



## Comprehensive Plan Committee

Regular Meeting

**Thursday, April 30, 2015 3:00 pm – 5:30 pm**

Northern Arizona Center for Entrepreneurship and Technology (NACET)  
2225 N. Gemini Drive, Flagstaff, AZ 86001 (928) 213-9234

---

### Draft Minutes

#### **CPC Members Present:**

Geoff Barnard      Patty Garcia      Wendell Johnson      David McKee  
Judy Prosser      John Ruggles      Maggie Sacher

#### **Core Planning Team Members Present:**

Jay Christelman, Director of Community Development  
Jeanne Trupiano, Planning and Zoning Manager  
Bob Short, Principal Planner  
Kate Morley, Senior Planner  
Zach Schwartz, Planner  
Hannah R. Griscom, Urban Wildlife Planner, Arizona Game and Fish Department and Coconino County  
Amanda Acheson, Sustainable Building Program Manager  
Loras Rauch, Comprehensive Plan Consultant

#### **1. Welcome and Introductions**

Jeanne Trupiano called the meeting to order at 3:11pm and passed out the Agenda. She began the process for everyone to introduce themselves. She passed out a schedule of open houses for public outreach. She explained that the May 12<sup>th</sup> Board of Supervisors Work Session was held off until June, where there would be three, 90 minute sessions with the Board of Supervisors to discuss elements of the Comprehensive Plan.

Geoff Barnard asked what the format of the public open houses was.

Ms. Trupiano explained that many of the open houses were actually neighborhood watch meetings and Community Development staff adds the Comprehensive Plan to the agenda. Typically, staff briefly and informally explains what the Comprehensive Plan is, what the timeline for the adoption of the update is, and what the process for the new adoption update is. Staff then collects any comments from the public or answers questions.

Judy Prosser asked how the public can access the Comprehensive Plan Public Release Draft.

Ms. Trupiano stated that it is on the County's website and copies would be available at public libraries throughout the County. She continued to discuss the timeline with more detail.

Mr. McKee asked how the CPC could be involved in the public outreach process.

Ms. Trupiano invited the Comprehensive Plan Committee (CPC) members to attend some of the open houses, namely the one for the area that they live in. CPC member, Jamie Neilson attended the open house in Bellemont, made a presentation on the Comprehensive Plan and offered to be the liaison between the community and the County.

Ms. Prosser asked if there was a scheduled CPC meeting in May 2015.

Ms. Trupiano answered that there will not be a CPC meeting in May. There is a meeting in June 2015 and the discussion topic will be the comments received from the Public Release Draft.

Amanda Acheson added that Hannah Griscom had given a Comprehensive Plan presentation to the Coconino Plateau Water Advisory Council (CPWAC) about the Plan's Water Resources Element. She explained what CPWAC is as well as their role and function in the community.

Mr. McKee asked if that presentation resulted in any comments or concerns for Ms. Griscom.

Ms. Griscom said that CPWAC was supportive of the Comprehensive Plan but the Water Resources Element did not meet all of the statutory requirements for what a *County's* Water Resources Comprehensive Plan Element should contain. Future water sources for the growing population needed to be addressed with greater detail.

## **2. Review and Possible Action on the Land Use and Growth Elements**

Loras Rauch began to address her comments on staff's proposed Land Use and Growth Elements. She thought that the currently adopted Comprehensive Plan, even with proposed changes were not as direct as they should be in identifying the spatial direction of growth. She asked the CPC to consider growth boundaries and where they thought gateway areas are. One way to address growth boundaries and gateway areas are with the County's pre-existing Area Plans; Area Plans can act like master planned communities. As Area Plans were updated, they should provide areas for rural activity centers. Rural activity centers are places where development should be concentrated. She explained that doing this would affect the decision making process as far as where new developments are approved or denied.

Mr. Barnard asked for clarification. He wasn't sure if the Comprehensive Plan would map out the specific growth areas/activity centers or if the Area Plans would do that.

John Ruggles said that the 'activity center' idea was elaborated on in the Flagstaff Regional Plan, and that those areas were much larger in the City of Flagstaff's adopted version when compared to Coconino County's. He said that it made sense that the activity centers would be smaller in the rural County and larger in the urban areas of the County. He thought that a large activity center posed more issues as far as infrastructure development, which is a great challenge in Coconino County.

Ms. Rauch continued asking how infrastructure should be planned in order to create smart growth. She reminded the group that engineers work to build anything in any place, but planners work to consciously and strategically develop things.

Mr. Ruggles mentioned that the availability and location of water resources should be a huge factor as far as deciding where growth and development should occur. He stated that infrastructure such as electrical lines would play a similar role.

Wendell Johnson noted that there was not infrastructure in certain areas where growth is currently planned, and he gave a few examples.

Ms. Rauch stated that the point is that there should be concentrated growth areas, and there should be some mention of these areas in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Ruggles thought that there are already constraints where development can occur, as there is a relatively small amount of private land in Coconino County as it is. He agreed with Ms. Rauch as far as the Comprehensive Plan stating something about where growth should occur.

Ms. Trupiano explained that Ms. Rauch had already started identifying in the Land Use Element where the different communities with Area Plans are and linking those to the Comprehensive Plan as far as elaborating areas of planned concentration of growth and development.

