

MINUTES

WORK SESSION
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 29, 2013
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
211 WEST ASPEN AVENUE
6:00 P.M.

1. Call to Order.

Mayor Nabours called the Flagstaff Work Session of October 29, 2013, to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance.

The City Council and audience recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Roll Call

Councilmembers present:

MAYOR NABOURS
VICE MAYOR EVANS
COUNCILMEMBER BAROTZ (telephonically)
COUNCILMEMBER BREWSTER
COUNCILMEMBER ORAVITS
COUNCILMEMBER OVERTON
COUNCILMEMBER WOODSON

Councilmembers absent:

Others present: City Manager Kevin Burke; City Attorney Michelle D'Andrea

4. Public Participation

Public Participation enables the public to address the council about items that are not on the prepared agenda. Public Participation appears on the agenda twice, at the beginning and at the end of the work session. You may speak at one or the other, but not both. Anyone wishing to comment at the meeting is asked to fill out a speaker card and submit it to the recording clerk. When the item comes up on the agenda, your name will be called. You may address the Council up to three times throughout the meeting, including comments made during Public Participation. Please limit your remarks to three minutes per item to allow everyone to have an opportunity to speak. At the discretion of the Chair, ten or more persons present at the meeting and wishing to speak may appoint a representative who may have no more than fifteen minutes to speak.

Kevin Lombardo with the Hopi Tribe Economic Development Corporation addressed Council in thanks for the support for the recent Heritage Square Hopi Festival. There were approximately 10,000 visitors over the two days. Because of this event and corporate sponsorships the Hopi Economic Development Corporation will be donating \$10,000 to Child Protective Services in Flagstaff and Hopi.

Susan Alteveros, resident, addressed Council with concerns about the Arrowhead Village property.

5. **Preliminary Review of Draft Agenda for the November 5, 2013, City Council Meeting.***

**Public comment on draft agenda items may be taken under "Review of Draft Agenda Items" later in the meeting, at the discretion of the Mayor. Citizens wishing to speak on agenda items not specifically called out by the City Council for discussion under the second Review section may submit a speaker card for their items of interest to the recording clerk.*

Councilmember Barotz asked that item 10-A Zoning Map Amendment be placed on the 6:00 p.m. meeting.

6. **Discussion regarding downtown street closure criteria for north Downtown and management of Heritage Square.**

Recreation Director Brian Grube introduced Recreation Supervisor in Community Events Glorice Pavey who offered a PowerPoint presentation on street closure criteria.

- ▶ STREET CLOSURE CRITERIA
- ▶ IS THERE A BEST TIME OF YEAR FOR A STREET CLOSURE
- ▶ CURRENT STREET CLOSURES
- ▶ STREET CLOSURE CRITERIA
- ▶ MARKETING PLAN
- ▶ PUBLIC OUTREACH
- ▶ PARKING PLAN
- ▶ AMBASSADOR PLAN
- ▶ TRASH, RECYCLING AND PORTABLE TOILETS
- ▶ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
- ▶ RATING MATRIX
- ▶ MOVING FORWARD

Mayor Nabours asked if there was consideration of non-profits operating as a commercial activity that may not be making a profit or giving profit to charity. Ms. Pavey stated that this would be evaluated in the rating matrix; a non-profit may get a higher point value than commercial.

Mayor Nabours asked how the matrix would be used and the purpose. Ms. Pavey stated that the matrix would be used for all events and there would be a numerical cut off; staff would rate the event and the matrix would be attached so Council could use it as a tool in determining approval or denial of an event or street closure.

Councilmember Brewster asked about the Downtown District's voice in the recommendation. Ms. Pavey explained that it is unknown at this time because staff is unsure about where the district is at the moment. The City Council will have to weigh in on things such as fire and police as well as other criteria but the district may have some oversight. Mr. Burke stated that the consultation with the District could be a requirement.

The benefit of the District is that everyone is a member whereas with the current Downtown Business Alliance there is not full membership. Consultation with the District certainly can be added to the criteria if so desired.

Mr. Grube began the next presentation on the management of Heritage Square.

