

## Characteristics of a Student Housing Development –Regional Plan Review

Below is the list of characteristics of a “good” student housing development that was brainstormed at the June 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the SHAP-External Working Group.

Topic	Characteristic	Action/ Priority	How well is it addressed in FRP30?	Contradictory policies	Comments
Building Design	Building has compatible scale, form, intensity and density with surrounding properties	Highest priority	CC.1.2, CC.2.3, CC.3.1, Policy CC.3.2 LU.1.2 (key is neighborhood input) LU.1.11 LU.2.1, LU.4.1 LU.10.3, LU.10.4 Policy LU.18.9. Plan activity centers and corridors appropriate to their respective regional or neighborhood scale. NH.1.1- NH.1.3, NH.1.5, NH.1.7, NH.1.8. NH.6.1	Urban policies - Policy LU.10.5., Policy LU.10.6. Activity centers - Policy LU.18.6. Support increased densities within activity centers and corridors. – may be too broad or need a condition about neighborhood preservation. Policy LU.6.1. Consider a variety of housing types and employment options when planning new development and redevelopment projects. The concept and use of the term reinvestment in the policies related in LU.1 and LU.5 could be problematic because the term is broad and not all reinvestment is appropriate in neighborhoods.	NH.1.7 is KEY and needs to be further defined Gateways demand particular attention FRP30 does not address the relative height or elevations of new development compared to surrounding buildings, neighborhoods and districts.  18.6 needs to be fixed in the Regional Plan to include a condition about neighborhood preservation.

Topic	Characteristic	Action/ Priority	How well is it addressed in FRP30?	Contradictory policies	Comments
Building Design	Protects the character of historic neighborhoods and districts	Highest priority	Goal CC.2. Preserve, restore, and rehabilitate heritage resources to better appreciate our culture. CC.2.4, CC.2.7 CC.3.1, LU.1.11 LU.2.1 LU.4.1, LU.10.3, LU.10.4 NH.1.1- NH.1.3 NH.1.5. NH.1.7 NH.1.8. NH.6.1 Policy ED.4.7.	Policy NH.1.4. Foster points of activities, services, increased densities, and transit connections in urban and suburban neighborhoods. Policy LU..5. Encourage the distribution of density within neighborhoods in relationship to associated activity centers and corridors, infrastructure, transportation, and natural constraints such as slopes and drainages.	NH.1.7 and CC.2.7 are KEY and needs to be further defined  CC.2.7 needs to be changed to add neighborhoods.  NH.1.4 needs to be changed to remove the broad statement about “increased densities”
Building Design	Appropriate intensity and location of activities such as parties, pools, etc.	High Priority	Not addressed specifically but could be indirectly addressed by Policy LU.1.11		Include topic in high occupancy housing specific plan under operations.
Building Design	Interior design is flexible to allow for families, students, etc. to live there	Medium Priority	LU.2.1, LU.11.4, LU.11.6 LU.18.4 LU.18.8 NH.2.3 NH.4.7		Include topic in high occupancy housing specific plan under operations.

Topic	Characteristic	Action/ Priority	How well is it addressed in FRP30?	Contradictory policies	Comments
Social impacts	Quality of Management, including training for managers on community issues and Crime Free Multi-Family Housing Program	High Priority	None		Include topic in high occupancy housing specific plan under operations.
Social Impacts	Protect iconic viewsheds		Covered under Community Character and Natural Resources chapters	Compact development principles and current commercial building height allowances.	Research into how this is regulated in other jurisdictions showed that viewshed regulation was primarily for nationally significant historic sites (the Alamo, statehouses, Monticello) and only regulated from public places. May also be legally infeasible in Arizona. This is a topic best left to specific plans for neighborhoods and districts.
Transportation	Proximity to campus	Medium	Policy LU.12.8. Provide for strong connections from the Flagstaff Medical Campus to the Northern Arizona University campus via pedestrian paths, bicycle connections, streets, and transit service.		At a previous meeting, the group discussed the benefits of concentrating versus distributing the availability of student/high occupancy housing throughout the City. Strong transit was considered essential for the latter.

