

Fort Valley Area Plan



An Amendment to the Coconino County Comprehensive Plan

**Development by the Residents of the Fort Valley Community
with assistance of the County Community Development Department**

Approved by the Coconino County Board of Supervisors on February 20, 1990

FORT VALLEY AREA PLAN

**Approved by
Fort Valley - Highway 180 Corridor Study Committee
September 25, 1989**

**Approved by
Coconino County Planning and Zoning Commission
January 2, 1990**

**Adopted and Approved by
Coconino County Board of Supervisors
Resolution No. 90-6
February 20, 1990**

Fort Valley - Highway 180 Corridor Study Committee

Jim David, Chairman
John H. Caskey
Lee Fitzhugh
Sharon Galbreath
Norm Johnson
Jimmie R. Nunn
Dianne Patterson
Verne D. Seidel, Jr.
Kathryn Stephenson
Peter B. Stilley
Nancy Taylor

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Study Area.....	1
Land Use Survey.....	1
Implementation.....	2
Water - Quantity & Quality	3
Water Quantity Information.....	3
Regulatory Framework.....	4
Water Transfers.....	4
Wastewater Disposal and Water Quality....	5
Utilities	8
Solid Waste Disposal.....	9
Fire Protection.....	10
Natural Resources & Environmental Quality	11
General Physical Characteristics.....	11
Air Quality.....	12
Lighting.....	12
Aesthetics.....	13
Vegetation and Wildlife.....	13
Natural Resources and Recreation.....	14
Environmental Policies.....	14
Roads	17
Road Policies.....	19
Land Use.....	21
Background - 1969 Zoning.....	21
Single Family Residential Uses.....	21
Home Occupations.....	22
Multiple Family Residential Uses.....	23
Commercial Uses.....	23
Future Uses.....	23
Open Space.....	24
Land Use Policies.....	24
Special Considerations	27
Historical and Cultural Resources.....	27
Appendix: Property Owner Survey	28

**NOTE: The Study Area Map is not included in this electronic version.
It can be obtained from the Community Development Department.**

Introduction

On August 15, 1988 the Board of Supervisors appointed an eleven-member citizens' committee, entitled the Fort Valley - Highway 180 Corridor Study Committee, to develop policies designed to guide future growth and development in the Fort Valley area. The committee selected the issues of concern which included water, fire protection, solid waste disposal, utilities, environmental quality, roads, and land use. The committee met for the first time on August 29, 1988 and met twice per month through the end of September, 1989.

Study Area

The Committee established the study area at its first meeting. The area decided upon was that depicted on the Department of Community Development's Fort Valley Zoning Map. This includes all lands outside of the incorporated City Limits of Flagstaff on both sides of Fort Valley Road/Highway 180 out to and including the Fort Valley and Baderville areas. The Committee decided to exclude Hart Prairie and Kendrick Park.

Throughout the process, the Committee thought of the study area as being in tow distinct parts. South Fort Valley included the Lockett property, Colton Ranch area, Mount Elden Lookout Road, Schultz Pass Road, the Magdalena/Van Sickle area, Forest Hills and Hidden Hollow. North Fort Valley included Fort Valley Ranch, both sides of Highway 180 in the main valley, and Baderville.

Land Use Survey

During August of 1988 staff completed a land use survey of all properties in the study area. The purposes were to establish existing land uses, to identify patterns and problems, and to locate areas where future development is likely to occur.

Land use in the entire study area is predominantly single family residential consisting almost entirely of site-built homes. There are no mobile home parks, multiple family residential developments, or industrial uses in the study area. There are only four established commercial uses. Considerably more than half of the private land in the study area is undeveloped. There are 16 undeveloped parcels of 40 acres or more and 9 of 100 acres or more. Existing land uses are discussed in greater detail in the Land Use chapter.

