



## Comprehensive Plan Committee

Regular Meeting

**Thursday, January 29, 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

---

### **CPC Members Present:**

Geoff Barnard	Jim Corning	Patty Garcia	Leo Gishie
Laura Huenneke	Wendell Johnson	David McKee	Judy Prosser
John Ruggles	Maggie Sacher		

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

Jay Christelman, Director of Community Development  
John Aber, Assistant Director  
Jeanne Trupiano, Principal Planner  
Bob Short, Senior Planner  
Zach Schwartz, Planner  
Kate Morley, Planner  
Hannah R. Griscom, Urban Wildlife Planner, Arizona Game and Fish Department and Coconino County

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

Jeanne Trupiano called the meeting to order at 3:15pm. She began the process for everyone in attendance to introduce themselves.

Ms. Trupiano explained that she would be going to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) with the Elements in draft form for comment on January 30, 2015. She stated that the Sustainability and Economic Development Elements have more work that needs to be done. She explained how the Energy Element is written more like an ordinance than a policy document and that it would be its own stand-alone document, with ordinance language, would be summarized and aligned with the Plan as a policy document and integrated into the Plan.

Ms. Trupiano asked if there were any general comments on any of the draft elements.

Laura Huenneke thought that the Land Use Element should have more definitions in general

because much of the language could be subjective.

Ms. Trupiano agreed and gave a specific example.

Geoff Barnard thought that the descriptions in the Plan preceding the policies are too long.

Hannah Griscom agreed that many of the elements of the Plan are too long. She believed that they were originally written that way to support the policies with theory.

John Ruggles thought that the details are important because they provide the intent behind the policies.

Mr. Barnard noted that some of the descriptions did not inform the policies and that the descriptions should only inform the policies. He gave an example.

Ms. Trupiano wondered if the group would be available for two meetings in February 2015. She proposed that the group meet on February 12<sup>th</sup> or 19<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Ruggles and Mr. Corning thought that the 12<sup>th</sup> would work.

Ms. Prosser would not be able to attend a meeting on February 12<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Barnard asked about starting early February 26, 2015. The rest of the group agreed with that.

Mr. McKee wanted to have an extra meeting instead of going longer as discussed.

Ms. Huenneke would not be able to meet on any other date than February 26, 2015. A majority of the group agreed that a longer meeting on February 26<sup>th</sup> was preferable to an additional meeting. The February 26<sup>th</sup> meeting would begin at 2:00pm.

Ms. Trupiano began to address industrial and light manufacturing.

Mr. Corning thought that a lot of the paragraphs could be combined into a single paragraph. He also mentioned language about performance standards. He thought that there should be some discussion as to what a 'clean industry' is.

Mr. Ruggles agreed and stated that the semiconductor industry is used as an example of a clean industry; it is not a clean industry.

Mr. Barnard stated that industries should not be specifically referenced in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. McKee thought that the term 'clean industries' should not be used at all because it is difficult to define.

Ms. Trupiano asked if 'restoration to healthy forests' is too specific.

The group agreed that it was too specific.

Ms. Huenneke asked if it would be too complicated to add wording on the impacts of

development to the social realm, as well as, environmental and natural. She stated that land use decisions have a large impact both socially and culturally.

Mr. Barnard thought that the Comprehensive Plan should be referenced as a whole throughout the “Plan” in order to capture the issues encompassed within the document but not specifically mentioned in any specific policy or goal. Policy 38 should be changed to say ‘reasonably developed’.

Ms. Sacher was unsure if that was the right terminology and thought that the sentence needs some work.

Ms. Huenneke thought that ‘reasonable’ was a good term to use there.

Ms. Sacher thought that the wording should be ‘not in conflict with other ideals in the Plan’. She added that Policy 40 should be worded as ‘encourage the proper...’ rather than ‘discourage’.

Mr. Barnard and Mr. Johnson thought that the first sentence should be deleted.

Ms. Sacher thought that ‘gateways’ should be better defined.

Ms. Trupiano then discussed legal nonconforming uses and policies that dealt with that issue.

Ms. Huenneke thought that Policies 48 and 49 should be combined.

Ms. Trupiano and Ms. Sacher thought that those two policies were in there separately in order to convey a different meaning.

Ms. Sacher said that she thought community resistance or support should be mentioned as a high priority in decision making.

Mr. Schwartz stated that the Parks Area Plan is an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

The group took a short break at 4:55pm and reconvened at 5pm.

Ms. Trupiano stated that support of traditional cultural practices was listed as a priority for the Comprehensive Plan Update by Supervisor Fowler. She stated that if the County were a Certified Local Government then we could have a Historic Preservation Officer which would aide in preservation of cultural and traditional sites in the County.

Mr. Short described the Glittering Mountain development at Twin Arrows and how that project would be affected if the County had a Historic Preservation Officer or better index of historic and cultural resources within the County.

Ms. Sacher thought that the tribal interests and other historic preservation should not be separated and that both tribal interests and historic preservation are equally important.

Ms. Trupiano explained why there are two different sections for tribal-related cultural preservation and four forms of cultural preservation.

Mr. Gishee explained how development on private land, related to tribal and traditional Native

American practices should work. He thought that the County and tribes should coordinate and work through tribal governments to ensure that there is not a lot of impact with development projects.

Ms. Trupiano briefly discussed scenic corridors and the state designation and/or federal designation. She then went on to discuss dark skies.

Mr. Ruggles thought that the wording should be 'shall' rather than 'encourage' in relation to preservation of dark skies.

Mr. Corning acknowledged that the Coconino County Zoning Ordinance preferred low pressure sodium bulbs but thinks that there is an issue with purchasing these bulbs.

Mr. Johnson stated that being too specific about what types of bulbs and fixtures were supported in the Plan would be detrimental because of improvements in lighting over the next ten years.

Mr. Ruggles explained that the wording 'narrow spectrum' was broad enough to meet intent and as well as to anticipate new technology.

Ms. Trupiano asked what the group thought about the idea of a noise ordinance.

Mr. Ruggles explained that the Town of Cave Creek deals with a noise ordinance and that if the County were going to adopt a noise ordinance scientific instruments (decibel levels) would need to be employed in order to determine if the ordinance was being violated. The lack of such instruments would inhibit the County in enforcement especially in a Court of Law.

Ms. Trupiano asked for more input from other committee members on the subject.

A number of committee members stated that a noise ordinance may be a good idea.

Ms. Prosser noted that Policy 43 may not be appropriate. She thought that it is the buyer's choice to live in an area and that the developer should not have to mitigate noise.

Mr. Barnard thought that the impact of existing noises around proposed development sites for residential uses should be considered in land use decisions.

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

No members of the public were present.

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

The next meeting was set for February 26, 2015, beginning at 2pm.