this parcel as official open space is truly an option, then it should be done with thought and care and the involvement of a naturalist and environmental designer. A contemplative open area that leaves the land largely untouched, with a low-impact walking path and low-key interpretive information about the ecosystem, would be a wonderful way for visitors to make a connection to the Flagstaff setting. If, on the other hand, this parcel were turned down for affordable housing only to be sold in the future for some other kind of sprawling residential project, it might be better to move forward with the affordable housing option. But then the RFP should specifically be written with an eye to preserving as much of the natural quality of the place as possible. Two-story limits aren't enough. It would also need to ensure that natural elements of the site are integrated and preserved, and that the total affect of the development be of belonging to, not disrupting, the landscape. Whether a developer could be found who would take pride in building such a place, prioritizing design over expediency, is hard to anticipate.</p>
27	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/19/2017 9:56	<p>I support the addition of affordable housing. I do think that the traffic comments about 180 are valid, but I also suggest we do not pick and chose, based on income and views who gets to live where. We should have affordable housing opportunities throughout the city. What I would like to bring to everyone's attention is the income threshold. We need to take care of our middle income folks, too. What about our professionals who are making \$30,000 - \$45,000 a year? I know there is a ton of people in this range who struggle to make ends meet, especially single income people. They certainly cannot afford to pay \$1200/month in rent either, but end up spending up to 60% of their annual income on housing which creates the vicious cycle of not being able to save for a down payment on a house. I would strongly encourage that these developments provide for a variety of income levels. This has been the most successful in other cities. It also prevents segregation of the "haves and the have nots." Let's make all areas of Flagstaff appealing and affordable regardless of our paychecks.</p>

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
28	James Foulks	inside City Limits	registered	6/19/2017 9:37	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed location for affordable housing at the Ft. Valley location. While I support and encourage affordable housing options at the other two locations as part of this proposal, and further proposals in the near-future for infill at various locations throughout Flagstaff; the Ft. Valley location proposal is entirely out of character with the surrounding area and will contribute to further negative impacts this area is already facing. First and foremost, any further development along the north Ft. Valley/Hwy 180 corridor is adding to the traffic problem which continues to grow each year. In the winter, the traffic delay's are significant and effectively block-in existing residents preventing timely access to the city. During the school year, traffic delays from traffic backing up at the Elementary School also contribute to this congested travel corridor. When this area was re-zoned over 10 years ago, the traffic congestion impact to Flagstaff residents were not as severe as they are now. This proposal will simply add to that problem. In terms of character, I can not think of a more iconic view of the peaks than the Ft. Valley location in August or after a fresh winter snow. This view welcomes all who see Flagstaff for the first time and is perhaps, one of the most photographed views of the peaks by tourists and residents alike. To block out the view of the peaks by building over this beautiful field with medium density, multi-family units is an affront to what we as Flagstaff residents value most: the preservation of open space. I strongly urge the council to readdress the zoning of the Ft. Valley parcel and preserve it as open-space. Furthermore, I strongly advise the council to continue to seek affordable housing options by pursuing more in-fill projects central to Flagstaff as appropriate.</p>

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
29	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/19/2017 8:20	I agree with all those who oppose housing at the N. Ft. Valley location for several reasons. First, that Road and Hwy 180 simply cannot support any increase in traffic. Because it is the only road to/from town for all residents already there and all visitors who travel it; because it is only two lanes; because the Sechrist School situation greatly slows traffic; because ski traffic in winter and summer visitors to/from the Grand Canyon greatly slows traffic; etc, the reality is that no other housing developments should be considered in that part of town unless and until these traffic related problems are resolved. There are times when it can take 30' to 45' to travel to or from town and that's simply unacceptable in a small town like Flagstaff. We're quickly becoming the northern Phoenix. Moreover, those traffic issues can become dangerous when folks need to get to the hospital or other healthcare providers. Second, as others have stated, those who need affordable housing won't find any of the necessary goods or services they may need access to if they don't have their own vehicles and walking several miles through winter snows (if the bus schedule doesn't meet their needs) is not a wise or safe option. Third, as many others have noted, that parcel of land has become a Flagstaff icon for locals and tourists alike especially when covered with a beautiful blanket of yellow flowers. Flagstaff even uses it to advertise Flagstaff to the world. Do we really want to trash that beautiful spot with the great view of the peaks? The only possible best use for that parcel is as a park without destroying any more of the flowers than necessary. Fourth, since Hwy 89 has a four lane Hwy with access to I-40 to move around town, it occurs to me that might be a better location for housing projects though even the limited goods and services available out there might be an issue. In short, I strongly oppose the construction of any new housing developments out Ft. Valley Rd / Hwy 180.
30	Debbie Leavitt Castleberry	inside City Limits	registered	6/19/2017 8:16	We-the-people need affordable housing in every section of this community. Two on the east side are great; where's the opposition to those locations? Equally, the Fort Valley location is great. Also, there's an empty lot two doors from my Back Yard; that would be okay too, yes 'in my back yard.' THANK COUNCIL for FINALLY starting to deal with this critical community issue!
31	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/19/2017 7:48	I support the proposed affordable housing project. We need affordable places for people to live. People who work at our restaurants, hospitals, etc. I also support the city in spreading it throughout the community. We all live in Flagstaff and we all need to do our part for affordable housing. Thank you to City Council for working on the affordable housing issue.

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
32	Name not available		unclaimed	6/19/2017 7:41	<p>First, this Peak Democracy forum is not user-friendly. It requires me to accept cookies and wants me to sign in as a Peak Democracy member, in which I have no interest. I don't see an option for "show this with my name to Staff only" which seems like the most important option to use. Regarding the proposed affordable housing sites, I believe sites 1 and 3 are in locations that promote access to public transit, grocery shopping, etc. without requiring the use of a vehicle. Site 2 will almost certainly require that the residents have vehicles in order to access work, school, or amenities, and that they drive along Ft. Valley Road, which is already incredibly congested during many seasons of the year. Furthermore, the site is directly in front of an iconic Flagstaff view, both for residents and for visitors arriving from the Grand Canyon, and I think that building a housing compound blocking this view is not appropriate. I do recognize that the parcel behind it is privately owned and could some day be developed, but I do not believe that the City should build housing on this site. It is far from shopping and other amenities and will require residents to drive, which does not promote affordability. It will also contribute to an identified traffic problem in town.</p> <p>Thank you for taking my comments.</p> <p>Karin Wadsack 33 E Trail of the Woods, Flagstaff, AZ 86001 928 699 0112</p>
33	Name not available		unclaimed	6/19/2017 1:18	<p>Affordable housing is a great idea. Now if there were affordable housing places that would be willing to except people who have felonies that are working on straightening their lives out, that would be even better. May even help people succeed more in life, instead of turning back to their criminal ways or the streets. Just food for thought.</p>

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
34	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/18/2017 16:31	No additional housing of any kind should be built at the N. Ft. Valley Rd location for the following reasons: First, that Rd and Hwy 180 can not efficiently support any more traffic due to the fact that it is only 2 lanes; when Secrist School is in session it greatly slows traffic; it is a main thoroughfair to/from the Grand Canyon; and during Ski season the traffic is also horrendous. Two days ago it took me 45 minutes to get from Sam's Club to Cheshire even though it was outside of Ski Season and the school year had already ended. That's unthinkable in a small town like Flagstaff. Unless and until the city either makes that 2 lane road a 4 lane road and/or builds an overpass or tunnel under that road for Sechrist school children or builds another road to that part of town, no more housing should be placed out there - period. Second, the Flagstaff sign across from Cheshire has been used to advertise Flagstaff for decades with the yellow flowers blooming in those fields. It's an icon of sorts which first attracted us to Flagstaff and its the only open green space on that side of town. If it should be put to any use, it should be used as an open park and kept green for its natural beauty with beautiful views of the peaks behind it. Third, with two lanes and access to I-40 from Hwy 89, any new housing should be built in that part of town until the "traffic" issues are permanently solved for Hwy 180 / N. Ft. Valley Rd.
35	Logan Brumm	inside City Limits	registered	6/18/2017 16:21	I am in support of low income affordable housing in Flagstaff. However, the proposed development in Cheshire is poorly placed for many reasons. When building low income housing, the first thing to look at in regard to location is proximity to services. This lot is isolated from everything in Flagstaff. There are no grocery stores, hospitals, employment opportunities, or entertainment options within at least a 3 mile radius. Placing low income housing at literally the last stoplight in town on the edge of forest service land doesn't make sense in any capacity. If the bus line were to increase it's frequency and house, this would not be a problem. However, the Mountain Line has no plans to do either and has questioned decreasing or getting rid of the Cheshire line (route 5). While unlikely, that would be detrimental to those living in a low income housing complex who may not have the luxury of an automobile accessible to them daily (and past 8:45PM when the last bus drops off in Cheshire - much earlier than many jobs get off even). This has nothing to do with the views that would be lost and everything to do with poor placement based on the demographic intended for occupancy.

