



## Comprehensive Plan Committee

Regular Meeting

**Thursday, February 26, 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 2:12pm and passed out the Agenda. She began the process for everyone to introduce themselves.

Jay Christelman read the Coconino County Mission Statement.

### **2. Discussion of changes to the timeline for revision of draft elements, upcoming work sessions with the Board of Supervisors, and update on schedule for Regional Open Houses**

Ms. Trupiano explained that the schedule for the Comprehensive Plan meetings had changed. She stated that the last Board of Supervisors (BOS) update had occurred the previous week. The BOS wants summaries of discussions on each element by the Comprehensive Plan Committee (CPC) and each work session that review two elements. There will be two public hearing dates scheduled in November 2015 with the tentative adoption date of the Comprehensive Plan in

November 2015. The County has retained an experienced contract employee for support of the Core Team and development of the Comprehensive Plan as well as a professional editor. The professional editor will be hired in April.

Geoff Barnard wanted more clarification on direction from the BOS.

Ms. Trupiano explained that the cover sheets of each Element would help guide the group with the changes. The BOS asked for a list of core recommendations and what has changed from the 2003 version of the Comprehensive Plan to this Updated version. She moved on to some comments made by Judy Prosser on the Land Use Element and the Community Character Element. Ms. Trupiano wanted the group to read and discuss those comments. The comments addressed “tools” that staff identified for gathering and using information on cultural resources that would aide in making better land use decisions. The Conservation Land System and Historic Preservation Officer were two “tools”.

Ms. Prosser explained her thoughts on those items. She stated that she had dealt with leases on state lands in the past. She stated that the use of information gathered with these “tools” (Conservation Land System and Historic Preservation Officer) may prove burdensome on landowners for the sake of protecting cultural resources. She stated that some governmental agencies require archaeological reviews for minor projects when there is only a *possibility* of cultural or historical heritage present. She said that even something as simple as cleaning a cattle guard can trigger an archaeological review. She said that the Historic Preservation Act considers structures built in 1964 (or being in excess of 50 years) as a cultural resource and she was not necessarily in agreement with that. She thought that historical designation makes for a cumbersome process for improvements. She stated that processes like this are not cost effective to the applicant or governmental agencies. She wondered how far these “tools” would go, as far as limiting development on private property; for example, would a sensitive plant species on a property stop development? The original intent of the Endangered Species Act was positive but now it causes developers grief. She does not want the County to have laws protecting cultural or natural resources similar to these.

John Ruggles gave his experience with historically designated structures and mentioned that Arizona statutes do not protect them much. Even the Federal Historic Register works that way. Mr. Ruggles thought that because the state and federal government have created laws on historical structures that the County did not have much authority to regulate them. Mr. Ruggles stated that gathering the information proposed by staff would help the Planning and Zoning Commission make decisions, however. He thought that conditions put on permits based on that information would not be helpful and not overbearing.

Rick Moore explained how he and Sat Best had contributed to the ideas that were proposed by staff in their recommendations as members of the Science Advisory Group (SAG) for the Comprehensive Plan Update. He explained that they were advocating for a position in the County similar to the City of Flagstaff’s State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), Karl Eberhard.

Ms. Trupiano explained that the County does not currently have a cultural resource expert who could help inventory cultural resources within the County. She mentioned development near the Twin Arrows Casino, where Principal Planner Bob Short had to ask the City’s SHPO for cultural resource information for a development case rather than relying on County staff for expertise.

## **2. Discussion and action on revisions to content, goals, and policies for the following elements: Community Character, Growth, Land Use, and Circulation.**

Ms. Trupiano asked the group to review and provide comments on the draft Elements for Community Character, Growth, Land Use and Circulation.

Mr. Barnard asked about the policy referring to ‘coordinating efforts’.

Ms. Trupiano stated that there were many agencies that County staff works with in order to accomplish many tasks. There are a wide variety of governmental agencies that are landowners or stakeholders in this region.

Mr. Ruggles stated that many entities were needed to aid in the response to the Shultz Fire and subsequent flooding.

Ms. Huenneke was curious about the wording ‘list of consensus species’. She thought it should be worded as ‘based on the consensus derived list’.

Mr. Barnard thought that the wording should not include ‘consensuses’ so that the County would reserve the right to consider species that may not be in consensus with other agencies.

Ms. Huenneke pointed out that the word ‘statue’ was used when the word ‘statute’ was intended.

Judy Prosser asked about the conservation lands system and whether it was meant to be an inventory or something more.

Ms. Trupiano explained that it would be a new process and its purpose and methods were not defined yet.

Mr. Barnard asked if the conservation lands system would be an inventory or process.

Ms. Trupiano thought that it could be a process that would be informed with an inventory.

Mr. Barnard thought, that the wording of should say that data collection would be used to inform land use decisions.

Ms. Prosser asked what data would be used in the conservation lands system; could be used to stop a land owner from building a development.

Ms. Trupiano stated that it would be similar to how Ms. Griscom works with the Community Development Department. Ms. Griscom councils Community Development as an Urban Wildlife Planner and provides expertise in relation to, up and coming projects so that County Staff can make an informed decision.

Ms. Griscom was not sure how reliable and how usable the information from the conservation lands system would be.

Ms. Trupiano thought that it would be dependent on what features were primarily identified.

Wendell Johnson thought that the inventory was not positive for land owners because the

County would use it to stop development on private properties.