Implementation

Upon adoption, this Fort Valley Area Plan becomes a part of the Coconino County General (or Comprehensive) Plan and serves as the official guide for future development. The Coconino County Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Ordinance contain provisions that decisions made by the Planning and Zoning Commission and Board of Supervisors shall be consistent with the General Plan. In order to approve development projects, the following findings must be met:

For zone changes: That the change is consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan and this ordinance.

For conditional use permits: That the proposed conditional use is consistent with and conforms to the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan or specific plan for the area.

For subdivisions: That the proposed subdivision conforms to the goals, objectives, and policies of the Coconino County Comprehensive Plan and its amendments.

Requests for projects which are not consistent with the Plan either should be denied or should be accompanied by a request to amend the Plan.

Water - Quantity & Quality

Virtually all residents in the study area are served by individual wells located on each property. In a few locations there are communal wells shared by a small number of households. In the Hidden Hollow Road area and in certain isolated spots throughout the study area, well drilling has been unsuccessful and residents must haul water from the City of Flagstaff or purchase water from a commercial water hauler. Most wells are relatively shallow (200 feet or less), located in perched aquifers and have low pumping capacity. Many wells in the study area are susceptible to water level fluctuations or even failure following extended periods of low precipitation.

Water Quantity Information

A complete hydrologic study and analysis of the Fort Valley groundwater basin has not been done. The best information currently available is contained in a Master's Thesis completed in 1980 by Ronald H. DeWitt entitled "Hydrogeology of Fort Valley." The thesis contains a description of underlying geology, the perched aquifers, weather, and recharge, and includes a description of existing wells. The study addressed only the North Fort Valley portion of the study area. Mr. DeWitt attended one of the Study Committee's meetings and summarized his conclusions. He said the number of wells had at least doubled since his research in the mid 1970's and the available information as a result of the state's 1980 Groundwater Management Act had increased significantly. He told the Committee a new hydrology study would be very desirable.

The Study Committee requested that the Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR) undertake a complete hydrology study of the Fort Valley area which would include interpretation of sub-surface geologic conditions, a comprehensive well inventory, a field inventory of all wells including location, depth, and water level, and a complete analysis of recharge to the basin. ADWR responded that they had assembled some preliminary data on Fort Valley from which general conclusions could be drawn, but that they did not currently have the resources to conduct a complete hydrologic study. Their preliminary study indicated that in the North Fort Valley area recharge to the perched aquifer coming from runoff from the surrounding mountains and infiltration within the basin itself amounts to approximately 300 acre feet per year. They estimated present withdrawals are about 56 acre feet per year based on 200 residences each using 200 gallons per day.

Regulatory Framework

In 1980 the State Legislature passed the Groundwater Management Code which was signed into law by Governor Bruce Babbitt. The overall goal of the law is "safe yield," a balancing of groundwater withdrawals and groundwater recharge. The principal focus was in areas where withdrawals have exceeded recharge and where water levels have been declining. Four such areas in the state - Phoenix, Tucson, Prescott, and Pinal County - were designated as Active Management Areas where the most extensive and comprehensive provisions for ground water management apply. The code firmly established the Department of Water Resources as the agency responsible for all aspects of groundwater control.

There are several provisions of the law which apply statewide. These include designation of groundwater basins, rules on transporting water from one area of the state to another, mandatory well registration, and requirements for developers of new subdivisions to evaluate and report on water availability. All well owners in the state were required to register their wells with ADWR with information on location, depth, size and capacity. Those drilling new wells are required to obtain a permit from ADWR. For new subdivisions, either a 100-year assured water supply must be demonstrated or a statement of water inadequacy must be contained in the Public report and in all sales and promotional literature.

Water Transfers

As mentioned above, the Groundwater Management Code specifically permitted the transportation of groundwater from one basin to another. Since this was authorized in 1980, it has become a very heated issue as municipalities have purchased large acreage farms and ranches in rural areas for the sole purpose of extracting and transporting the underlying groundwater. If local water users are adversely affected by water extraction and transportation, they may sue for damages; however, they cannot stop the transportation. The burden is on the local property owners to prove that the transportation is causing the damage.

