

## Daniel Symer

---

**From:** tyler denham <tyler.b.denham@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 8, 2021 11:47 AM  
**To:** Daniel Symer  
**Subject:** Comments on February 9th Work Session PZ-21-00019

Tyler Denham  
760-449-0512  
PZ-21-00019

I am very excited to see the City Council discuss an expansion of the affordable housing incentives, these incentives have the potential to help many of the neediest families in Flagstaff. However, there is a sentence in the proposed amendment that threatens to undermine the City Council's laudable goal of improving housing affordability. Section B.4.D of 10-30.20.040 states:

[Property Development Standards that may be modified pursuant to this section do not include Building Height, Density or the Number of Units per Building Type.](#)

Overall affordability in Flagstaff will never improve until housing supply catches up with demand. This is a hard fact that the City Council has to grapple with eventually. The affordable housing incentives could be a great vehicle to increase overall supply. Also, by limiting the density of affordable housing developments you limit the number of families that can take advantage of them.

I urge the City Council to edit the proposed amendment to allow density increases, so as to improve overall affordability and increase the number of families that can take advantage of the developments.

Best,  
Tyler Denham

## Daniel Symer

---

**From:** Duffie Westheimer <dwestheimer@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 10, 2021 11:33 AM  
**To:** Daniel Symer  
**Subject:** Comments re: affordable housing code amendments

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Greetings Dan,

I would like to offer these comments regarding the affordable housing code amendments. They will be brief due to time restraints so if anything is unclear please ask for clarification.

- *There is no end to the need for housing and affordable housing*, especially with so many people relocating these days. Metrics need to be in place to be sure development and building types meet the need rather than opening a free-for-all for developers and investors. This could easily lead to overbuilding and types of housing people don't want located there, or want to live in but work for developers. We cannot build our way to affordability. History shows that prices here have only increased while the size of the city has grown.
- When my City provides incentives that essentially give away value permanently, the benefit to the community needs to also be permanent. For example, 30 year deed restrictions are not commensurate, and neither is increased density if it does not fit with the established area character and makes residents unhappy in their homes.
- The downtown areas should not be the focus of increased density. These areas are the soul of the community and have a character that until recently accommodated growth at a comparable and reasonable scale. *, The historic areas have already absorbed growth.*
- The downtown area already chokes with traffic. People drive and it is legal for people to do so. (I ride a bike and walk for 99.9% of my transportation needs and the roads are already unsafe--we do not need more people who are frustrated by traffic jams, or on their mobile communication devices when at the wheel of a vehicle).
- People have vehicles. It is legal for everyone 16 years old and older to have a vehicle, and to use them (many people have more than one). To think they won't have vehicles and use them is head-in-the sand thinking. This is the type of mistake that has very long term impacts. Require realistic parking.
- Using the bus is not realistic for people who do multi-purpose trips unless they have all day to do so. This is not a criticism of the bus system, just the reality.
- The City should have to get my permission to change the code on my property even if it is to up zone or theoretically increase the value. This is my home, not a revenue source. I live here. I have neighbors very close and so I am considerate of them at all times. The downtown areas are already quite dense.
- It is unlikely people will work near where they live, especially if there are multiple household members who work. This means people move around a lot--vehicles will be used.
- COVID has shown the public health risks of density. There must be open and green areas near dense development. The developers need to provide and pay for it.
- If the zoning code allows and incentivizes increased density that damages neighborhoods and quality of life, people will move out of the homes and into the County, or further.
- Have an "old town" area that has a historic scale and character, and a "new town" area with modern scale and where density, height, etc. are established as the modern character.

That is all for now.  
Best regards,  
Duffie Westheimer