- ▶ MANAGEMENT OF HERITAGE SQUARE
- ▶ MEETING PURPOSE
- ▶ HISTORY
- ▶ TYPICAL WEEK ON THE SQUARE
- ▶ WHAT WAS BROUGHT TO LIGHT
- ▶ THE CHALLENGE
- ▶ THE SOLUTION – LOOKING FORWARD
- ▶ SOME QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED
- ▶ NEXT STEPS
- ▶ QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

Mr. Burke stated that a goal NH.2 from the Regional Plan states the City will “look to downtown Flagstaff as the primary focal point of the community character.”

The following individuals addressed Council regarding street closures and Heritage Square:

- John Tannous
- Mark Lamberson
- Joan Martini
- Janet Avillar
- Katherine Farr
- George Averbeck
- Gordon Watkins

Some of the comments received included:

- Heritage Square is not meant to be a retail center, it is meant to be a space for performances and public meetings.
- The processes discussed in the presentation about Heritage Square are great.
- The Downtown Business Alliance is in support of the value matrix system proposed.
- Request that the lower volume and bass limitations be added to the criteria.
- Suggest limiting the closures to three per year, Fourth of July parade, Christmas light parade, and Dew Downtown.
- Do not feel that there is a level playing field right now with retail sales, should keep events to family events.
- There should be consultation with downtown businesses before a street closure is approved.
- Many people do not attempt to come downtown because of the parking situation.
- Do not want retail sales on the square 15 weeks in a row.
- Non-profits are local and constructive.

- Suggest putting together an evaluation committee made up of city and community representatives.
- There is a lot of inequity in the fee structure for Heritage Square.
- No more new events, parades, or street closures in north downtown.

Mayor Nabours stated there seems to be a feeling that there is no reason retail sales should be allowed at all in Heritage Square; it is a place for events. It is possible that a craft fair in conjunction with demonstrations would be ok. The long term events over multiple weeks should stop.

Councilmember Oravits stated that it is so inexpensive to utilize Heritage Square for retail sales that it is unfair to the downtown merchants who pay rent and taxes for their locations.

Councilmember Overton stated that he sees Heritage Square as a public venue. He does not want to get into telling an event producer what they can and cannot do and what they can and cannot sell. The high quality events bring people into a new kind of art and exposure. There is some problem with selling retail items but craft items or specialized items are different. There is an issue with repetitive events and he would like to see a more diversified pool of events. No one wants to see art in the park for 14 weeks in a row. A reasonable number needs to be determined and attempt to diversify what is attracted to the square. He suggested avoiding the first come first serve idea and encourage multiple uses. There can be a good mix of retail and events.

Vice Mayor Evans stated that if selling is a part of an event then it is different than a specific retail sale event. The purpose of the event should be taken into consideration. Heritage Square events should have a different application process than the standard special events packet as Heritage Square is a place not an event and the facility would be rented much differently.

Councilmember Brewster stated that to come and sell goods is not a good use of the facility. She suggested adding something into the matrix to say what the initial purpose of the event is and then connect the selling with the purpose. Additionally, Heritage Square events should be a separate application process.

Mayor Nabours asked if there is a time limit on the sound. Ms. Pavey stated that sound must end at 10:00 p.m. and can start no earlier than 9:00 a.m. 90 decibels is the max right now, Heritage Square could get to 86 decibels and be just fine. Mayor Nabours asked for that accommodation to be looked into further.

Mr. Burke clarified that a majority of Council is in favor of no retail sales downtown unless ancillary to an event, there has to be some kind of programming simultaneously.

Mr. Grube asked if a standalone application is desired for Heritage Square or an amendment in the current special event packet relative to Heritage Square. Council would like to defer to staff for their recommendation as they have to administer the process.

Mayor Nabours suggested putting together a moratorium on parades. Councilmember Oravits stated that he would like to see two of the four parades moved to Fourth Street where there is plenty of parking and places to walk.

Vice Mayor Evans suggested creating a sliding scale for fees associated with closures downtown versus other areas. By offering lower fees at locations outside of downtown it may encourage the parades to look at other areas.