Although not involving a major municipality, water transfer has become an issue in Fort Valley. In 1987 a Tusayan motel owner purchased a 15 acre parcel which had an existing well and storage tank on it in North Fort Valley. The reason for the purchase was to truck water from Fort Valley to Tusayan, located just south of Grand Canyon National Park. Until recently, Tusayan did not have a water source within the community, and all water had to be hauled in from some considerable distance. Most of the water is purchased from Williams or Bellemont. Recently, a well was drilled in Tusayan which will partially serve the community's needs.

It was county staff's opinion that the Squire's proposed water withdrawal was permissible by right and was under the state's jurisdiction according to the Groundwater Management Code. Staff asserted, however, that the trucking operation required a Conditional Use Permit approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission. At the Commission hearing, a subsequently at the appeal hearing before the Board of Supervisors, numerous area residents protested the issuance of a permit and both bodies denied the request. The Squire then filed in Superior Court requesting a preliminary injunction preventing Coconino County from interfering with their right to withdraw and transport the water. The request for injunction was granted by Judge John F. Taylor in Navajo County Superior Court.

Fort Valley residents continue to be extremely concerned about the impact of large water withdrawals on their own private residential wells.

Wastewater Disposal and Water Quality

There is no central sewer system serving any portion of the Fort Valley study area. This means that wastewater disposal is handled by individual on-site systems. Septic tanks and leach fields serve most of the developed properties in the study area. Because of very high groundwater in certain portions of North Fort Valley, alternative systems are required on many parcels. These are typically "mound" systems where leach lines are installed in imported fill above the preexisting grade.

Regulations pertaining to wastewater disposal and wastewater systems are developed and enforced by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. The state has delegated to the County Health Department permitting, inspection and enforcement authority for conventional septic tank systems. Other alternative systems must be approved by the state.

There is very little, if any, information about the impact that on-site wastewater disposal might be having on water quality. Testing of privately owned individual homeowner wells is not a requirement of either the state or the county. Many residents voluntarily test their wells occasionally, generally for bacteria, but testing for nitrates or other substances that might indicate long term degradation of water quality has rarely been done. The Study Committee requested that the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality conduct a one-time sampling study to determine water quality. ADEQ responded that they would be willing to assist the County in gathering this information. The department agreed that such a study was appropriate.

The Committee also expressed concern with the potential impact of horses on water quality, especially in areas where large numbers of animals are kept or boarded. There is a potential that nitrate levels could be affected by this use.

Goals

- The preservation and maintenance now and in the future of an adequate supply of good quality water to all Fort Valley residents
- Availability of water should be a major consideration in determining future growth in North and South Fort Valley
- To assess, maintain, and strive to improve water quality in North and South Fort Valley in an ongoing manner within the authority available to the County

Policies

1. Water quality shall be protected by assuring that there is an adequate wastewater system for all construction.
2. For all development requests requiring review by the Planning and Zoning Commission and Board of Supervisors water consumption should be considered.
3. Water conserving plumbing fixtures shall be required in all future development within the study area. Water conserving plumbing fixtures should be encouraged for use in all existing single family residences and other developments.
4. The Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ), Coconino County Health Department and landowners shall be encouraged to conduct sampling at regular intervals of area wells to determine if nitrate and coliform levels exceed current standards.
5. The Department of Water Resources (DWR) shall be encouraged to conduct a comprehensive hydrology study of both upper and lower Fort Valley to determine the source, nature and quantity of groundwater resources.
6. All projects approved with individual wastewater treatment plants should be encouraged to reuse treated wastewater for irrigation and/or fire protection purposes.
7. All projects approved in the study area should be landscaped with drought tolerant/water conserving plants and native species.