Ms. Trupiano stated that that was not the intent. She explained that there are land features such as cultural resources that the County requires studies for prior to development. It would be better if we had data on like that so that we would not require developers to create their own studies. The Twin Arrows Development was given as an example.

Maggie Sacher thought that the term ‘conservation lands’ may be confusing to people because it is a term used by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and means something different. She thought a different term should be used by the County.

Ms. Griscom agreed with Ms. Sacher’s and stated that the BLM uses the term ‘conservation lands’ as a regulatory term.

Mr. Barnard suggested that the wording should be ‘ensure the best available information based on reliable science will be open to the County for land use decisions’.

Mr. McKee asked about the maintenance of the data and how it would be updated.

Ms. Trupiano explained a way that it could be maintained.

Mr. Barnard thought that the policy should not be specific about the way the data was stored or used and that it should be generally referred to in the Plan.

Mr. Ruggles thought that there could be legal issues if the County did not gather and maintain the data in a way that would inform land use decisions.

Ms. Sacher wondered how much this process would affect the way staff makes presentations and reports to boards and commissions.

Mr. Johnson thought that this “tool” should not be addressed in the Plan. He thought that this “tool” may be a good thing, but he was not sure it belonged in the Plan.

Mr. Ruggles thought that it should be in the plan to show a connection between policy and ordinance.

Mr. Johnson agreed that it would be good, but, not all of the “tools” used for implementation of the Plan should be written in the Plan itself.

Mr. Barnard suggested some policy language. That wording was recorded by Ms. Trupiano for use in the Plan.

Ms. Trupiano moved to the community agriculture section. She stated that it would be used to update Sections of the Zoning Ordinance and read the proposed policies aloud.

Ms. Sacher made some comments about water use and its connection to agriculture. She thought that increased agriculture would endanger some private wells. She stated that in many cases, the Planning and Zoning Commission has told people that groundwater is a subject that the Commission has no jurisdiction over, as far as regulation and that that regulatory authority is vested within the State of Arizona.

Ms. Griscom thought that maybe water conservation goals in relation to agriculture should be included in the Plan as well because of Ms. Sacher's comment.

Ms. Sacher agreed that that would be a good idea.

Ms. Trupiano continued to ranchland and ranges. She stated that this section needed work.

Mr. Johnson thought that the County could not do much about it.

Ms. Trupiano stated that legislation may be pending that would allow for land exchanges and that if the opportunity presented itself for the County to have more involvement it would be good to have a policy ready for that.

Mr. Ruggles stated that State Trust reform could present an opportunity to keep open space in strategic places; State Trust Land could be developed in the future if there is not a way to exchange the land.

Ms. Huenneke gave the example of a beneficial land exchange with the Centennial Forest and how that helped buffer activities for Northern Arizona University.

Ms. Sacher agreed, and thought that the language related to land exchanges should include BLM. She thought that it could be beneficial to businesses in the Northern parts of the County.

Ms. Trupiano continued to different types of land uses stated that park models are no longer permitted as affordable housing.

Ms. Sacher stated that park models can be a great form of employee housing. She thought that park models should be permitted and businesses can benefit from there use especially in the from of employee housing.

Mr. Barnard thought that 'good design' was not good wording. It should be 'design that is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan'.

Ms. Huenneke suggested new wording '...conversely, cluster development near low residential...'.

Ms. Trupiano mentioned that there was not a policy that supported gated communities in the Regional Plan because it had been deleted.

Mr. Ruggles thought that gated communities were not real communities, and that their existence actually detracted from the larger community.

Patty Garcia thought that gated communities might be controversial if they were permitted because the County might maintain 'public' roads that are inside of a gated community.

Bob Short stated that typically the County does not maintain roads inside of gated communities.

Ms. Huenneke liked that discussion at the top of page 10 related to gated communities.

Ms. Garcia noticed that second homes are part of the Plan and that they are both positively and

negatively referenced and wants to know what the County's position on second homes is.

Mr. Johnson thought that the group should make the determination on what the County's position on second home ownership is. He thought that there were a great deal of negatives related to second home ownership in the County.

Ms. Griscom thought that Policy 20 and 18 were redundant, and that Policy 20 should be deleted.

Mr. Barnard thought that Policy 18 should be deleted and Policy 20 should be kept.

Ms. Griscom thought that maybe there should be just a policy on cluster development.

Ms. Sacher thought that incentivizing cluster development could be a good thing, and that Bill Cordasco had agreed with this in the past.

Mr. Gishee asked about supporting technical assistance for planning specific developments.

Ms. Trupiano stated that the Coconino County Sustainable Building Program and Community Services Department provides aid for technical assistance. She would look into how that may be used within the Plan and moved to Policy 25.

Mr. Corning commented on his personal business, and stated that the Comprehensive Plan discouraged it because of the use and zone that it is located in and thought that the Plan should mention businesses that should be supported rather than discouraged.

Ms. Sacher thought that 'rural activity centers' should be put up front and then defined as far as what should be included in them.

Mr. Corning thought that light industrial uses are often similar or less impactful than commercial uses, and that more light industrial uses should be supported in the Plan.

Ms. Sacher noted that Policy 28 mentions 'inholdings' and that that term should be clearly defined.

The group collectively agreed with Ms. Sacher's statement.

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

No members of the public were present.

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

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