Vice Mayor Evans expressed concern with the list of grandfathered events. The homecoming parade used to be on the NAU campus and Tequila Sunrise was different back then. The reason being is that students had to get back to campus to see and participate in the parade and there is a strict discipline policy that provided incentive to sober up and behave. The homecoming parade should not be grandfathered. Councilmember Brewster stated that it will be important to have collaborative discussions with NAU and the alumni association about the parade and other options.

Mayor Nabours clarified that two way streets are able to be closed without the consent of Council. Ms. Pavey indicated that that is correct but staff has made it a policy to bring these to Council for approval.

Councilmember Oravits asked how many street closures there are per year. Ms. Pavey responded that there are eight or nine per year and all have to come before Council with the exception of the four parades.

Council agreed that they would like to see every street closure application for the downtown area which consists of Route 66 to Elm. Ms. Pavey explained that the street closure application is rooted in various different departments in the City and there are a number of conditions required in order to be approved. Events cannot exceed five days including one day for set up and one day for tear down.

Mayor Nabours asked that criteria be added that addresses traffic flow and circulation in the community.

A break was held from 7:43 p.m. to 7:59 p.m.

7. Regional Plan Discussion

A. Regional Plan Discussion #9 - Neighborhoods, Housing & Urban Conservation

Councilmember Barotz left the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

Comprehensive Planning Manager Kimberly Sharp provided a PowerPoint presentation on Neighborhoods, Housing and Urban Conservation.

- ▶ CHAPTER XIII – NEIGHBORHOODS, HOUSING AND URBAN CONSERVATION
- ▶ MANAGING OUR NEEDS
- ▶ HOUSING NEEDS

- ▶ HOUSING CONTINUUM
- ▶ NEIGHBORHOOD AND URBAN CONSERVATION
- ▶ GOAL NH.1
- ▶ GOAL NH.2
- ▶ GOAL NH.3
- ▶ GOAL NH.4
- ▶ GOAL NH.5
- ▶ GOAL NH.6

The following individuals addressed Council about neighborhoods, housing and urban conservation:

- David Monihan
- Joanna Estes
- Carol Kendall
- Vance Peterson
- Angela Horvath
- Gaylord Staveley
- Jeff Knorr
- Rob Wilson
- Sophia Katz
- Norma Rodriguez
- Joy Staveley

Some of the comments received included:

- Concerns that this would end up with a property maintenance ordinance.
- Income rental properties and second homes need to be considered.
- People do not want to live in high density areas.
- Concerns with the cost of housing, explore options to make housing more affordable.
- Would like an addition to properly protect residents of displacement.
- Not interested in pursuing outward land acquisition.
- Do not urbanize Flagstaff.
- If the situation of homelessness is improved, the door will be open to more homelessness.
- The plan emphasizes compact development and vilifies the automobile.

Mayor Nabours asked about the commission discussion concerning open space, infill, displacement and sprawl. Ms. Sharp stated that over 70% of the community is considered suburban. The discussion was that Flagstaff is not going to be an urban city; however, small pockets of urban residential will improve walkability in the community. Those small areas of infill can make a big difference. Redevelopment is a different situation and has its own opportunities and challenges. The overall thought is to not change the character of the community.

Councilmember Oravits stated that he understands what Ms. Sharp is saying but he is concerned that the plan does not say that. Compact development is

mentioned ten times on one page which makes the plan seem like an urbanization plan. Ms. Sharp stated that the 2001 Regional Plan 1st goal is to encourage compact development; this is a continuation of that goal.

Vice Mayor Evans requested more emphasis placed on the individuals in the neighborhoods. For example, in the Helpful Terms box on page 13.3 the plan talks about preservation but does not discuss the people that are also important to the neighborhoods.

Vice Mayor Evans requested a line be inserted on page 13.7 after thoughts on affordability in the 3rd paragraph that reads "While many Flagstaff neighborhoods will experience change over time, existing neighborhood values and character as well as cultural diversity must be upheld during the redevelopment process. At first, to stabilize certain neighborhoods during the redevelopment may also be necessary."