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
36	Name not shown	outside City Limits	registered	6/18/2017 8:43	<p>Thank you for soliciting public comment. I am writing to request that the council oppose the development along the 180 corridor. I hope that our county supervisors have relayed to you the extreme issues regarding traffic. I hope that the city and county are working together, as the city's decisions greatly impact those of us who live beyond your limits. Since you live and work in the city, you might not have experienced the extreme traffic congestion. Living it on a daily basis, especially in winter, has not only become inconvenient and time consuming - but is actually life threatening in the case of a medical emergency. I avoid the traffic as much as I can, but find myself hoping that no one has an accident, goes into labor, suffers a heart attack, or has a fire or other emergency during the long hours of traffic congestion. In a medical emergency, every moment counts especially during that first golden hour. I support a moratorium on development along the 180 corridor until a plan to address safety issues and transportation is in place.</p> <p>From the information I've reviewed, it appears that there will be no changes by ADOT considered in the foreseeable future. It appears that the purchase and change in zoning of this parcel occurred over ten years ago. The site should be reviewed and updated, since much has changed since 2005. Previous consideration does not include traffic congestion and safety under the limitations. The value of the open space is listed, but I'm not sure if it's considered as a limitation. My hope is that the council views the loss of the open space as a limitation to the proposed site. The beauty of this space has been highlighted by many other public comments. It would seem that zoning of this parcel was changed in 2005, and that it could be changed again. It's current zoning could be changed to preserve its open space. Just because it is currently zoned for building, does not mean that the city must build on it.</p> <p>In addition, I agree with the majority of posts regarding building affordable housing in areas which are closer to resources (grocery stores, medical care, etc).</p> <p>A lot has changed since 2005. Building affordable housing on this parcel does not meet our community's best interests.</p> <p>I support affordable housing and the values espoused by FFF. But the 180 site does not meet FFF's criteria. Please research and find another parcel which can be added to the other two proposed sites to maintain a livable community.</p>

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
37	Name not shown	outside City Limits	registered	6/17/2017 14:00	<p>I believe that the housing development that is being proposed on the corner of 180 and Shultz Pass road is not right for the city of Flagstaff. I have several reasons, which I will list here, as to why the development should be located elsewhere in Flagstaff.</p> <p>1) The view of the Peaks across the Stilley Ranch field, filled with wildflowers, is iconic to Flagstaff. The view is so iconic that the City of Flagstaff uses that image for its website! This area is enjoyed by all Flagstaff residents and tourists alike. I live close to the corner and I see hundreds of people stopping for photographs throughout the summer. It is the gateway to the greater Flagstaff area for everyone traveling on 180 to visit the Peaks and the Grand Canyon! A development on that corner does not convey respect for the beauty of our home.</p> <p>2) If ADOT would ever like to put in a roundabout to help with the traffic flow on Fort Valley Road, they will need some of that land to allow for enough space to install a roundabout. If that space is limited by structures, the growth of the highway will be limited, forever grid locking the tourists and residents during wintertime travel.</p> <p>3) Traffic and parking will be an issue. More commuters from the area will increase traffic on 180. The traffic on 180 is already a deterrent for travelers and residents. There is also no parking allowed on 180 or Shultz Pass Road. Where will the residents and their visitors park?</p> <p>4) Developing that parcel of land does not respect the private landowner who preserves this incredible area for us. What does the development of this area, as high density housing, communicate to the Stilley family? How does this encourage them to continue to preserve their land (the actual field just behind the small acreage that is city owned) instead of develop it themselves? Please reconsider the plan to build on this iconic corner!</p>
38	Name not shown	inside City Limits	unverified	6/17/2017 12:13	<p>I believe that the proposed affordable rental housing development on Fort Valley road is a mistake and that the city should not be involved in this type of housing project . Also the proposed location is just not right for this kind of concept. What about all the folks who have invested in single family homes in this area the new proposal just doesn't fit with existing homes I , as a Flagstaff taxpayer strongly oppose this project and urge our city council to reject it!</p>

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
39	Name not shown	outside City Limits	registered	6/17/2017 7:54	I've lived here for over 30 years and in my opinion Flagstaff is being ruined with projects like the Marriott, the Hub and the Loft - with even more development yet to come. I adamantly oppose affordable housing on the Schultz Pass road / highway 180 parcel. The other 2 parcels make much more sense as they are closer to everything one would need - shopping, groceries, etc. Many reasons have already been stated - traffic, distance from town, wrong location to name a few, and I agree with them all. This parcel has a beautiful view of the peaks and is used by locals and tourists alike to admire them during all four seasons. When the sunflowers are in bloom, there is a gorgeous field of yellow which would be blocked from view. The highway 180 corridor traffic is already problematic without adding more housing and therefore traffic to the apparently unsolvable problem. Additionally, the high pressure pipeline under the property limits the amount of space that could be used for construction, so the only way to build would be up - 2 and 3 story buildings - totally contrary to the neighborhood environment already in place. Flagstaff is already building like crazy which is adding to the traffic congestion everywhere. This parcel needs to be protected as open space, just as the city did with their 20 acre parcel on Elden Lookout Road not long ago. Preserve these little islands of openness!!! Once they're gone, they are gone for good, and land is the single thing that we can't make more of.
40	Name not shown	outside City Limits	registered	6/16/2017 18:59	With traffic on Hwy 180 being as heavy as it is, it does not make sense to add to the problem with affordable housing being built on the Hwy 180 site.
41	Name not shown	outside City Limits	registered	6/16/2017 15:53	I am totally against the affordable housing proposed at the 180 address. Are the reasons not obvious, views, taxing of water resources, traffic congestion. The traffic is atrocious now, what are you thinking. There are so many other eyesore areas in Flagstaff that need to be revived why are you not looking at this. I have paid a lot of money to live out here and enjoy the views and quietness of the area, and I continue to pay a lot in taxes. This is the worst idea you could have come up with. It stinks just like that hotel you allowed on Humphries. You are ruining this town.
42	Name not available		unclaimed	6/16/2017 15:53	As a homeonwer off of Schultz pass road, please do NOT add anything that will put more congestion on 180 until you figure out how to deal with the snow play/tourist traffic. It's terrible! I get that affordable housing is needed....but please find somewhere else until this other problem is figured out....because it IS a problem! Thank you!

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
43	Wayne Anderson	outside City Limits	registered	6/16/2017 14:34	I respectfully share a no with the project on 180. Even the front page of the City's web site showcases this area in pictures. At some point let's be good stewards and preserve some of the best green space. In addition, let's build high density housing in walking and biking distance to downtown. Highway 180 and downtown already are bursting with traffic congestion. Thank you.
44	Name not available		unclaimed	6/16/2017 14:15	The spot planned on Fort Valley would be shameful to develop as affordable housing. This is a great open space that should remain open.
45	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/16/2017 13:57	I was born and raised in Flagstaff. A huge part of me and my family staying here is the wonderful open space and views that we have. With all the high rise hotel, student housing and building on the mesa, Flagstaff is losing his charm. I am opposed to the affordable housing proposed off Schultz Pass Rd. Many are aware of the beautiful field of yellow flowers that grow every year. However the truly important issues include adding to traffic that is already terrible through this corridor, the fact that the proposal would cram five buildings into a three acre parcel (the small amount of housing there wouldn't have a significant impact on the cost of housing in Flagstaff) and the lack of nearby resources. The bus only runs once an hour. How would the residents be able to travel into town and to get to work? Lastly, some of us have stayed in Flagstaff, gone to school and worked hard to afford to buy land and enjoy this beautiful view. Why is it fair that others get subsidized housing to get the same view? I urge the council to vote no on this proposal. Please stop trying to turn Flagstaff into Phoenix.
46	David Menotti	outside City Limits	registered	6/16/2017 13:50	You guys let these college kids increase the minimum wage and now you wish to have affordable accommodations in Flagstaff? You can't have it both ways. Why on Earth would accommodating certain people be a good idea when The rest of us are paying over \$300k to live in this area? Absolutely not. Let's move on to things that will actually help people like lowering that minimum wage so daycare isn't \$1000 per month. Maybe of people saved in other areas they could afford housing.

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
47	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/16/2017 13:35	I am completely opposed to the proposed affordable housing projects in particular the one located at Fort Valley and Schultz Pass Road. The Fort Valley Road project is too far from town and available services such as grocery stores and schools. It would greatly impact the already terrible traffic conditions of Fort Valley road. In addition it would destroy one of the most iconic Flagstaff views of the Peaks. If the city is truly concerned with the cost of housing/living here are many simple things it could do to alleviate this situation such as allowing the people to vote on the repeal of the of the economically destructive minimum wage law in a timely fashion, as well as not increasing the property taxes which contribute to the high cost of housing in this community. Its time that the city make sacrifices rather than continue to burden its citizens.
48	L FARELLA	outside City Limits	registered	6/16/2017 13:23	The Fort Valley entrance into Flagstaff is the only entrance that isn't cluttered with several level hotels, strip malls and big box stores. Instead of apartments in that area I would recommend a park. People are always parking on the first curve on Schultz Pass Rd to take pictures and enjoy the view. Adults, children, dogs, are standing around their parked cars oblivious of the hazards to themselves and to local car, bike, and pedestrian (especially school children) traffic. An area that provides parking, tables, rest rooms, and even a playground would be a great spot for people to gather and take in the view of the Peaks. I understand this recommendation does not solve the housing problem and it does not bring in income. It does welcome local people and visitors to Flagstaff with it's beauty and oh yes, the Museum is just across the road.
49	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/16/2017 12:29	I do not support this proposal. Single family homes for families not apartments, condos, and town homes are what is needed here in Flagstaff!!! I really hate that the city wants to own the land for these programs. It is a shame that working families have no options to buy and rent keeps rising!!! As an NAU employee and single income family, it is very difficult to live in this town. I am not in support of more complexes. I wish the city would work with NAU and develop some options for staff and faculty. Rent and housing prices are outrageous and no one on city council or at the University wants to address this problem. As neighborhoods are being gentrified, the poor are being pushed out and families have no place to live. If there is no solution there will continue to be families left without any options and more wealth disparities in the community and more employee turnover at NAU.