Mr. Barnard asked for more clarification on the Area Plans, and thought that a policy should be crafted with regards to the Area Plans.

Ms. Trupiano explained that the areas of intended growth are typically defined within the Area Plan for that area of the County and those areas are already defined by location of infrastructure.

Mr. Barnard wondered if the County should take a proactive or reactive approach to the occurrence and location of growth and development.

Mr. Johnson thought that any policies in regard to the occurrence and location of future growth and development should be written in a more vague way, so as not to limit creative ideas of where and how growth should occur. Flexibility and guidelines would be better than strict limitations or processes.

Ms. Trupiano thought that certain performance standards should be met.

In the case of proposed zone changes for higher density or more intensive uses, Ms. Rauch thought that the County should have specifics as far as what should be supported or not for legal basis of approvals or denials.

Judy Prosser stated that she thought the topics being discussed now have not been discussed at previous CPC meetings and she does not think that the CPC is adequately representing the County or if the CPC members are qualified to be making these kind of determinations because they do not have the knowledge base to do so. Ms. Prosser recommended that the growth boundary topic should be based on the local Area Plans so the people living in these communities can make these decisions for themselves.

Mr. Rauch stated that the idea, at this point, was not get into too much detail with planned growth, or to set limits for private properties but develop general policies that support concentrated growth and activity centers.

Mr. McKee thought there was a simple solution; bring in the ideas from the Area Plans and integrate the documents.

Mr. Ruggles agreed with this statement. He thought that this discussion should be more grass-roots and that the Area Plan would inform the Comprehensive Plan on the growth issue.

Ms. Rauch elaborated that general concentrated growth areas should be delineated on a map; or inserted in a map that identifies existing Area Plans and potential or future Area Plans may be developed. Ms. Rauch stated that detailed discussion of growth should be in the Area Plans.

Ms. Trupiano thought that a number of policies in the Plan already addressed the issues of where developments are preferred or not.

Ms. Griscom added that the places identified in the Flagstaff Regional Plan should be called out in the map that Ms. Rauch suggested as well.

Ms. Trupiano agreed, and thought the Comprehensive Plan should explain the relationship between the two documents.

Mr. Barnard commented that there are many places in the County that do not have Area Plans.

Ms. Trupiano said that funding for new Area Plans was difficult to obtain but is sometimes available through the Federal Government. Camp Navajo may provide funding to update the Bellemont Area Plan because of the military's installation there.

Ms. Acheson mentioned that the Board of Supervisors earmarked funds to update the Area Plans because they know that some of them are in dire need of updating.

Ms. Rauch stated that updating of the Area Plans is something that was in the Implementation Plan for the Comprehensive Plan update as a high priority.

Ms. Trupiano continued the discussion, explaining what gateway communities are. She noted that they are particularly identified along scenic byways.

Mr. Johnson commented that viewsheds from Highway 180 were a concern.

Zach Schwartz explained how viewsheds and scenic areas are protected by zoning regulation and that it was supported by the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Schwartz gave an example of the regulation of communication towers in the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Barnard asked what the implication of a 'gateway community' is.

Mr. Johnson noted that not everyone thinks that wildcat subdivisions are bad, and he thought that if certain people want to live in a wildcat subdivision area that they should be able to.

Mr. McKee thought that there was an issue with people moving out to an area such as a wildcat subdivision and then pleading with the government to fix issues caused by the very creation of the wildcat subdivision.

Mr. Barnard thought that gateway communities should be self-identifying. The community members should choose to be a gateway community or not.

Ms. Rauch liked the idea that gateway communities would be self-identifying and that at this time the CPC might call out certain areas as 'potential' gateway communities.

Ms. Acheson agreed with Ms. Rauch on the potential gateway communities, rather than the CPC calling them all out at this point.

Mr. McKee brought up a recent Board of Supervisors (BOS) hearing where Tim Dalegowski with Coconino County Public Works discussed biking corridors and a multimodal transportation study for Bellemont.

Ms. Rauch thought that that should be mentioned in the Circulation Element.

Mr. Schwartz agreed that the study should be in that element.

Mr. Johnson asked if there was ever a plan or study that called for a buffered bike trail along Highway 180, because at one point he had seen something about it.

Wrapping up the meeting, Ms. Trupiano read a list of accomplishments from the previously adopted Comprehensive Plan aloud for the group.

Ms. Rauch added that parts of the Conservation Framework have been changed and that there are no longer cross references in the document; they are inherent.

Mr. Barnard said the Conservation Framework *should* look different than the rest of the Plan so that it *is* obvious that there is importance. He thought that they should be emphasized and asked is there a need for cross referencing?

Ms. Rauch said it would be chaotic to keep the cross referencing and instead it should be apparent that each element should be referred to in the Conservation Framework.

Mr. Barnard thought that the Plan is somewhat like the Bible, in the sense that so many interpretations could be made of it when it is considered as a whole. He thought that it should be a little more apparent the implications of the goals and policies along with the Conservation Framework as a whole in regard to any specific development.

Ms. Trupiano called the meeting to a close at 5:15pm.

### **3. Call to the public**

No members of the public were present.

### **6. Set Next Meeting**

The next meeting was set tentatively for the end of June, 2015.