Vice Mayor Evans noted that under Managing Our Needs it states that college students make up 20% of the City's population. NAU has a growth model right now that suggests that 25,000 students will be in Flagstaff within the next five years however, there is no plan for NAU to increase housing on campus. The plan addresses offsite housing for students but there is nothing that speaks to where offsite housing will be built. Crime is affected by high density development and would like the plan address offsite dormitories.

Also, on page 13-7, there is a lot of talk about neighborhood plans but there is no approval of such plans. If the City and the Regional Plan are saying these plans are going to be used, the City Council should approve them.

Vice Mayor Evans proposed a new goal of NH.1.7 on page 8-9 that prioritizes stabilization of a neighborhood's identity and maintain existing cultural diversity as new development occurs. Another proposed goal of NH.6.3 that when planning for redevelopment the existing needs of the residents should be addressed as early as possible in that redevelopment process.

Vice Mayor Evans also asked that a concept of a displacement or relocation policy be included in the plan.

On page NH.1.2 she said there is discussion about respecting traditions, and she would like more information on how that is being done. She also asked for a clear definition of how downtown is being defined.

B. Regional Plan Discussion #8 - Ch. IX. Land Use

Ms. Sharp stated that staff submitted the Land Use chapter through the Planning and Zoning Commission for discussion. The discussion included running four or five projects through the chapter to observe the flow. The result is an updated chapter; the content was not changed, only how it is organized.

Ms. Sharp offered a PowerPoint presentation on the Land Use chapter.

- ▶ PUBLIC COMMENTS GATHERED
- ▶ STATE STATUTES
- ▶ OUR VISION FOR THE FUTURE
- ▶ CONTEXT OF LAND USES
- ▶ AREA & PLACE TYPES
- ▶ POTENTIAL GROWTH BASED ON
- ▶ AREA TYPES
- ▶ EMPLOYMENT
- ▶ SPECIAL PLANNING AREAS
- ▶ ACTIVITY CENTERS
- ▶ CORRIDORS
- ▶ NEIGHBORHOODS
- ▶ LAND USE TYPES
- ▶ ORGANIZATION OF AREA TYPES
- ▶ FUTURE GROWTH ILLUSTRATION
- ▶ EXAMPLE PROJECT

Using the example project, Mayor Nabours asked if a major amendment to the Plan would be needed to change the use of the parcel should the State sell the land. Ms. Sharp stated that it depends on what the owner wants to do as future suburban is quite broad.

Mayor Nabours asked if this plan dictates how a parcel may be used although the parcel is not currently owned by anyone. Planning Director Jim Cronk stated that the City assumes State land is private property and it is zoned accordingly. Mayor Nabours stated that section 20 is designated Suburban Future and asked if the owner wants a very dense community and commercial space, so it is more Urban Future, if a major amendment to the Regional Plan would be needed. Mr. Cronk responded yes, the City Council is voting on a future policy direction of a recommended use of the land. An owner can use existing entitlements they can use their existing zoning without touching the Regional Plan. Only in the instance that they want to rezone to something not contemplated by their existing zoning or the Regional Plan would there need to be an amendment.

Mayor Nabours asked how closely property owners have to be watching their property and what designations are being assigned as well as if there was notification to everyone about the potential designations. Mr. Cronk stated that there was notification to everyone and if there is a desire to change the zoning that is when attention is most important.

Councilmember Oravits requested that the Land Use section be postponed to another meeting as the time is getting late and many people who wanted to speak are leaving.

Councilmember Woodson stated that goal LU.4 applies to compact development however there is no discussion of compact development mentioned in the example. Mr. Burke asked staff to define compact development. Ms. Sharp stated that the discussions came from the 2001 Regional Plan and compact

development can be found in all areas. There is a whole page in the plan that defines compact development. Compact development in an urban area is more dense and it is walkable. Compact development in a suburban area is where there is an opportunity for shared open space. For example the FUTS trails connect schools, parks, and neighborhoods. Someone can get from place to place by walking if they want to. Compact development in rural areas is again the concept of shared space, for example a few ranchettes that share a horse pasture. It is a concept of using and sharing open space.