Topic	Characteristic	Action/ Priority	How well is it addressed in FRP30?	Contradictory policies	Comments
Transportation	Off-site barriers to walkability between site and campus	Medium	LU.10.3, LU.11.2, LU.12.7, LU.12.8, LU.12.9, LU.13.1-13.2, LU.13.9, LU.15.4, LU.18.5, LU.18.15, LU.18.16, LU.19, T.5.1.-T.5.4, T.6.1, T.6.2, T.8.3, T.9.4		Off-site barriers to walkability were recognized as an issue that influences the decision of student to drive or walk to campus.
Transportation	Adequate off-street parking – ties to occupancy and not bedrooms	Highest	In urban areas, the Regional Plan generally supports parking on-street, shared lots and in garages and a residential parking program. In suburban areas, the Plan supports, screening and pedestrian friendly design of parking lots.(CC.4.4, LU.10.2 LU.12.3 LU.12.11)	The Plan does not address how much parking should be provided by a new development and whether that parking should be on or off-street.	The Zoning Code does address parking requirements for different uses related to how many spaces, whether on or off-street can count towards the parking requirement, landscaping, etc. <b><i>See briefing paper for details</i></b>
Transportation	Proximity of other forms of transportation (FUTS, bus, etc.)	Highest	LU.7.1 LU.19. T.1.6. – T.1.8, T.3.2, T.3.8. T.6.1, T.6.2, T.6.5. T.7 NH.4.6		Use of vehicles by residents at a few multifamily housing properties was significantly reduced when Route 10 was initiated by NAIPTA. Cars stay on property much more than they used to, indicating students are not driving them to campus, even in winter weather. Traffic dept. is going to do a parking and transportation study on this after the Fall semester starts.

Transportation	Avoids locations where traffic impacts are hard to mitigate (i.e. Hwy 180)	Not carried forward for further discussion	LU.19. T.1.6. – T.1.8		There are legal standards, City Codes, policies, and Regional Plan policies that are used to address this on a case by case basis. It is a fairly well covered area of law and policy.
Building Design	Stepped back upper floors (“wedding cake” design)	Fold into compatible scale, form			This could be a good solution in some contexts but not others. For instance, if the concern is noise nuisance a wedding cake may not allow you to build an interior courtyard,
Natural Resources	Considers impacts to dark skies	Not carried forward for further discussion	E&C.5	All night lighting is a consideration for employment uses and not for multifamily housing in lighting zone 1.	Being addressed by a committee outside of the City process and will wait on their findings and recommendations.
Social impacts	Relocation of existing residents	Not carried forward for further discussion	Policy LU.1.12. Seek fair and proper relocation of existing residents and businesses in areas affected by redevelopment and reinvestment, where necessary. NH.3.3 NH.3.5. NH.4.1		The council took this up in January but did not act on it. Could be brought up at a later time as a separate policy form the Regional Plan and Zoning Code. Zoning Code update requires tenant notification
Building Design	Security and Environmental Design portion of Crime-Free Multi-Family Housing program	Folded into Quality of Management			The design issues are usually not a significant impediment to joining the program, when management and property owners want to join.

**Topics that are outside of a property owner or developer’s control**

Topic	Action/ Priority	How well is it addressed in FRP30?	Any contradictory policies?	Comments
Public engagement, Transparency and Accountability		Policy LU.1.11. Ensure that there is collaboration between a developer, residents, and property owners in existing neighborhoods where redevelopment and reinvestment is proposed so that they are included, engaged, and informed.		<p>New zoning code has requirement for additional meeting with neighborhood before the public hearing and for the notes from the meetings to be sent to attendees for accountability. Current zoning code requires that the report from the developer to P&amp;Z and Council include an explanation of how they addressed public comments.</p> <p>Other ideas discussed for this topic: Demonstrated effort to incorporate comments for project, significantly address neighborhood concerns, community support for projects</p>
Proportion of on-campus housing		Policy CC.5.2. Coordinate educational master plans (Northern Arizona University, Coconino Community College, Flagstaff Unified School District, and charter schools) with regional planning efforts. CC.4.4, LU.10.2 LU.12.3 LU.12.11 T.11.3		There was an idea at the last meeting of having a Town-Gown Housing policy that NAU and the City sign off on but given this list of issues perhaps it is a land use housing and transportation document that is needed.
Education for off-campus students				
Long term parking for students				
Park and Ride facilities for campus employees and students				
Create buffers between residential and student housing				