8. The County shall encourage the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the DWR to review and revise floodplain/floodway mapping of the study area, to fully cover the effects of stormwater runoff and possible improvement of groundwater recharge from this runoff.

9. Potential degradation of water quality shall be a consideration when reviewing any development proposal.

10. Substantiation of a reliable water supply for domestic use and fire flow shall be required prior to County approval of subdivisions, multiple family, commercial or industrial developments. For subdivisions, this may be in conjunction with the evaluation of adequacy and issuance of report of assured water supply by DWR as required by ARS 45-108.

11. Applications for all development requests requiring review by the Planning and Zoning Commission and Board of Supervisors involve significant change in use of existing wells shall be evaluated in light of possible impacts on adjacent or nearby wells. Such evaluation shall not be the basis for denial of a project.

12. The County opposes water transfers within and without the study area to the degree allowed by state law.

13. Zoning and Health Department regulations pertaining to the keeping of horses and other animals should be strictly enforced.

Utilities

The extension of utilities, including electric, gas, telephone, and cable television, is part of the growth and development process. Utility companies provide service as necessary and as demand dictates under the control of the Arizona Corporation Commission. The County's involvement is primarily through the subdivision review and approval process. As part of this process, there is a Subdivision Review Committee which examines preliminary plats prior to consideration by the Planning and Zoning Commission and Board of Supervisors. Utility representatives establish availability of service and comment on easement requirements.

Outside of subdivisions, developers proposing higher density residential and commercial projects are encouraged to locate where utilities are available; where utilities are unavailable, very low density rural uses are recommended.

Much of the study area is served by overhead electric and phone lines. In open meadow areas and on properties with views of the San Francisco Peaks, overhead lines can seriously detract from visual quality. While underground lines are recommended in all new developments where preservation of unmarred views is important, placement of lines underground is currently only required in subdivisions with lot sizes of less than one acre.

Development of new high voltage lines can also have significant impacts. Location of such lines within existing corridors or in heavily treed areas can mitigate this impact.

Policies

1. Public utilities shall be located, operated and maintained in a manner that will not degrade environmental quality. The use of underground electric and communication lines shall be required in all new subdivisions with parcel size of five (5) acres or less and strongly recommended in subdivisions with lot sizes greater than 5 acres.
2. The County shall coordinate with electric, gas, telephone, and cable television services to assure that utilities are available where needed. Conversely, development other than very low density residential shall be discouraged where utilities are not available.
3. For the installation of new high voltage electric transmission lines, use of existing corridors shall be encouraged.

Solid Waste Disposal

Trash collection is currently handled by residents of Fort Valley in one of two ways. Residents either haul their own or they contract with a private garbage collection company. The nearest landfill is located in Doney Park northeast of Flagstaff, a distance of almost 20 miles from North Fort Valley. This landfill serves the entire Flagstaff area and is operated by the City but is subsidized by the County based on estimated population in unincorporated areas and usage by county residents. In other areas more distant from Flagstaff, including Pinewood, Mormon Lake, Tusayan, Long Valley, and Forest Lakes, the County operates trash compactor facilities. Refuse is then transported to the City landfill.

Another problem in the Fort Valley area possibly related to the distance to the landfill, is indiscriminate dumping on public land. Apparently, this is a fairly severe problem in the Schultz Pass Road area. The Forest Service lacks the funds and manpower for effective enforcement.

Policies

1. The County shall research and develop solutions for solid waste disposal in North and South Fort Valley including but not limited to contracting with the City for garbage removal services, providing neighborhood dumpsters, or establishing a compacting station.
2. The County should expedite the enforcement of violations of current ordinances and regulations regarding solid waste disposal.