Councilmember Woodson offered that using the word compact is maybe a poor choice and suggested using the word connective instead. Mr. Burke agreed stating that this has been the biggest challenge because people hear compact and they think that they are losing their backyards.

The following individuals addressed Council about land use:

- Tish Bogen-Ozmun
- Vance Peterson
- Gaylord Staveley
- Charlie Odegaard
- Charlotte Welch
- Michelle Thomas
- Mike Sistik, on behalf of the Flagstaff Chamber of Commerce
- Judy Louks
- Gabor Kofacs
- Sofia Katz
- Angela Horvath
- Terry O'Neal

Some of the comments received included:

- The activity center on the future growth illustration map on page IX 15 and 16 is located in a wildlife corridor called Huffman Tank; please consider moving the activity center.
- Keep the 2001 growth boundary as Flagstaff has not grown enough to even reach that boundary. If the City is looking to infill it should not be looking to expand.
- The plan is allowing the University to dictate growth. If more land is opened for new development it will drive up home prices.
- Consider using the land the City already has.
- There is a lot of redundancy throughout this chapter with other areas of the plan and that should be eliminated.
- The beginning of every chapter should have a disclaimer statement that says that the plan is not a legal mandate.
- There is concern about the lack of industrial use defined in the plan.
- High density development increases crime.
- Concerns with the preservation of the historic districts.

- Infill and redevelopment are essential; would like to see neighborhoods and families protected through the process.
- The plan is not a utopian vision of Flagstaff.
- Do not want growth but rather quality of what is existing.
- Concern of additional taxes for people that is not used efficiently for transportation; more than 90% of the community rely on cars, more buses and taxes to pay for them are not wanted or needed.

Councilmember Oravits asked Ms. Louks the amount of time spent of the land use section. Ms. Louks responded that three years was spent on the other sections and the Land Use section was pushed and hurried. The Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) was broken into smaller groups so there was not the force and effect of the entire group. Councilmember Oravits asked if there was a lot of public participation during the land use discussions. Ms. Louks stated that there was very little public participation.

Vice Mayor Evans stated that she is concerned that the land use section of the plan does not mention the citizens or the people incorporated in the area. She proposed a new policy on page 9-64 LU.18.11 to read "the needs of existing residents should be thoughtfully considered during the reinvestment and redevelopment process." Additionally, this section of the plan should reference a relocation and displacement ordinance that is needed as well as the concept of where the City is going to place the off campus dormitories.

Councilmember Oravits stated that there are so many comments and concerns to discuss but the time is late and he requested additional time to discuss the chapter. He then noted on page IX 60 it discusses the use of automobiles and promotes a new preferred method of development in compact development. He requested a further discussion about what compact development is.

Councilmember Oravits noted IX 5 there is a paragraph that notes a paradigm shift in how the City addresses auto capacity last. While he encourages expanding walkability and biking, the community will continue to grow and vehicles will be used to travel. The plan needs to adequately plan for auto capacity since it is the primary mode of transportation.

Lastly, he offered that the Land Use section needs a lot of work and that he will email staff his detailed comments and concerns.

Councilmember Overton requested more in depth information included about industrial development. The City is limited on what is available but feel that it is important to address it more. There should be more focus on medium and high density industrial.

8. **Community Reinvestment Policy - Part 2**

Council requested that this item be discussed at a later meeting.

9. **Review of Draft Agenda Items for the October 15, 2013, City Council Meeting.***

**Public comment on draft agenda items will be taken at this time, at the discretion of the Mayor.*

Carol Kendall, resident, addressed Council to express a desire for more public input in the rezoning process.

10. **Public Participation**

None.

11. **Informational Items To/From Mayor, Council, and City Manager, and Requests for Future Agenda Items.**

None

12. **Adjournment**

The Work Session of the Flagstaff City Council held on Tuesday, October 29, 2013, adjourned at 10:12 p.m.

MAYOR

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK