

Note: Due to the low number of responses to some of the concepts, some percentage results in the “Support” and “Do not support” columns may not be an accurate statistical representation of the community’s desires.

Summary of HOH Open House (08/18/2020) and Flagstaff Community Forum Comments (07/26/2019 – 09/03/2019)

	Concept	Total Respondents:	Support:	Do not support:	Written Comments Received
1.	A. High Occupancy Housing Development (HOHD): Is any of the following: 1. A mixed-use or multiple-family development, with three or more dwelling(s) units, and: a. has a density greater than 29 dwelling units per gross acre; b. has a bedroom to gross acre ratio greater than 72.5; c. has a bedroom-to-dwelling unit ratio greater than 2.5; d. has a dwelling unit has bedroom-to- bathroom ratio less than 1.3, excluding 1- and 2-bedroom units; or e. more than 10 percent of the dwelling units have four bedrooms or more.	Total Respondents: 5	Support: 100%	Do not support: 0%	1. There must be something written into the Code for some High and Medium density that would trigger the discussion of affordable housing 2. Lower the density to 25 3. Balance between affordable housing and greed as well as "what the market will bear" philosophy. 4. Yes, but the definition should include "rent-by-the-room" 5. Yes, but the definition should include height, square footage, and mass (volume) 6. Definition should be based on long-term residents/professionals who are looking for a single occupancy for either an individual or a couple as a family unit 7. Yes, but there should be an upper limit to how many 4+ bedrooms. 8. Yes, but clarify whether or not this would include housing targeted to college students 9. Yes, but consider using workforce or student housing in the definition instead of multiple-family 10. I support the definition, regardless of the number of four bedrooms
	B. A single-family attached or detached dwelling, duplex, or triplex that contains four bedrooms or more, and a bedroom to bathroom ratio of less than 1.3, (Excludes developments in the Rural Residential (RR) and Estate Residential (ER) zones, and accessory dwelling units.)	14	79%	21%	
2.	Mixed-use High Occupancy Housing Development (MHOHD) shall conform with the definitions of High Occupancy Housing Development and Mixed-use.	6	67%	33%	1. Activity Areas S13, S14, and S15 are overcrowded with High Occupancy Housing developments.
3.	Should a Mixed-use High Occupancy Housing Development in a Regional Activity Center Pedestrian Shed be allowed up to 50 dwelling units per acre before requiring a Conditional Use Permit?	15	33%	67%	1. The reason is all regional activity centers are created equally. The other side, it depends on who interpretation and who is interpreting. 2. Density should not exceed 29 dwelling units (75 beds) or 50 dwelling units (125) in the Regional Activity Centers 3. Density should be less. 4. The Regional Activity Center should have a lower density 5. The greatest density should only be located in Downtown and Southside only 6. Density should not exceed 29 dwelling units (75 beds). 7. Greater densities should not be allowed in the Regional Activity Centers.
4.	Proposed Additional Conditional Use Permit Criteria: A. The property owner has submitted plans that shows how a development can be converted to a traditional multiple-family development consisting of studio, 1 bedroom, 2 bedroom, and 3 bedroom units.	10	80%	20%	1. Additional Criteria is needed to ensure infrastructure, and on street parking is not overburdened. 2. I agree with the additional proposed Conditional Use Permit criteria, specifically neighbor character. 3. I agree with the additional proposed Conditional Use Permit criteria. 4. I agree with the additional proposed Conditional Use Permit criteria. 5. Is appropriate. Not a hard rule. 6. Depends. 7. Can the Builder pay for the transit stop? 8. Setback is important. 9. I am concerned that the building heights may eventually affect tax payers through the purchase of more advanced fire equipment, like ladder trucks and other insurances drivers needs in public safety.
	A. A High Occupancy Housing Development is located in an activity center delineated in the Regional Plan.	10	80%	20%	
	B. The High Occupancy Housing Development that contains more than 50 dwelling unit per acre or 125 bedrooms per acre, is located in a Regional Activity Center Pedestrian Shed	11	73%	27%	
	C. The lot or parcel that contains the High Occupancy Housing Development shall be within 1200 feet of permanent transit stop.	10	90%	10%	
	D. A High Occupancy Housing Development is designed with a character, including mass, scale, height, colors and other elements, that is compatible with the existing structures of the neighborhood were the High Occupancy Housing Development is located.	10	80%	20%	
E. Property owner, and owner's management company or representative(s) shall operate the High Occupancy Housing Development in accordance with an approved safety plan and, a “good neighbor” plan approved by the Flagstaff Police Department.	10	90%	10%		

Note: Due to the low number of responses to some of the concepts, some percentage results in the "Support" and "Do not support" columns may not be an accurate statistical representation of the community's desires.

5.	<p>High Occupancy Housing Development with three dwelling units, or less (single-family, duplex, and triplex):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 parking space per bedroom. <p>(This is the current Room and Boarding parking requirement.)</p>	18	72%	28%	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> For this size development there definitely need to be adequate parking so I would support there being one space per bed. Because we have no street parking overnight in the winter monthes this must be a requirement especially in the neighborhoods where students live close to campus. Sure, it's good to have enough parking so that residents don't park in other areas, exacerbating the city's already limited parking. But, more important than the ratio of parking spots to beds is the TOTAL number of people (and therefore cars) that a development will bring to a neighborhood. So sure, 942 spots for 942 beds sounds good, but that is 942 MORE VEHICLES REGULARLY ON THE ROAD IN THAT NEIGHBORHOOD. Large numbers like that are causing rapidly deteriorating traffic situations in Flagstaff. This could be avoided by limiting the sheer number of bed permitted in these developments. With density comes the need for improved walking routes and public transportation for commuting to/from work and for leisure. Fewer parking spaces combined with intentional development of interconnected sidewalks, promotion of public transportation and even incentivizing ride share/taxi services will help to lower the need for a 1 person 1 car infrastructure that becomes unnecessary with thoughtful density. All buildings should provide enough parking. We have so many vacation rentals in our neighborhood that don't have adequate parking and they raise the cost of housing so there is no affordable housing. Make sure that HOH in CC are not NAU student housing or investors putting in short term rentals. The condos on Beaver and Dale already have short term rentals which are changing the character and sense of community in our neighborhood. "In reading this, my understanding is this is for smaller developments like the one recently built on N. Beaver near Nativity church. Based on that assumption, I would hope those smaller developments would be targeted to Flagstaff residents & families VS NAU students. Perhaps for these smaller developments one of the other ratios would be appropriate like the .77? Rents in Flagstaff are so very high already making housing for residents nearly unattainable & I don't know if a 1:1 parking: bedroom ratio for places, hopefully targeted for residents, would make them out of reach for the intended target & then simply filled with even more NAU students?" In my opinion this is a critical requirement. Developers try to provide less parking. This always leads to an increase in "on street" parking which is already at a premium. the existing parking code of one parking space per bedroom is to extreme, a 3 bedroom unit would require 3 spaces assuming that all 3 bedroom s are of driving age. most households have only 2 cars. a one parking space per unit should be fine per dwelling If anywhere near an established neighborhood, there should be one space for each bedroom. That is the modern reality. Anything less makes life bad for existing residents.
6.	<p>High Occupancy Housing Development with Four Dwelling Units and Above:</p> <p>Option 1 1 parking space per bedroom</p> <p>Example, The Standards has 942 bedrooms: 942 bedrooms x 1 space per bedroom = 942 spaces</p> <p>(This is the current Room and Boarding parking requirement.)</p> <p>Option 2 First 100 bedrooms: 0.90 parking spaces per bedroom Remaining bedrooms greater than 100: 0.80 parking space per bedroom.</p> <p>(Not eligible for transit and bike reductions)</p>	Total Respondents: 23	Support: 52%	Do not support: 48%	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> I find this to be one of the most difficult problems with the HOHD. A large part of these developments are huge parking garages or parking lots. The whole point of allowing these types of density was to get people out of their cars and walking or using public transit. The idea of 1 space per bed shows the complete failure of our ability to have this density work in the way it was intended in the Regional Plan. There should be studies of whether with the existing student housing developments all of the parking spaces are occupied. This should impact the amount of spaces required. Any incentives to stop out of town students from bringing cars to Flagstaff should be tried. Unfortunately, the lure of these developments is the reason many prefer them to on campus housing where there is no parking. There should be efforts made between NAU and these building management firms to provide inexpensive transit to Phoenix on the weekends, where I imagine most of these students are going. Carpooling should be encouraged in whatever way possible to dinners out, bar hopping or weekend hiking. If these HOHD are primarily student housing they have to work creatively to lessen the needs for their occupants to bring cars to Flagstaff.

Note: Due to the low number of responses to some of the concepts, some percentage results in the "Support" and "Do not support" columns may not be an accurate statistical representation of the community's desires.

	<p>Example, The Standards has 942 bedrooms: $942 \text{ bedrooms} \rightarrow (100 \times 0.90 \text{ space per bedroom}) + (842 \times 0.80 \text{ space per bedroom}) = 764 \text{ spaces}$</p> <p>(This is option is alternative requirement that would require more parking for smaller development, and less for larger developments.)</p>				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. I like option 3. Flagstaff is at a fantastic juncture to either embrace a lifestyle that provides more high-quality public transportation options... or go the way of Phoenix and remain shackled to our cars. 3. 1 parking space/bedroom, plus secure indoor bike storage of 1 bike spot/bedroom 4. One space per bedroom with NO allowances for proximity to mass transit or secure bicycle storage. It is way too optimistic to think that one can live in Flagstaff easily without a car. 5. For these monolithic supposedly 'mixed use' HOH developments 1:1 - Option 1 is appropriate. However, I am wary about the allowances that could be granted for transit & bike parking. Are the numbers spelled out somewhere? 6. Option 3 seems reasonable 7. Option 3, make people dependent on alternative modes of transportation. 8. Option 1.
	<p>Option 3 0.77 parking space per bedroom</p> <p>(Not eligible for transit and bike reductions)</p> <p>Example, The Standards has 942 bedrooms: $942 \text{ bedrooms} \times 0.77 \text{ space per bedroom} = 726 \text{ spaces}$</p> <p>(This is option is based on an actual City of Flagstaff Transportation Engineering Study of several High Occupancy Housing type developments.)</p>	14	36%	64%	
	<p>Please provide your thoughts as to whether or not the parking requirements in Option 2 and 3 should be allowed to be reduced for providing transit pass to residents and/or additional high-security bike parking.</p>	Total Respondents: 5	Support: 60%	Do not support: 40%	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I support the reductions 2. Yes, but the total parking provided should not exceed the reduction. 3. I do not support the reductions 4. I support the reductions 5. I do not support the reductions
7.	<p>Proposed Parking Reduction Requirements</p> <p>A. Transit:</p> <p>Should a High Occupancy Housing Development that provides free transit passes for residents be allowed up to a maximum 20% reduction in the required parking spaces?</p>	14	88%	22%	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The free transit pass requirement stay with the same development perpetually, regardless of change of ownership. 2. The actual car usage reductions created by providing the transit passes is needed to determine the allowable reduction percentage. 3. All Depends. Could be ok if the goals are met 4. Great idea, but let's be realistic. The tenant will pay the cost of the transit pass in their monthly rent. I think this should be available and optional if the tenant chooses as they might desire other forms of transportation based on their needs - walking, Lyft/Uber, bicycle, etc. However, I do think that there should be a cost/fee to utilize a parking space. If we make driving a car more expensive, that will change behavior that this rule may be trying to achieve. 5. "Before this is put into anything official, the verbiage needs to be corrected since it currently states ""free PARKING"" passes and not 'free TRANSIT' passes 2x. 6. Besides that, maybe a 10% reduction not 20%." 7. Great idea. 8. Too high. 5% max.
	<p>B. Bike Parking:</p> <p>Should a High Occupancy Housing Development that provides at least 50 parking space be eligible for a reduction of one parking space per 4 high security bike parking spaces (e.g. bike lockers, monitored bike rooms or enclosures, or similar), up to maximum 10% of the required parking spaces.</p>	10	60%	40%	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I believe there is a place for reducing parking, but 4:1 is not acceptable. 2. All Depends. Could be ok if the goals are met. 3. Yes, but increase the bike ratio and lower the cap 4. I support the reductions 5. This is a great idea and along with bus passes should be encourage and incentivized. 6. I like this idea and believe it is this type of innovative thinking that we need for a multi-solution approach the a multi-faceted problem. I believe this should remain on the table as another option. 7. I don't think that there should be any reduction in the parking requirements of HOHD under any circumstances. 8. "No reduction in parking should be made for access to carshare programs especially in the 50+ HOH category. I believe the majority of the HOHD occupants are people who come from outside of Flagstaff. The primary purpose of carshare programs is to provide a vehicle for a short period of time for a particular 'task' that requires a motor vehicle.

Note: Due to the low number of responses to some of the concepts, some percentage results in the "Support" and "Do not support" columns may not be an accurate statistical representation of the community's desires.

					<p>9. Carshare programs do not address one of the main reasons the HOHD residents Bring a car with them...to get from Flagstaff to wherever they came from be it points south in state or out of state. A carshare program isn't going to make any difference in the number of cars brought to town so they can go home for winter break."</p> <p>10. we own a duplex at 2315 n. center and are considering adding a 3rd. unit to our property , parking for the 3rd unit would have to be from the rear ONE WAY alley which runs from 6Th ave to colanthe ave . Would the city owned alley be a allowable entrance to our proposed #3rd.unit & allow parking to the parcel from the alley ??? also with the "High Occupancy housing plan" will the city be maintaining the alley in a better manor than they currently have in effect.???</p> <p>11. Carshare seems like a nice idea, but is not proven. We should not base parking space requirements on anything less than fully proven means of discouraging the one person/one car paradigm.</p>
	Please add your thoughts pertaining to the proposed high-security bike parking reduction provisions for a High Occupancy Housing Development. Also, is the reduction amount sufficient, or too high? If the reduction is too high, or too low, what should the reduction be? Should there be additional criteria? If so, what additional criteria do you recommend?	Total Respondents: 4	Support: 50%	Do not support: 50%	<p>1. I support the requirement</p> <p>2. I support the requirement</p>
	C. Car Share: Should the parking requirements of a High Occupancy Housing Development be allowed to be reduced for carshare facilities and vehicles?	13	31%	69%	<p>1. Change the "Should" to may.</p> <p>2. Not every development will work as a requirement.</p> <p>3. All Depends.</p> <p>4. Could be ok if the goals are meet</p>
	Please provide your thoughts on the maximum amount that the parking requirements for a High Occupancy Housing Development should be allowed to be reduced. e.g. 5%, 10% 20%, etc. Please provide an explanation for your answer.	2	50%	50%	<p>1. I support the reductions. We need to find ways to reduce students from bring cars</p> <p>2. Maximum reduction of 10%</p>
8.	A. Proposed Bedroom Allowances: 1. Medium Density Residential (MR): Maximum bedrooms per acre outside of the Resource Protection Overlay: 35 (2.5 bedrooms per dwelling unit x 14 dwelling units per acre = 35 bedrooms per acre)	4		6	<p>1. I don't entirely understand what this proposal means - how it translates to a real thing? However, I would like to not have high density housing that allows for lots of people to share the space. I am in favor of anything that makes it hard for many college students to room together (to save on the rent) in the same unit.</p> <p>2. However, we can combat the city being overwhelmed by gargantuan multi-bedroom student housing projects is a good thing. Flagstaff is slowly being overrun by NAU's growth and the projects being erected throughout the city by outside developers are not in any way beneficial to the city's affordable housing crisis.</p> <p>3. Any increase in restrictions to reduce the maximum bedroom density is a good thing. High maximum bedroom density leads to a ghetto like atmosphere. We certainly do not want to turn into Chicago. However, we do need to address our affordable housing shortage in Flagstaff, but high-density housing is not the way to do it.</p> <p>4. The MR should not be increased and the HR should not be increased.</p>
	2. Maximum bedrooms per acre in the Resource Protection Overlay: 22.5 (2.5 bedrooms per dwelling unit x 9 dwelling units per acre = 22.5 bedrooms per acre)	7	71%	29%	
	B. High Density Residential (HR) maximum bedrooms per acre: 72.5 1. Maximum bedrooms per acre outside of the Resource Protection Overlay: 72.5 (2.5 bedrooms per dwelling unit x 29 dwelling units per acre = 72.5 bedrooms per acre)	7	86%	14%	
	2. Maximum bedrooms per acre in the Resource Protection Overlay: 55 (2.5 bedrooms per dwelling unit x 22 dwelling units per acre = 55 bedrooms per acre)	6	84%	16%	
9.	Should High Occupancy Housing Development in the commercial zones have a different density and bedrooms per acre in the Resource Protection Overlay ((2.5 bedrooms per dwelling unit x 22 dwelling units per acre = 55 bedrooms per acre).	4	25%	75%	<p>1. I support densities. The Resource Protection Overlay is to save our trees and slopes.</p> <p>2. Greater densities should not be allowed anywhere.</p> <p>3. The greater density should be allowed</p> <p>4. The greater density should not be allowed.</p>

Note: Due to the low number of responses to some of the concepts, some percentage results in the “Support” and “Do not support” columns may not be an accurate statistical representation of the community’s desires.

10.	<p>Replace Rooming and Boarding in the following Zones with High Occupancy Housing Development land use in the following zones:</p> <p>Manufactured Housing (MH)</p> <p>Estate Residential (ER)</p> <p>Medium Density Residential (MR)</p> <p>High Density Residential (HR)</p> <p>Suburban Commercial (SC)</p> <p>Community Commercial (CC)</p> <p>Highway Commercial (HC)</p> <p>Commercial Service (CS)</p> <p>Central Business (CB)</p>	<p>5</p> <p>7</p> <p>6</p> <p>6</p> <p>5</p> <p>7</p> <p>5</p> <p>4</p> <p>6</p>	<p>40%</p> <p>29%</p> <p>67%</p> <p>83%</p> <p>40%</p> <p>57%</p> <p>80%</p> <p>50%</p> <p>50%</p>	<p>60%</p> <p>71%</p> <p>33%</p> <p>17%</p> <p>60%</p> <p>43%</p> <p>20%</p> <p>50%</p> <p>50%</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. So does this mean that HOH is rent by room housing? If that is not the case then there should still be an additional hoop a developer has to jump through if they want to exclude families and only have students. Our goal should be to have housing that serves all and doesn't discriminate against families or anyone who cannot afford the expensive rent by room costs. If all of these changes are happening to regulate student housing or rent by room housing than you should call it what it is. It seems with this change you are just making it easier for developers to have this type of rental property. Rent by room should be approved with careful consideration of the neighborhood and the needs of the whole community not just NAU. 2. I don't think there should be any housing with multiple tenants each having separate rental agreements. This just promotes developers targeting their units to college students - we have enough of that already. 3. I am not sure I understand this. So, my comment may not apply. However, Flagstaff needs to somehow increase regulation of AIRBNB / VRBO, etc units as much as our restrictive Arizona state regulations allow. AIRBNB / VRBO and other short term rentals are out of control. 4. What new requirements will be imposed on landlords who have been renting their property under this classification in prior years? The structures that have been utilized under the Rooming and Boarding land use may not meet the new requirements for HOHD. How will this be addressed? 5. What about the Transect Zones? High Occupancy Housing should not be in allowed in these areas since they are mainly existing neighborhoods and are not consistent with existing developments. (Verbal comment at morning open house meeting at the Murdock Center) 6. The High Occupancy Housing allowed in the Transect zones should not be allowed. (Verbal comment at morning meeting at the Murdock Center) 7. How are you going to stop High Occupancy Housing in Transect Zones? They could not be allowed (Verbal comment at morning open house meeting at the Murdock Center). 8. Projects like the HUB, and multi bedroom triplexes and duplexes (four bedrooms and greater) High Occupancy Housing types that are allowed in transect zones and are out of scale with existing developments, impact parking, and neighborhood. These types of HOH development should not be allowed. (Verbal comments on southside meeting on Zoning).
11.	<p>Please provide your thoughts pertaining to whether a high occupancy housing development should be allowed as a Conditional Use Permit without including commercial as a mixed use development.</p>	<p>Total Respondents: 1</p>	<p>Support: 100%</p>	<p>Do not support: 0%</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I support HOH without Mixed Use
12.	<p>Proposed Zoning Code Specific to Use Requirements for a High Occupancy Housing Development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A mixed-use High Occupancy Housing Development shall comply with the mixed-use development standards of the Zoning Code. 2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the HOHD, the property owner shall obtain approval of a safety plan from the Flagstaff Police Department’s Crime Free Multihousing program. 3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the HOHD, the property owner shall obtain approval of a “good neighbor” plan from the Flagstaff Police Department’s Crime Free Multihousing program that all tenants are required to sign and comply with as part of the tenant’s lease. 4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the HOHD, the property owner shall obtain approval of a waste management plan from the City’s Public Works Director that shall be implemented to the reduce waste generated by the development.; 	<p>4</p>	<p>50%</p>	<p>50%</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. These are all good but why isn't recycling included with the waste management section. If we are to have this kind of density producing so much more waste in our community, why isn't there requirement for some of this waste to not go in the landfill. Why are these types of developments exempted? 2. Agreed.

Note: Due to the low number of responses to some of the concepts, some percentage results in the "Support" and "Do not support" columns may not be an accurate statistical representation of the community's desires.

	<p>5. Prior to the final approval of a subdivision that creates one or more lots or parcels that would contain a development conforming to the definition of a HOHD, the property owner shall obtain approval of a Conditional Use Permit for the property that would contain the HOHD.</p> <p>Please share your thoughts about the proposed use requirements for a High Occupancy Housing Development. Does the propose requirements capture your thoughts as it pertains to this use?</p>				
Total Comments Received		271	Total Written Comments Received		90
Total Participates (40 - Open House Attendees) + (260 - Online Community Forum Views)		300			

Summary of Public Comments and Questions Received

from the February 13 and 14, 2020 Open House Meeting on the Zoning Code.

1. Does the proposed Zoning Code or High Occupancy Housing Plan allow for additional building height?

Staff Response: Neither the proposed zoning code and the High Occupancy Housing Plan allow for additional building height

2. Is the High Occupancy Housing Plan specific to any one area?

Staff Response: The High Occupancy Housing Plan address all areas of the City.

3. Where is High Occupancy Housing allowed?

Staff Response: There are large and small High Occupancy Housing developments. As defined, the proposed Zoning Code allows High Occupancy Housing all residential and commercial zones, and all transect zones (excluding the T1 Natural (T1) and T2 Rural (T2)).

4. Are there ways to getting around the High Occupancy Housing requirements? For example, a dwelling unit having 8 bedrooms

Staff Response: Only the single-family dwelling unit has a bedroom cap in any one dwelling unit. There is no bedroom cap in the two-unit/duplex or a multifamily development.

5. Is a request for a Conditional Use Permit subject to the surrounding neighborhood comment?

Staff Response: All Conditional Use Permits require a public meeting, at least, before the Planning and Zoning Commission. The Planning and Zoning Commission, or the City Council when applicable, may consider public comments in rendering their decision in the approval or denial of the Conditional Use Permit. The Planning and Zoning Commission's and the City Council's decision is limited to the Conditional Use Permit Criteria.

6. In a single-family neighborhood, is an accessory dwelling unit allowed.

Staff Response: An accessory dwelling unit is allowed in a lot with a single-family dwelling unit.

7. Is it correct that Northern Arizona University (NAU) attendance going down?

Staff Response: Staff has been informed that the attendance had decreased this past semester.

8. Does the development have to be compatible with the style of existing surrounding developments?

Staff Response: The Conditional Use Permit criteria requires a finding that the compatibility criteria have met.

9. The Standard is not 100% full, 90% full per the leasing manager. It has open parking on the ground floor that is set aside for the commercial areas. Currently the residents are using the spaces since the commercial is vacant. There is available parking on the upper floors.

10. Why are they building more rooms for students? The attendance is down as NAU.

Staff Response: Arizona is a free market state. Therefore, the property owners and developer can build what they want if it is allowed by the properties zone.

11. So, we will have just a bunch of slum housing in and next to downtown.

12. Arizona laws prohibit requiring affordable housing

13. Could the proposed standards require a minimum number of studio and one-bedroom units? For example, a minimum of 20 percent of the total dwelling units. Also, could the proposed

standards have a maximum number of 4 bedrooms or greater? For example, a maximum of 20 percent of the total dwelling units. Therefore, this would not allow 50 to 80 percent, or more, of the dwelling to be 4 bedrooms or greater

Staff Response: Yes, the proposed standards could.

14. Are there developer pushing to get their approval before the adoption of these proposed development standard.

Staff Response: We have been told that some developer desire to get their approvals before the proposed standard become effective.

15. The market demand is 1 and 2 bedrooms. We want the three, four, and five-bedroom unit apartment near NAU, where the student can walk.

16. What is there to protect the low-density developments?

Staff Response: Each zone has a list of allowed land uses and densities. The Zoning Code provided for protections within the zone, although almost all zones allow for multi-family developments at different densities. Also, single-family is allowed in almost all of the zones.

17. What regulates the Zoning Code?

Staff Response: All new zoning code amendment must be in conformance with the Regional Plan, and applicable specific plans.

18. The proposed parking standards are to high for small developments. They should be like the transect zones.

19. Allow smaller HOH developments by-right, without the requirements for a Conditional Use Permit.

20. Provide incentives for infill developments with a lower parking requirement.