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
50	Russ Bull	outside City Limits	registered	6/16/2017 11:37	I've lived in this area for 16 years, and do not support "affordable housing" on this land. My experience is that affordable house usually entails poor quality construction such as Railroad Springs where these affordable homes now sell for 1/4 million dollars. Affordable housing is a way to make a fast buck on the backs of the economically disadvantaged. Thousands of tourists currently visit this area to observe nature's beauty and "affordable housing" will undoubtedly change that dramatically. If you continue to detract from Flagstaff's scenic value, the growth you desire may diminish. Please preserve our real treasure and avoid the quick buck. Russell B. Bull
51	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/16/2017 10:22	Affordable housing is clearly an issue in Flagstaff but the location for the development is poorly chosen for several reasons: 1) This is a highly congested area and adding additional housing adjacent to the roadway will only add to this problem and limits the ability to widen 180 in the future, 2) this is one of the most aesthetically emblematic locations of Flagstaff and would be much better preserved as open space because it draws locals and visitors to view the peaks and sunflower field, and 3) I would imagine that to have an 'affordable' housing project in Flagstaff, the project site would have to be fairly cheap to develop. This area has highly expansive clay soils which increase the cost of development. Also, wouldn't it be more economical to develop a larger parcel with more housing? This parcel is rather small and would not accommodate a very large number of units.
52	Name not shown	outside City Limits	registered	6/16/2017 9:26	The sign inviting public input for public housing on the corner of Schultz Pass and 180 is very badly placed, as it is placed immediately behind a large utility pole and virtually hidden from view. There are no other signs for the Ft. Valley residents who live within the city limits to see - this is no way to elicit public comment. The proposed development on Ft. Valley and Schultz Pass Road is a bad idea for multiple reasons. This parcel has a buried gas pipeline at its back. Poor families should not be so closely subjected to this risk. The traffic on 180, especially in the winter, is terrible. This development would increase the congestion. The parcel is not within walking distance to employment or shopping. The corner is part of the scenic view of the Peaks from the homes in Chesire and 180 and should remain a green zone.

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
53	Name not available		unclaimed	6/16/2017 8:09	I'm a current resident of public housing. It's been a goal of mine to get out. I'm a single mom of 1 child, I work 2 jobs and I go to school full time. To rent a 2 bedroom can range about 900 for poor conditions to 1200 and up for better living conditions. If you look at Lake Havasu or Phoenix rent can be a low at 400. However I can't just get up and move. I have friends who live at the Grove and to know so many new developments are being built for students breaks my heart. I wish I could live at the Grove where they have a nice pool, free hot chocolate, free coffee, free arcade room. The Grove and all those new apartments by the Grove don't have affordable housing. Building affordable apartments in areas where Public transportation is hardly accessible is not good. Will new roads be built to help with the traffic during ski season? Maybe the city can work out an agreement with these new student housing to offer affordable housing for someone who is single with only 1 kid.
54	Mike Hudson	inside City Limits	unverified	6/15/2017 20:50	Putting affordable housing on 180 would be a huge mistake. The road is already woefully inadequate to handle current traffic and the proposed area attracts a great deal of tourists. <u>Housing here would be a terrible move.</u>
55	Chuck Dryden	inside City Limits	registered	6/15/2017 20:31	I'm skeptical that the proposed "Affordable" housing projects will have any significant effect on the very high cost of housing in Flagstaff. The site on Fort Valley Road is especially poorly chosen. Construction of a medium- or high-density project there will obliterate one of the City's best-used and most attractive open spaces and it will aggravate already serious traffic problems, especially during ski season. I'm opposed to the project on Fort Valley Road. I hope the City's review of the many thoughtful objections presented here will lead it to reconsider at least that portion of the overall plan.
56	Name not available		unclaimed	6/15/2017 20:07	The housing project on Fort Valley Road was originally approved in 2005. We did not have the unbelievable traffic gridlock on the 180 corridor. The City should have a moratorium on all development until, when, or if the 180 corridor and the City streets have been widened and we have infrastructure that can fix the problem. I have lived on this corridor for 36 years. Enough is enough.
57	Name not available		unclaimed	6/15/2017 19:54	I feel that the site on Forry valley road is not a good place for affordable housing. It requires a person to have transportation and it is harder to get groceries, etc. It is also part of the view that will be obstructed for tourists.

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
58	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/15/2017 18:36	More affordable housing options are incredibly needed in Flagstaff. I am very sorry to see the Sunflower field go as it is a fantastic viewing spot for the brilliant yellow and view of the peaks. I am glad to see that the recommendation there is to only go to 2 stories. Are there any options for brownfield re-use elsewhere? The Big-Lots parking lot is huge and largely empty - it seems like something creative could be re-envisioned there, or the old San Francisco school site, or the property near the AquaPlex that the City owns at 4th Street and Rte 66 (currently designated commercial - don't we already have enough Commercial property?). Thanks for soliciting feedback.
59	Name not available		unclaimed	6/15/2017 18:06	These are great ideas and will certainly be helpful to low income families. However, it will not be helpful when rent is based on income and all your income is taken for rent. Flat based rent is also a hardship for families. It is hard to get ahead or save money for emergencies, etc. All-in-all it is helpful for those who do not abuse this privilege.
60	Janet Dowling	outside City Limits	registered	6/15/2017 18:03	We moved to Flagstaff because we thought this community, unlike so many others, valued open space and limited development - especially in areas with scarce water and narrow, two-lane roads. We are shocked and disgusted that City politicians, against the will of most residents, are even considering using the beautiful open parcels on 180 for dense "affordable" housing which is very unlikely to benefit the City's poorest residents. Traffic on 180 is already a nightmare for residents and visitors alike during the winter season, and there is no plan to fix it. Further, we are deeply troubled that our community's elected officials ignore the impact on scarce water resources, the groundwater impact from more sewage systems, and further degradation of Flagstaff's vaunted but disappearing "dark sky". This sort of bad idea is what we'd expect from California officials. The solution - improve run-down existing neighborhoods in the more affordable areas of Flagstaff; allow infill and extra units in places that are dense already, and require the hospital and University to provide more housing for their employees and for students. We are sad that what we came here for is being thrown away while the City's and County's existing roads and infrastructure are so badly in need of investment and improvement. Janet Sands (Mrs. Edgar L. Sands)

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
61	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/15/2017 16:20	The only site I think is inappropriate for affordable housing is the location by 180 and Schultz Creek Pass. I support the other sites. 180 is a heavy trafficked road and this will not help. As a resident of Flagstaff for 30 years and live in Cheshire the 180 cannot handle any more multi-unit housing. This location is also a staple of Flagstaff, often photographed by tourists. I understand you need three locations (or perhaps a certain number of housing units) to qualify for some sort of assistance or subsidy. I also agree that Flagstaff needs affordable housing, but I would highly recommend finding another location.
62	Name not shown	outside City Limits	registered	6/15/2017 16:16	While I support affordable housing in proper settings, I am strongly opposed to the development of the parcel of land off 180 at Shultz Pass Rd. This is a highly enjoyed scenic landmark by locals and tourists alike that flock to this landmark every year during peak wildflower season, as well as for winter photos. Flagstaff is known for its natural beauty and this area is one of the most iconic locations on our beautiful town. Why would you ruin that by building more housing, and disappoint all of its visitors? Additionally, Fort Valley is not an appropriate area for subsidized housing that requires proper public transportation, suitable road and traffic conditions throughout the year, and proper access to businesses and services. I strongly urge you to utilize the other two locations outlined in the proposal and leave our beautiful corner as open land for everyone to continue enjoying. Thank you!
63	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/15/2017 13:42	As a community member and a participant in the social service field, I fully support the development of more affordable housing.
64	Name not shown	outside City Limits	registered	6/15/2017 13:13	The only site I think is inappropriate for affordable housing is the location by 180 and Schultz Creek Pass. As a resident of Baderville, the 180 cannot handle any more multi-unit housing. This location also is a treasured open space, often photographed by visitors and featured in materials and online by the CVB. The public transportation to and from this location is bad at best, and does not qualify as a walkable community due to the distance from retail and services. I understand you need three locations (or perhaps a certain number of housing units) to qualify for some sort of assistance or subsidy, but this is the WRONG location. There must be a dozen more appropriate locations where building affordable housing would actually improve the property rather than destroy it.

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
65	Kerri Strunk	inside City Limits	registered	6/15/2017 13:02	<p>Please do not move forward with the housing development on 180. It is not an appropriate use for that plot of land. Just because there is an empty parcel available, does not mean we need to race each other there to develop on it. Don't get me wrong, I'm a 31 year old resident of Flagstaff, I've lived here my whole life and I'm having a difficult time affording a home myself. I fully understand the struggles and sacrifices we make financially to enjoy the beauty of our little mountain town. I just don't believe this would be an answer to the housing problem. The location for one, is not easily accessible. Someone who might end up living in those affordable housing units may not have a personal owned vehicle. You're placing them all the way out there to rely on public transportation. Also, in the past few years with the increased traffic to Snowbowl with their guaranteed ski season with artificial snow making, new lifts and the snow play area out at wing mountain - why would you want to develop further and add to the problem? The affordable housing on Izabel actually places residents within walking distance to so many other amenities - schools, restaurants, gas stations, dr. offices, parks, and mainly the Safeway grocery store on Cedar. Why not continue to develop the areas IN TOWN that could really use the face lift and revitalization and allow the people who end up living in them access to what they really need? Flagstaff needs to get a handle on these developments, and quick. We need to stop and think what we want to be and look like 20 years down the road...50 years...a 100 years from now. Instead of eagerly eating up property as quickly as we can. And do I really need to talk about how that area is a Flagstaff icon? Residents have been enjoying its beauty for years and years. Some things should just be left untouched.</p>
66	LeAnn Finney	inside City Limits	registered	6/15/2017 12:48	<p>Please consider carefully the proposal for housing on Fort Valley Road. My greatest concern is that it is on Fort Valley Rd that is already heavily travelled and way past it's capacity. Until there is a solution for another route to Snow Bowl there is no need to add further traffic. The other two sites are very appropriate for new housing but not this one.</p>

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
67	Ryan Nelson	inside City Limits	registered	6/15/2017 12:47	As a new resident of Cheshire and a long-time resident of Flagstaff I am strongly and emphatically opposed to the development of Schultz Creek Road and Highway 180. While I agree with essentially everyone posting here that affordable housing is indeed a crisis and needed in Flagstaff, this site needs to be preserved and remain undeveloped. While this parcel of land is ready for easy development due to gas lines, zoning, etc. etc., it's also a relatively small piece of land that is not ideally suited for multi-site housing once considerations are made for distance from the road, parking, and actual usable area. Furthermore, considerations with regards to traffic congestion, limited public transportation to this area, and distance from areas of employment and services make the location undesirable for affordable housing. The land is however highly regarded in it's value for tourism, not only for people visiting in person, but also as one of our most scenic viewpoints that is used in multiple promotional photographs of beautiful Flagstaff. I have witnessed marriage proposals, graduation & prom pictures, and families taking pictures of their newborn children at this location due to its beauty. Developing this land would only serve to tarnish one of Flagstaffs truly incredible and accessible scenic viewpoints. I urge the city council to listen to the voices of the public who are overwhelmingly against the development of this land to look for other solutions that will better serve the public, including both those that want our beautiful land preserved and those that need access to affordable housing.
68	Michael Caulkins	inside City Limits	registered	6/15/2017 11:41	My name is Dr. Michael Caulkins, and I am a resident of Flagstaff. I believe that Flagstaff is in desperate need of good affordable rental housing, and this proposal helps to fill that need. I think the 3 city-owned parcels are well situated and will help make our community more livable. I urge city council, and community members, to support this project!
69	Sofia Nicoletti	outside City Limits	registered	6/15/2017 11:02	Increasing congestion on Highway 180 by building low income housing on Ft. Valley Road is a very bad idea. The traffic, especially in winter, is already a nightmare for residents. The city and county have not come up with a viable solution to this problem; why make it worse? The only sensible thing is to take this site off the table. I would recommend leaving this parcel as a green space or park; it is an iconic site for viewing the Peaks - I always see people there taking photos, whatever the weather. Any development would simply be another example of poor planning and a disregard for the master plan for the Ft. Valley corridor that is supposed to be in place. This plan, as I understand it, calls for low density use/development of the land along Ft. Valley Road.

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
70	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/15/2017 10:53	<p>I am seeing a lot of comments here regarding disapproval of further development and construction. I would like to ask these people what they think will happen if we build an affordable housing development elsewhere? Development and construction is necessary in order to provide the number of housing units needed for Flagstaff's most vulnerable. I am in support of this affordable housing development, ESPECIALLY in the area of Schultz pass. I am in support because affordable housing is already scarce in Flagstaff, and we have an incredibly high homeless population in need of a place to live. Our shelters and current affordable housing units do as much as they can, but they cannot keep up with the demand. The Schultz Pass property has been zoned for affordable housing for more than ten years, and is therefore not a designated open space. While I do believe that open space is important, I think in this particular case, it is more important to cater to the needs of Flagstaff residents, who, without housing, are more likely to be sick, injured, experience violence, and die than folks with a home.</p> <p>The Schultz Pass property is the largest of the three parcels, and provides the greatest potential for the most homes. We must realize that this development will not be the same as the HUB, Freemont Station, or any other High Occupancy Housing Unit Development built to maximize profits. This is affordable housing, and is catering to a need that Flagstaff has been trying and failing to meet for decades. The cost of housing in Flagstaff is 40% higher than the national average, and with a minimum wage that has only just increased, and the inflation that has come along with it, we are not likely to see a reduction of rent prices anytime soon. As for the view of the Peaks, the City Council has already agreed to restrict the development to two stories high. We MUST consider the needs of the people here. While it may increase traffic, or take up space, we have to put those issues aside and understand that we are talking about people's lives here. Are we really going to deny dozens of low income families access to housing, and therefore food, safety, and security, because it might slightly inconvenience their better-off neighbors? Flagstaff doesn't have many more options to go with affordable housing. I think we should take every opportunity we can to provide for Flagstaff's most in-need.</p>

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
71	Eric Weidinger	inside City Limits	registered	6/15/2017 10:46	The city has the right idea of adding affordable housing in Flagstaff. However, by adding homes along 180 is not a logical spot for such a development for several reasons: As a resident of Flagstaff for 25 years this spot is Flagstaff's most iconic spots having a beautiful meadow in front of the peaks. This spot to me is a historical landmark due to the natural beauty it creates and how it symbolizes Flagstaff. There are multiple major gas lines that run through the parcel with the corresponding gas easement that splits the housing design from the north to the south. Lastly, Adding more vehicles to an already congested roadway with only one way in and out does not make sense to me. Emergency vehicles have a hard enough time maneuvering through a congested roadway during the winter season and it would seem best fit not continue to add risk to a risky situation.
72	Name not shown	inside City Limits	unverified	6/15/2017 10:44	I'm someone who definitely needs affordable housing and that area by Fort Valley would be really nice. It's already too crowded in Sunnyside.
73	Name not available		unclaimed	6/15/2017 10:22	I strongly support this proposal. These parcels were thoughtfully chosen and I was happy to see staff talking about how best to ensure they fit into the neighborhoods where they will be going.
74	E. Dru Monroe	inside City Limits	registered	6/15/2017 10:16	I am writing to strongly support the proposal to develop more affordable housing at the three parcels on city owned land on West St., N. Fort Valley Road and E. Sixth Ave. I have been working since 2011 with the HUD-VASH program in Flagstaff. This program partners with the City of Flagstaff Housing Authority to house formerly homeless veterans in a Section 8 apartment. Our VA staff offer case management and therapy services to these veterans to assist them in recovering from homelessness. Due to our success with housing homeless veterans and the generosity of the City of Flagstaff Housing Authority, our program has grown from 25 to 106 vouchers since 2011. Over the past three years, our program has had increasingly bigger problems finding affordable nice housing units for our veterans. To date, we have veterans with a HUD-VASH Section 8 voucher who continue to live in the woods and at shelters while they unsuccessfully search for a home. Some give up and move on unfortunately. We desperately need more housing choices for our clients in Flagstaff. Particularly this summer we are finding that the few apartments that come available are usually over the payment standard allowed by Section 8 or the landlord is unwilling to rent through Section 8. The current tax credit properties report yearlong or more waiting lists for one and two bedroom units, which are the primary need of our client population. I thank Sarah Darr for her efforts to find long-term solutions to this ever growing problem.

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
75	Name not available		unclaimed	6/15/2017 9:29	The Ft Valley plan is not compatible with the site. The area already has traffic congestion, nearly a blind corner and poor soil to build on. This is a view shed that will be spoiled by these ugly buildings. Lack of Affordable Housing is a due to greed of developers, property owners and gentrification of Flagstaff's once work force town turned rich folks mecca.
76	Name not shown	outside City Limits	registered	6/15/2017 8:57	While I agree that Flagstaff needs affordable housing, it makes absolutely no sense to increase the already congested Highway 180 corridor with multiple housing units. It is a one way in and one way out access. This area already cannot handle the existing traffic.

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
77	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/15/2017 8:38	<p>For all the challenges the Schultz Pass site will raise if it's approved and built as it's currently being presented, these very challenges Friends of Flagstaff's Future (FFF) outlines and doesn't support in their mission and vision statement on their website. Councilwoman Eva Putzova was on their board of directors and president for a combined five years, so we would assume her values are closely aligned to FFF's. FFF promotes smart growth: There are limited resources on the 180 HWY for this new development. Winter traffic issues are peaking. The other two parcels are flanked by many day-to-day resources residents need both a short drive away (.3 or less) or highly walkable. It's nearly 2.5 miles from Scultz Road to Humphrey's to the closest grocery store [Basha's], and the Mountain line bus comes hourly on this route. Thus it might take a resident using the bus more than 2 hours to access groceries for their family. This is not a walkable community. FFF promotes the preservation and protection of open spaces in city limits: While previously zoned multi-housing, this is a much cherished open space by local residents and visitors - enjoyed and photographed by thousands annually. it's even regularly used in Flagstaff CVB marketing to Flagstaff visitors. FCVB FFF believes growth should not be a burden on the community: There is no plan in place to expand the two-lane highway along the 180 corridor in Flagstaff City limits. FFF believes residents and concerned citizens should have as much influence on the process as the property owners: We're happy the City is inquiring for public opinion, but have they already decided and approved this project internally. Friends of Flagstaff's Future supports policies that promote smart growth, including compact development, mixed uses, historic neighborhood preservation, and walkable neighborhoods. We believe that infill and redevelopment projects should result in "No Net Loss" of affordable housing. We support limiting our growth to the availability of our water resources and promoting the preservation and protection of open spaces within city limits. We believe that growth should pay for itself and should not be a burden on our community. We support development fees which cover the costs of growth, not just for police and fire protection but for all infrastructure including new roads, water and sewer expansion. We believe that, through the discretionary zoning review process, neighbors and other concerned citizens with an interest in the health of the whole community should have as much influence on the process as the property owners, developers and business interests who profit from these changes.</p>

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
78	Name not shown	outside City Limits	registered	6/15/2017 7:36	It is not logical to put low income housing on 180 and Shultz Pass for several reasons. If the family's are low income, why would you ensure they have additional transportation expenses as it is far from shopping and work? In addition, 180 is so congested an ambulance can't get through in the winter time. Everyone would be better served to sell the land as a single parcel that can not be subdivided and utilize the funds for additional low income housing in the proper location, close to the convenience of public transportation. Low income housing is needed, but in the proper location , where the recipients can benefit the most with the least overall expense.
79	Kathy Harper	outside City Limits	registered	6/15/2017 6:57	I think building low income housing at this location is a poor choice for numerous reasons. 180 has serious congestion problems as well as safety concerns with a neighborhood on a main drag! There is no walking access to grocery stores etc in the area. That parcel is pristine land and is a gateway viewpoint to Flag! I support low income housing in Flag (badly needed) but NOT on this particular parcel!
80	Lorin Peterson	outside City Limits	registered	6/15/2017 4:41	I am strongly opposed to the development of the Ft. Valley/Schultz Pass property until/unless the problem with snow play traffic in the winter is resolved. The last thing we need is more traffic and more congestion in this area. As I write this, the daily news headlines are filled with the story of a high rise building fire in London where many people died as a result of known hazards which had been repeatedly reported but never acted on. Does the same tragedy have to happen on Ft. Valley road before government agencies respond? Create a bypass via the Flagstaff Ranch or A-1 Mountain exits and I'll support this recommendation. Until then, you are guilty of adding to the dangerous situation.

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
81	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/14/2017 22:30	I am writing to comment on the proposed building of affordable housing at 180 and Schultz pass road. I am deeply sympathetic to the plight of the working poor in Flagstaff. Rent here is astronomically high and we certainly need more affordable housing options. However, building a large housing complex or cramming high density housing on that corner is a recipe for trouble. There simply is not any infrastructure along Highway 180 to support a large development. Traffic is no longer a problem just for the winter time, although that is a serious headache, but when Sechrist school dismisses, or a tree needs to be trimmed or any sort of construction along 180 now causes major delays.If there is to be affordable housing at that corner it must be very carefully designed, single story, low density housing that fits with the beauty of that setting. An iconic setting that draws people from all over the state should not be used haphazardly but should be thoughtfully designed to blend with the natural surroundings. Please do not continue down the road of large construction projects that are changing the very character of our city. Flagstaff's open space is why so many people feel it is worth the economic sacrifice to live in Flagstaff. Thank you for your serious consideration of this matter.
82	Allie Cole	outside City Limits	registered	6/14/2017 21:58	** I AM NOT OUTSIDE CITY LIMITS ** Rental property built at Ft Valley/Schultz Pass Rd would be tragic!! That open space is a treasured green space. Locals and tourists all take photos with the Flagstaff sign and even more so when the field is covered in sunflowers. We can absolutely not build on that precious piece of land!! Also the massive traffic congestion in that area has yet to be solved. The city can NOT intentionally add more residents and even more traffic to an already overwhelmed area. It doesn't make sense for the new potential residents either to be so far away from town. It's such a BAD idea from all angles!!!
83	Name not available		unclaimed	6/14/2017 21:16	Please do not build at the gorgeous site of 180/Schultz Pass road. The view of the peaks from here is a Flagstaff local and visitor favorite. Please utilize other sites you have available.

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
84	Charles Mars	inside City Limits	unverified	6/14/2017 20:28	<p>My wife and I are home owners and residents of the Cheshire neighborhood on Fort Valley Road. Recently, we learned of a proposal to build an affordable rental housing project on the corner of Fort Valley Road and Shultz Pass. We do not want to see this city parcel developed at all and that if the Council takes it off the table that it should then re-zone it as Open Space so that future Councils will be very unlikely to sell it to a private developer, which could lead to an even more dense and incompatible project on the site. We have four reasons for this position. First, traffic is already extremely heavy on Fort Valley road, as it serves as the only artery to the Snow Bowl and the Grand Canyon. The traffic congestion already creates difficulties for local residents. Development of any sort would only contribute to these conditions. Therefore, this parcel should be left vacant in the absence of a solution to existing traffic conditions. Second, this stretch of Fort Valley Road is on the migratory path of the local elk herds. Developing this land would apply additional stress to the elk population. In turn, this could lead to consequences such as elk herds being forced to move through already developed areas, leading to safety and property concerns. Therefore, this property should not be developed until adequate study has been done on the environmental impact. Third, the Fort Valley Road/Shultz Pass area already contains several developments of upper income properties. The presence of a n affordable rental housing project would certainly force property values down, placing a burden on existing property owners trying to leverage or recoup their investments. This property should not be developed as it financially harms the existing community. Finally, this parcel of land is less than ideal for affordable rental housing. It sits at the extreme northern edge of the city boundaries, far from potential places of employment. Even with the bus route, residents would face a long and difficult commute to work. This property should not be developed as it does not fit the needs of the community it is intended to serve. We are dismayed at the lack of transparency surrounding this proposal. The information posters placed at the corner of fort Valley Road and Shultz Pass were removed Monday, June 5th. I had to go to City Hall to get a copy. The electric sign on the parcel was not operational until June 12th, fifteen days before the council meeting where this will be discussed. The city has done a poor job of engaging the community on this important issue. My wife and I will be attending the June 27th meeting to reinforce our concerns about the proposed affordable rental housing project at the corner of Fort Valley Road and Shultz Pass. As stated above, we do not want to see this city parcel developed at all and that if the Council takes it off the table that it should then re-zone it as Open Space so that future Councils will be very unlikely to sell it to a private developer, which could lead to an even more dense and incompatible project on the site.</p>
85	Name not shown	outside City Limits	registered	6/14/2017 17:10	<p>I am a former resident of Flagstaff and still visit family up there regularly. I loved living in my mountain town. As of late, the town has been swathed in construction projects of monstrous proportions. The mountain is losing its natural value as a result. The mountain is obscured from view which is the highlight of the place, the seal of the city of sorts. Please do not diminish the mountain town's appeal, drivability and natural space anymore. Do not construct housing projects in Shultz Pass Rd.</p>

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
86	Amanda Matje	inside City Limits	registered	6/14/2017 16:02	Absolutely do not let this happen. That beautiful field is a flagstaff icon. My family has taken yearly family pictures there for years. Flagstaff is beautiful because of open spaces like these please don't allow another one to be ruined. There are plenty of less iconic, less beautiful places that could be developed if truly needed.
87	Joe Shannon	inside City Limits	registered	6/14/2017 13:32	The idea of affordable rental housing is needed in Flagstaff as was illustrated in a recent AZ Daily Sun article. However, I feel that the 180 and Shultz Rd parcel is not an ideal location for development. Traffic problems on Fort Valley Rd/AZ 180 are well known by the City Council and staff, including the Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization for decades, yet there has been zero substantial progress. Winter snow play traffic has been the focal point, but traffic continues to increase year-round as more land is developed and recreational use expands. Please consider a moratorium on building in the Fort Valley/180 Corridor until a well funded plan is developed and implemented. The safety of the children going to Sechrist Elementary school and residents is at stake. Finally, instead of rental properties, I think affordable home ownership would be a better use of "our" City land.
88	Name not shown	outside City Limits	registered	6/14/2017 11:39	I think that the development plan on Fort Valley is a huge mistake. Not only will it add to the increasingly worsening traffic situation, but that is one of the most iconic and beautiful areas in the whole city. In the early fall, that field is covered in sunflowers with an astonishing view of the San Francisco peaks. Flagstaff is nothing without its beauty and connectiveness to nature, and I believe that destroying a feature of the town that could bring a lot of positive publicity and provide another area for tourists to admire the town is a huge mistake. I have lived off of Shultz pass road for 22 years and I would be very upset to see this area developed.
89	Linda Radosevich	inside City Limits	registered	6/14/2017 11:14	I believe building low-income housing on Ft. Valley Road near Schultz Pass Road is a mistake. I don't live in Cheshire, Ft. Valley, Baderville, or other communities in that area, but I avoid even traveling to that area on days when I know the traffic congestion is going to be overwhelming, even though I live in west Flagstaff. Lack of access to transportation services while placing people who may need those services is incompatible with wise planning. Please don't add to the congestion of this much-traveled road by allowing more housing construction.

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
90	Deborah Shepard	inside City Limits	registered	6/14/2017 10:05	These proposed developments of affordable housing must be targeted to Flagstaff residents employed here, not going to school - i know restrictions on housing violates federal housing laws - but we must take care of young people starting out, families with kids and our Elders as all valuable members of our special community. Housing brings jobs brings families - keeps us vibrant and a growing community together. Debbie Shepard - Flagstaff Creative Cohousing - rebuilding neighborhoods!
91	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/14/2017 10:03	I oppose public housing on 180 & Schulz. That location should remain open space. The city needs to increase it's efforts to find other spaces that are closer in town with easier access to work & school.

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
92	Name not available		unclaimed	6/14/2017 9:47	<p>Apartment housing project at 180 and Schultz Pass</p> <p>Has anyone else heard of this? A multi-level, high density apartment complex in that lovely meadow at the intersection of 180 and Schultz Pass. From what I've heard, it's been kept under the radar, but they are having a public meeting about it sometime on Tuesday the 30th, before the City Council Meeting. That beautiful view is one of the highlights of our neighborhood! And can you imagine what it would do to our traffic?</p> <p>Logan Brumm, Cheshire on 26 May</p> <p>While I am opposed to this, at least it is capped at 2 stories (per the article). The Stilleys own the field where all the beautiful flowers bloom each year, and I HIGHLY doubt that is the parcel they are considering. It is probably the small plot between 180 and the field. Sounds like we all need to be at that meeting!</p> <p>Robyn Martin, Cheshire on 27 May</p> <p>The FALA red flags are gone, and I believe they were a school project. They were there for about a day or so, and I saw students out in the same area doing some kind of exercise/activity. Re: location of potential housing development--I can't tell exactly, according to the Daily Sun map, where the nearby parcel is located. I think the city owns the land on the northwest side of the intersection of Schultz/Fremont and 180, but that land is right next to the gas pipeline. I wonder how usable and safe it would be for this kind of housing? If they build there, here comes more traffic, and there goes the prairie dog town that is there now.</p> <p>Kathryn Kozak, Coconino Estates on 27 May</p> <p>I have not heard of this, but there is also the issue of more traffic on 180. If this is approved then traffic will increase on an already busy road. Do you know when the city council is hearing about it? A group opposed to this will want to be there with solid arguments.</p> <p>Chuck Roth, Cheshire on 27 May</p> <p>This week the Daily Sun reported that the City is looking to have city-subsidized affordable housing built there.</p> <p>Thank</p> <p>Eileen Tulli</p> <p>Eileen Tulli, Cheshire on 27 May</p> <p>I don't have any more detail on the meeting yet, a coworker, who told me about it, is supposed to let me know. I'll share as soon as I get it</p> <p>Pez Owen, W Summit Ave on 27 May</p> <p>I am in favor of city subsidized low income housing. Where would be a smart place to build it? Comments</p>
93	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/13/2017 21:44	<p>The proposed Hwy 180 location is a bad idea. It creates sprawl and would add to an already highly congested traffic corridor. This development project is totally out of place. To even consider destroying our iconic view of the summer flowers and peaks with cheap housing is unthinkable! Why is this city so determined to destroy the quality of life of long-time residents with traffic and low quality, high density housing? I pay a premium to live here and I'm definitely starting to feel cheated.</p>

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
94	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/13/2017 21:42	<p>I am writing in opposition to the affordable housing complex that is being considered for the Shultz Pass/Highway 180 intersection. While I am a supporter of affordable housing, I feel that this location is a poor choice for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The real issue of traffic congestion on Highway 180 has not/is not being addressed. This a major issue, and to add to the problem significantly by adding a high volume housing complex is irresponsible and will only lead to furthering an already serious issue. 2. It does not help the people who might potentially live in this complex to be so far out of town, away from schools, shopping and medical resources (esp w traffic issues). The other selected locations put residents near these resources, allowing residents who donâ€™t have transportation the ability to do what they need to do without difficulty. The proposed Shultz Pass location will only create difficulty for residents in basic loving needs due to isolation from resources. 3. The view enjoyed by thousands of residents and tourists on Highway 180 canâ€™t be denied. To place a building in front of that would be poor planning. This space would be best rezoned into Open Space, so that one of Flagstaffs great views is not ruined forever. <p>I know the city owns a lot of land around Flagstaff. Surely there is a better location that can be considered? To use the Shultz Pass sight would be irresponsible planning, and I hope you will consider another sight.</p>

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
95	Sharon Fox	outside City Limits	registered	6/13/2017 20:47	<p>I support affordable housing when placed in the right location, a test which two of the proposed locations meet. The third, a parcel on the corner of 180 and Shultz Pass, is a bad choice for several reasons:</p> <p>First, the 180 corridor suffers from increasing gridlock. This is not a mere inconvenience, as it also prevents emergency vehicles from access to the neighborhoods along 180 when traffic is backed up and snow players line the side of the highway. Additionally, residents have to plan their trips to/from town around the gridlock. Those who are on call for work have to stay in town, instead of home, in order to get to work if needed. Please don't add an apartment complex, and associated cars, to Hwy 180 until this situation is resolved.</p> <p>Second, this area seems to be a poor choice for lower income families. It is not near a grocery store, services or job centers. For those without transportation, bus service is infrequent. It seems that there are other areas of town do not have these issues and would be more suitable.</p> <p>Finally, this land is an iconic meadow in Flagstaff. It features a spectacular view of the San Francisco Peaks and the gateway "Flagstaff" sign. It is carpeted in yellow flowers after the monsoon rains, bringing many locals and visitors to paint, photograph or just gaze at the beautiful sight. This is an important open space that needs to be protected and preserved.</p>
96	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/13/2017 20:15	<p>New homeowner in the Cheshire community here, I think there are better options for affordable housing than the Fort Valley location for Flagstaff. The traffic on Fort Valley Road and the 180 is way too congested and not accommodating to the traffic it sees now, let alone even more traffic. The view of the Peaks with the wildflowers in late summer is also a sight to be seen, I know people come from all over for that particular view, it's what this beautiful mountain town is known for. I am all for affordable housing, as a teacher in this town, I KNOW it's necessary but I don't believe Fort Valley is the right place for it.</p>
97	Name not shown	inside City Limits	unverified	6/13/2017 19:23	<p>I do not support the Ft Valley site because as it would contribute to the already heavy traffic on this road, particularly while Snow Bowl is open. This parcel is also a favorite spot for photographers to capture flowers and the Peaks. When coming into town on Hwy 180, I would hate to be greeted by high/medium density housing just beyond the Welcome to Flagstaff sign. See how ugly our Community is right off the bat.</p>

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
98	Name not available		unclaimed	6/13/2017 17:42	<p>I am excited about any new affordable housing in town.</p> <p>While the parcel on 180 is further from downtown and city services, there are already other housing developments there, and ideally each neighborhood would have affordable options within it.</p> <p>I am afraid that if the 180 parcel is not developed due to a desire to preserve views, this will set a precedent. Housing, and maintaining a diverse population, is more important than private views.</p> <p>The City should continue to develop MORE parcels for affordable housing, including the old public works yard adjacent to Thorpe.</p> <p>These proposals should move forward - the City should not limit building heights on the eastern parcels due to neighborhood pressure, but rather should promote density, in line with our community sustainability goals. As residents of an urban city that is landlocked by forests, we all must accept affordable housing, dense housing, or larger buildings in our backyards.</p>
99	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/13/2017 16:40	<p>My husband and I have lived in Cheshire for over 20 years and I have lived in Flagstaff for more than 60 years. Over the years, and with many different councils, the argument that the open spaces and beauty of Flagstaff will be sacrificed in favor of building has usually been ignored. It is quite true that the traffic on Fort Valley Rd. needs to somehow be alleviated for the safety of all. That being said, affordable housing is very much needed. But not just any cheap housing. If the goal is to provide housing for those who could afford it in other communities, just not here, it would serve everyone to plan housing with the ultimate goal of pride of ownership. Well-built homes, using quality designs and finishes, will provide for homeowners who will reside in and care for these homes over time. In addition, Sechrist School will not be overburdened. Just as other schools have made room as student bodies fluctuate, I'm assured that this school will be accommodating.</p>
100	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/13/2017 15:00	<p>Affordable housing is not the only issue in Flagstaff. Traffic flow on Highway 180 is also an ongoing issue. We had the privilege of purchasing a house in Cheshire about 11 years ago. The increasing flow of traffic on Highway 180 to and from Snowbowl has Dramatically increased over the years. Adding more congestion to this area without taking care of the traffic situation first will create more frustration for many people. I urge the city to please reconsider the Schultz pass site for an affordable housing site. Also, the Shultz Pass meadow is a beautiful site that should continue to be open space for all to enjoy.</p>
101	S Hess	outside City Limits	registered	6/13/2017 14:37	<p>Please DO NOT build on the Shultz pass field...it is a beautiful corner and view of our grand peaks with wildflowers every year. There should be no further housing development until there is enough infrastructure to serve the 180 corridor in traffic issues, water necessity, and FS needs...</p>

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
102	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/13/2017 11:23	I support this project moving forward. While I think the units are somewhat clustered I also understand that city owned land and zoning might be the reason for that. In terms of the concerns addressed in other comments about the Fort Valley Rd site, as I look at the fact sheet it states that only 18-28 units will be built in that location, which does not sound like enough of a population increase to impact traffic. Previous comments also indicated that the bus only runs once an hour, which assumes that everyone living in the new units will be utilizing public transportation, which is most likely not true. The income limits for a family of 4 is \$50,250 so we're talking about folks that can afford vehicles and do have jobs, they are the nurses, teachers, librarians and law enforcement personnel struggling to pay \$1,500 and up a month for a dilapidated two bedroom rentals. I encourage people to read the fact sheet about this project and challenge all to re-think your idea of who needs "affordable housing" in our community as it includes many working professionals.
103	alan s	inside City Limits	registered	6/13/2017 11:06	City council-Please reconsider the option of building the affordable housing at the Fort Valley location. I would to know the "pros" that would come from this building? Cons 2 miles away from services outside of a nearby gas . Taking away an iconic view of the peaks. WHY CAN'T WE TAKE ADVANTAGE OF ALL OF THE INFILL THAT COULD BE TAKING PLACE IN THE INTERIOR OF THE CITY instead of sprawl sprawl sprawl???? I expected this type of direction from the old city council/mayor. It is sure not why I voted for those in office currently. I will save the balance of my thoughts for the meeting on 6/27/17.

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
104	April Smith	inside City Limits	registered	6/13/2017 9:19	<p>Flagstaff resident, 12 years, AZ resident 45 years. Current age: 73. Gender and race: immaterial. All humans have the same needs: food, shelter, family. Affordable housing is in such short supply already, the addition of income restricted affordable is absolutely crucial to Flagstaff values and lifestyle. Start with land already zoned for occupancy levels, plan and complete that project while working on rezoning the remaining two parcels and get it done in a timely manner meeting all zoning and codes in the process.</p> <p>-All housing campuses should be tobacco free reflecting it's toxicity to living beings, plants and animals. Tobacco yearly costs should added to applicants income for purposes of eligibility assessment. Drug addiction costs should also be counted as income for purposes of eligibility assessment.</p> <p>-All housing should emphasize privacy and sound control, light and air circulation, meet or exceed R values in terms of insulation, emphasize water harvesting and onsite roof top power generation</p> <p>-Residents should be allowed gratis bus passes in lieu of parking. If parking is required provision should be provided for only one vehicle, and assessed monthly service charges unless vehicle is electric powered. -Electric vehicle charging stations should be weather protected and located throughout the property.</p> <p>-All units should include the in-unit provision of a front loader washing machine (small or large load washing machine according to number of bedrooms). Provision for outdoor drying of laundry should be out of line of sight of all units and accessible to all mobile tenants.</p> <p>-Dishwashers and air conditioning well as hot water and heating equipment operated on solar units should be standard.</p> <p>-Intergenerational please.</p>
105	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/13/2017 9:06	<p>I have no issue with building "affordable" housing; however, if the city keeps raising taxes, it won't matter how "affordable" the housing is -- the average or low income person won't be able to afford to own a home ANYWHERE in Flagstaff. I have lived here many years and my little modest house is paid off, but I may not be able to stay and enjoy the fruits of my hard work if I can't afford to pay the taxes on my home in my retirement years. We have to stop voting for tax increases and at some point demand that the City operate on what they have, just like we have to.</p>

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
106	Name not available		unclaimed	6/13/2017 8:52	Thank you for your efforts to develop additional affordable housing! I am excited that this is moving forward. I have no opinions on the West St development. I am resistant to the Fort Valley proposal because it is literally the most iconic viewshed in Flagstaff. I am happy to hear that the 6th St parcel is moving forward, however, I hope that it will not affect the existing footprint of the community garden. Countless hours have gone in to developing that space. Additionally, I am concerned about whether the building height will shade the garden. Thanks again for all of your work!
107	Gregory Paulin	outside City Limits	registered	6/13/2017 8:22	I am opposed to the proposed affordable housing project on City land on Fort Valley Road. My primary concern is the effect on Highway 180 traffic. The current highway does not accommodate traffic now, especially during the winter months. It is presently a safety issue for residents in the greater Fort Valley community. Additionally affordable housing would be much more comparable at the other two proposed sites.
108	Camille Paulin	outside City Limits	registered	6/13/2017 8:20	I live in the Fort Valley corridor. I do not think affordable housing at this proposed site is a good fit. It will drastically compound the traffic problem already present. It will adversely affect Seachrist school's student population. And it will not be compatible with the quality of existing local housing. I would ask that you keep this small triangle of open space as a green belt. I think the other two possible sites listed would be a better fit. Thank you.
109	Breann Velasco	inside City Limits	registered	6/13/2017 0:15	I support affordable housing but I strongly disagree with the Shultz Pass development. Placing high-density housing here will not only extinguish an iconic and historic viewpoint but also increase the traffic congestion that is already an issue for this road. Please don't place affordable housing in this location when other locations in Flagstaff can be developed for this reason. Thank you for your consideration.
110	Name not available		unclaimed	6/12/2017 19:02	I am for the use of 2 of the 3 parcels. I don't think that the parcel on Ft. Valley Rd. Should be utilized for this as there is too much traffic in that area as it is.

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
111	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/12/2017 16:57	I am against a portion of this proposal for all of the same reasons others have so passionately provided. Affordable housing IS a problem in Flagstaff, but building a unit in the middle of the field away from services is not the answer. There is only a gas station about half a mile away from the proposed site and I'm sure the residents of the area do not want to see this stretch of highway developed with commercial properties. There is a bus stop, but as everyone pointed out it only runs about once an hour and that's during peak times. It simply doesn't make sense to build a housing unit in a place with so little services. There are so many areas around Flagstaff that would be better suited for a similar development. Adding the Shultz Pass location to this proposal just seems like a "here's good" solution.
112	Heidi Wolford	inside City Limits	registered	6/12/2017 15:42	I strongly oppose the Shultz Pass Meadows (Hwy 180) development. In general, I am a supporter of affordable housing and the positive impact it has on individuals, families, and the community. As a Flagstaff native and a real estate attorney at a large national firm that typically represents developers, I am not one to push the "Not In My Backyard" argument as I am fully aware that affordable housing does not affect the value of neighboring homes and can be beneficial to all. However, the Shultz Pass Meadow in particular, is one of the most precious spots in our beautiful mountain town and I would consider it to be the worst location for a development of any kind. In my opinion, this property needs to be designated as Open Space so that its natural beauty can be enjoyed by all for years to come. Not only is the Shultz Pass Meadow sacred to Flagstaff locals, but I live off Hwy 180 near Anasazi Ridge and the traffic along 180 is horrendous, particularly during the winter months, and as all are aware, there's no alternative route in this area. Additionally, housing with inadequate public transportation and no walkability really doesn't serve the purpose for which it is intended. The Mountain Line services Cheshire only once every hour and there are no grocery stores within a walkable distance. Again, affordable housing is not the best use for this meadow especially given that there are other sites in the city that would serve the purpose more adequately. I hope the council will consider designating this sacred meadow as Open Space.

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
113	Kelly O'Brien Magill	inside City Limits	registered	6/12/2017 15:26	I am against the unending loss of open space in our community. We are told the cost of living here is so high because of the beauty we get to live in. The city just continues to sell off this beauty for the \$\$\$ it brings them. Stop ruining this beautiful space we call home. I want the open space on Schultz and 180 left as is and the council to Take it off the table and then re-zone it as Open Space. <i>Kelly OBrien Magill</i>
114	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/12/2017 15:17	We definitely need more affordable housing in Flagstaff and I'm glad the city is making progress. Please be willing to build these housing units as multi-story. If you're allowing it for hotels and short term options, you should allow it for affordable housing as well. I am, however, disappointed that the selected locations do not prioritize infill development, and instead promote additional sprawl into open space. The Flagstaff city yard would be a perfect place for infill housing development, rather than building into a scenic meadow. If you're going to develop the meadow, at least make sure housing is compact and efficient, rather than sprawled and low, please.
115	Name not available		unclaimed	6/12/2017 15:01	Hello, I am a single mother with two children and am a full time student that is having trouble finding safe and affordable housing. I currently live in a home built from the 1950's and it has lead based paints in it. Obviously it is not something I want to raise my children in. My concern with this is being able to move somewhere that is more safe for my children not only physically but mentally. When I have attempted to find affordable housing elsewhere, it was not in the cards for me because the monthly rental pricing is \$1300 minimum for a 2 bedroom home. This is not good for local families who plan on living and contributing to this community.
116	Name not available		unclaimed	6/12/2017 12:26	Affordable housing is an obvious necessity in Flagstaff, and the locations on Sixth St. and West are logical, as they are well-served by existing bus service and they are within walking/biking distance of many amenities. I wish the City would consider the existing public works yard as the third option, instead of the site on Highway 180. I realize that a small, vocal group of citizens didn't like this plan, but I'm sorry....there is not a better location for affordable housing. You have access to transit and you can walk to several places. These are not options at the Highway 180 site. What do we expect people to do? Walk to the Shell station when they get hungry? You can't put affordable housing in a food desert.

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
117	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/12/2017 11:31	I would like to provide my enthusiastic support of the use of three city owned parcels for the development of affordable rental housing. Affordable housing is a crisis in Flagstaff and while these city owned parcels will not solve the problem, they will certainly get us closer to a solution. Additionally, I would encourage City Council to prioritize development plans that consider the challenges associated with traffic and infrastructure and to choose the best plan that accommodates those issues.
118	Tom Isakson	inside City Limits	registered	6/12/2017 9:48	I support this project. Yes, we will lose a great view, but I think we need to value the health and safety of our homeless and nearly homeless citizens more than a view. I work for a non-profit helping homeless veterans, and sometimes even when a vet seeking to get out of homelessness has a federal voucher that will pay most of the rent, he/she can't find a landlord to take it. To those who say "somewhere else," where did you have in mind? If there were better sites for this, our very competent and caring city staff would have identified it.
119	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/12/2017 9:05	While I do understand the need for affordable housing in Flagstaff, I am very opposed to having new housing development off of 180. This area already experiences severe traffic issues with tourists, skiers, and residents of communities like Cheshire and Baderville. Creating new housing would escalate these traffic issues and increase traffic through school zones like Sechrist Elementary, Marshall Magnet, and Flag High's school zones. Not only would housing built here intensify the traffic, it would also destroy an iconic view of the Peaks. As a born-and-raised resident of Flagstaff, I would be devastated to lose one of my favorite photography spots to housing which could be placed somewhere else. There are many solutions to our housing problems, but this should not be considered as one of them.
120	David McCain	inside City Limits	registered	6/11/2017 18:22	I strongly support this project. Flagstaff desperately needs affordable housing given the high cost of living that is pricing out many people who have limited resources. I applaud the Council for distributing the project around the city rather than only adding more affordable housing to neighborhoods where it already exists. Thank you City Staff and the Council for bringing this project forward. It is an auspicious step toward the goal of making Flagstaff a more livable place for all residents.
121	Name not available		unclaimed	6/11/2017 15:03	I don't think putting affordable housing on ft valley is a good idea. But I don't feel that we need more affordable housing. I am a single mom living in a hotel cause I can't afford any housing.

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
122	Name not available		unclaimed	6/11/2017 11:24	Removal of public open space within the City for unattractive housing doesn't enhance our neighborhood. Look at existing Tax credit projects with community and ask your self the question? Would you like that project in you neighborhood. Most residents would say no. These housing projects should be incorporated into market rate developments, not concentration of population together
123	Name not shown	outside City Limits	registered	6/11/2017 11:01	Our family has lived off Fort Valley Road for over 27 years, and our main concern about placing high-density housing on these sites is the increase in traffic congestion. It is already a nightmare, particularly during ski season. Please don't do this to us. From an occupants' perspective, it seems that placing this property in a location from which residents can walk (rather than depend on cars or Mountain Line) to shopping and so on would be a win-win. Thank you for your consideration.
124	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/11/2017 8:46	I am writing to respectfully express my opposition to the proposed site in Fort Valley road. As others have mentioned, the traffic in this location is a significant problem especially during the winters months and adding a multi family development would only contribute to this issue. In addition, the Fort Valley corridor is largely comprised of low density housing and this proposed development is not in line with the character of this community. Natural spaces are important to the quality of life for all Flagstaff residents, and this iconic area is frequently used for outdoor enthusiasts, photographers, and local residents alike. It would be a shame to develop such a beautiful natural space with a high density project. Lastly, the location is far removed from many basic services with the nearest facilities more than 2 miles away. Given the limitations of the mountain line, this creates some challenges in the winter months for low income residence who may rely solely on bus access for transportation. As a resident in this area, I know that it can take well over an hour to reach many locations in Flagstaff using the mountain line alone, and a few errands can easily stretch into an all day excursion when traveling from this area. In conclusion, while I applaud the City's efforts to create affordable housing for our residents, I do not feel that the Fort Valley location is a good option to address this issue and I urge the City to reconsider their proposal for the Fort Valley location.
125	Sabra Zedick	outside City Limits	registered	6/10/2017 21:44	I am steadfastly against any multiple unit housing development at 3500 N Ft Valley Road due to the dismal and unresolved traffic problem along the 180 corridor. It is absurd to even consider additional daily traffic on a highway on which the current abysmal traffic situation remains unsolved. My husband and I have been Baderville residents since 1992, and since the opening of the snow play areas to the north on 180, the winter traffic has become not merely a nuisance, but potentially life threatening.

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
126	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/10/2017 18:43	The congestion on 180/Fort Valley is already an issue that has yet to be resolved. Adding housing at Schultz Pass and 180 at what is an iconic and picturesque location for visitors and locals particularly in August would be tragic. This site should not even be considered until something is seriously done about the traffic. I completely agree that we need affordable housing in Flagstaff, however the city needs to really think about where it places any and all developments
127	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/10/2017 16:03	Similar to others, I urge you to remove the Schultz/180 property from ever being developed for housing. Hundreds of residents and visitors enjoy the beauty of the peaks from this location. Construction of housing would ruin the view and the experience for everyone. Please retain this as public open space for all to enjoy!
128	rudy rugerbret		unverified	6/10/2017 13:08	i lived in downtown Sacramento HUD studio apt. - \$210 per mo. dinner included. best 18 months of my life.
129	robyn martin	inside City Limits	registered	6/10/2017 8:36	As a long-time resident of Cheshire (my street faces north towards the Peaks and runs directly parallel to Highway 180) I respectfully write to urge the housing committee and city officials to choose a different place for the affordable housing project other than the city-owned land on Schultz Pass Road (see link: http://azdailysun.com/news/local/article_8f6d980b-7710-53ae-8a8f-b540c15b79b4.html). All of us that live in the area, from here to Baderville, are currently struggling with traffic gridlock on 180, a road not built to handle the congestion that we see growing every year. More cars from a new housing project would further load this overly-taxed corridor with even more traffic. Additionally, the Mountain Line only serves us 1x an hour, and if those who were living in affordable housing needed to use public transportation to get to work, putting families way out here wouldn't help them, especially in the winter season, where those of us already living here are confined for hours at our homes because of traffic congestion, unable to get to town on time for work and basic services. Please consider that these families will need more reliable access to work, medical care, and other services, and we only have one already overloaded, congested ingress/egress to get to and from town. I ask you to share these concerns with those who are making the decision about this affordable housing proposal. Please consider not just us living here on 180, who are struggling trying to solve our own traffic problems, but the needs of those who would be living in these units. Please don't add to our already complex problems of gridlock and traffic congestion in our area, and find a more appropriate place for this project, one that will serve the citizens living in this housing and their neighbors, both. Thank you. Respectfully, Robyn Martin

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
130	Name not available		unclaimed	6/10/2017 6:39	FINALLY a real proposal for affordable housing instead of just talk. I SUPPORT these three locations ENTHUSIASTICALLY! Comments I've read on various pages say 'no ghetto' and 'don't ruin our viewshed.' Extreme responses. Take down that downtown Marriott if you care about our views. Meanwhile, YES WE NEED AFFORDABLE
131	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/10/2017 0:53	Two of the sites appear to be good picks for potential housing. The other, Ft Valley Rd and Schultz Pass, is very problematic. It is right next to a busy thoroughfare and bisected by a gas line. At times, the winter traffic is horrific and there are no plans for improvement. The bus service is not frequent and it is not walkable to anything except beautiful trails. It may be city owned and zoned "correctly" for easy development, but it is not a good choice. You also would be paving over the best viewpoint in the city of the peaks. Visitors stop there in all seasons to take pictures and locals flock there in the late summer for a glimpse of the gorgeous wildflowers. I'll admit a sense of pride when I see them and can't help but smile every time I pass them. A quick glimpse at http://www.flagstaffarizona.org/about-flagstaff/ shows that the first TWO images in the "visit Flagstaff" promotional video are of the summer wildflowers that would be either paved or no longer visible. I think the city page itself features a picture of the early wildflowers with the Peaks in the background. The "Welcome to Flagstaff" sign with wildflowers in the background is also often seen in city or tourism bureau materials, so I am not the only one who believes the open space and the resulting wildflowers are an asset to the city. Please do not just take the easy option and develop this uniquely Flagstaff piece of open land.
132	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/9/2017 23:03	Wow , it makes me very sad to think of that beautiful open space to be filled with housing . I have lived in Cheshire since 1987 . And I have had to deal with the building of the numerous new divisions . I have tried to ignore it over the years. But this spot that you want to build on will ruin that view forever !! That is the most popular picture spot on this road , any time of the year . The number tourists that stop there is amazing . Wether it's for a snow shot or the most beautiful Spring , Summer , or Autumn flowers you have ever seen . That field is also filled with horses , deer , elk and lots of other wildlife . Do we have ruin everything that's open and beautiful ? Not to mention the horrendous amount of traffic congestion that it will add to a growing problem. Please , please , please don't build there ? Find another spot . Please ? That open field is what makes living out in this area special . For thoseOf us who love living out here , please don't take that open space away ?

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
133	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/9/2017 16:51	Please no! Not on Fort Valley Road. We are losing the heart of what Flagstaff is by paving over every area that once held peaceful beauty. I understand the need for the housing just not the placement of it. I don't mind it being close to my house. Move it diagonally to the open lot on the other side of the road, just don't take our beautiful view away. I can't tell you the number of times pictures have been taken by the Welcome to Flagstaff sign with the mountains in the background. That picture speaks to the heart of this place. If this goes through the sign will be in front of affordable housing. Please don't let that be the image of Flagstaff.
134	Name not available		unclaimed	6/9/2017 12:47	I think Fort Valley is the best location - plus it is already zoned appropriately.
135	Name not shown	outside City Limits	registered	6/9/2017 12:33	The Isabel Street site is an improvement to the neighborhood and keeping the Community Garden is considerate. The West Street site is a creative use of space, and offers convenience to grocery and other services. The Schultz Pass Road/180 site is a desecration of Flagstaff's gateway, of Fort Valley, and of the most iconic view shed left in the area. Whether it is the unobstructed view across acres of snow, or an endless sea of yellow flowers from mid-summer to fall, this view IS Flagstaff. This parcel holds the key to either preserving this view shed or obliterating it. I urge the Council to remove this particular parcel from consideration and to look for an alternative. It may slow the process up, but better that than destroying something that holds so much value for so many residents and visitors alike. I know there are alternatives out there and hope the staff makes finding a better location a priority! There are other city-owned parcels in this part of town with equal or better development potential that don't destroy the last best view of our peaks.
136	Name not available		unclaimed	6/9/2017 9:52	I fully support the City using its property to build affordable housing, however the Ft. Valley property is the wrong place. Affordability is the cost of housing PLUS the cost of transportation. Therefore affordable housing needs to be in convenient locations where people can reduce their transportation costs by walking, biking, bus etc. and the Ft. Valley property does not allow that. Instead, the City needs to look at variety of other properties, including the Public Works yard for these needed projects.
137	Name not available		unclaimed	6/9/2017 7:39	I do not support the City developing the Schultz Meadow parcel for affordable housing. This is an iconic gateway to Flagstaff and should be preserved as such. Additionally, public transit is not on a frequent enough cycle to be a practical resource for low income transit. Low income developments should be on public transit lines that have the most frequency, not infrequent on the outskirts of town. I support affordable housing developments but on parcels that are centrally located to job centers, grocery stores, etc.

What does the community think about using three city owned parcels for development of affordable rental housing?					
Below are the statements as of 2017-06-22 07:29:40 Shown in Chronological order					
	Name	Location	User Status	Created	Comment
138	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/8/2017 20:19	The sad thing about using the Fort Valley parcel is that in the summer and fall when all the yellow flowers bloom there so many tourist stop there on that corner and take pictures and walk through the flowers. It is a great attraction to our city. And very beautiful with the Peaks behind it. There must be other properties that can be used to save this attraction for not only tourist but also the citizens that enjoy the flowers and views. I would hope we could save this parcel as the growing city is taking away so much of our aesthetic views. It is a beautiful place in late summer and fall. Save our views please.
139	John DeGraff	inside City Limits	registered	6/8/2017 18:29	This idea is not the solution to the affordable housing problem we have here in Flagstaff. I am writing today to ask the City Council to reconsider their options for the use of the corner of Fort Valley Road and Schultz Pass. This corner showcases one of the last glimpses in Flagstaff of the iconic San Francisco Peaks, for tourists who head towards the Grand Canyon. I have witnessed many artists with their easels and many with cameras in hand trying to capture the essence of that view. Cars stop and admire the magic which occurs on that spot every August. Is it possible instead of housing, we make a park/viewpoint in this area? So much of our views of the San Francisco Peaks are disappearing due to development here in Flagstaff. I understand the need for housing, especially affordable, in Flagstaff. This proposed development would just be "a cinder on a volcano" compared to what really needs to be happening, as you probably already know. Please don't hide my/our mountain from view by building high density apartments on the corner of Fort Valley Road and Shultz Pass Road.
140	Name not available		unclaimed	6/8/2017 6:41	Quit ruining the city and run it. You are not in the housing business!
141	Name not available		unclaimed	6/7/2017 17:03	The city should focus on creating more middle class jobs than affordable housing. The main reason we need more low income affordable housing is because there's no jobs. Go ahead and keep raising the minimum wage, it won't help.
142	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/7/2017 17:01	The City should not be in the housing business.
143	David Cornforth	inside City Limits	registered	6/7/2017 16:45	I think it will be a good idea. There are many people who will need it.
144	Name not shown	inside City Limits	registered	6/6/2017 16:43	I think it is great! We need more affordable housing!