Fire Protection

Virtually all of the Fort Valley study area is considered to be part of an urban wildland interface area which is a boundary between populated urbanized areas and naturally forested areas. The threat of a forest fire spreading into residential areas or conversely of a fire in a residential area starting a forest fire is a very serious concern. With the prevailing southwest winds, a fire caused by lightning or by recreationists, transients, or smokers along I-40 in the A-1 Mountain area could jeopardize all of the study area. Likewise, an out-of-control residential fire could spread to the San Francisco Peaks.

While the Forest Service is responsible for fire protection on adjacent National Forest lands, private property owners must take responsibility for fire prevention on private lands. Control of weeds, slash, and construction debris, restrictions on outdoor burning, avoidance of wood shake shingles and careful use of woodstoves including use of spark arrestors and proper disposal of ashes would all improve fire prevention.

Impediments to fire protection include the development of many areas which are served only by private easements and the lack of an addressing system. Easements which are not built to an adequate width and which are not all-weather roads make access by fire equipment difficult if not impossible. Absence of street names and addresses slows response time by requiring the fire department to seek directions.

The North Fort Valley Area has organized and formed the Fort Valley Fire District. The District contracts with the City of Flagstaff for fire protection. In the South Fort Valley area, residents must contract individually with the City to receive fire protection services. Construction of the fire station in the Cheshire Subdivision dramatically reduced response time to all of the study area.

Policies

1. The County should establish an address numbering and street identification system to assist fire departments in locating properties.
2. The County should discourage the use of shake shingle roofs in forested areas, especially where wood stoves are installed. If wood is used, the County should recommend fire retardant wood shingles.
3. Private easements shall be developed and maintained to a full width to be adequate to provide access to fire equipment.

Natural Resources & Environmental Quality

As noted previously, the study area was considered as two distinct areas identified as North Fort Valley and South Fort Valley. Both areas enjoy location on one of Northern Arizona's more scenic routes, Highway 180, which provides the main access to the South Rim of the Grand Canyon as well as to year-round recreational areas on Forest Service land including commercial enterprises such as Fairfield Snowbowl and the Nordic Ski Center. Situated at the base of the San Francisco Peaks the study area provides an unique rural living environment. The preservation of this environment and the maintenance of open space areas was continually stated as being of prime concern to the committee members and also rated high in the survey of property owners. It is no doubt the natural environment and rural setting which enticed most residents and landowners to this area.

General Physical Characteristics

That portion of the study area identified as North Fort Valley primarily consists of a wide, flat valley bound by a mature Ponderosa Pine forest, including the Fort Valley Experimental Forest to the west and to the east. A significant portion of this valley is encumbered by the floodplain of the Rio de Flag, which originates on the southwestern slopes of the San Francisco Peaks. The Rio de Flag is a tributary of the San Francisco Wash which in turn flows into the Little Colorado River. The Rio de Flag continues to make its way toward Flagstaff in a southeasterly direction paralleling Highway 180, and enters the study area again in south Fort Valley on the westerly side of the highway. The majority of the property included in the South Fort Valley area is not included in a designated floodplain although some of the meadow areas near the Highway experience standing water in periods of high run-off. The ground elevation in the South Fort Valley area ranges from 200 to 400 feet lower than that in the North Fort Valley area. Vegetation in both areas consists primarily of that associated with the Ponderosa Pine forest. Since the area is one of past volcanic activity soils tend to be cindery. Mean annual precipitation in and around the study area ranges from approximately 20 inches near Flagstaff to approximately 35 inches on the Peaks.

Air Quality

Although according to State officials there are no major air quality problems in Fort Valley, there is an ever increasing cloud hanging over the Valley which is due to high particulate levels, the primary sources being woodstove emissions and dirt roads. Due to its location in a valley, the cloud of smoke and dust tends to settle over the area and is particularly a problem in the winter months due to the increased use of woodstoves and the cold air inversion characteristic of that season. The South Fort Valley area, due to its proximity to Flagstaff's corporate limits, shares in the ever increasing air quality problems of the City. Part of the problem is already being addressed in that virtually all new woodstoves sold after January 1, 1989 will meet more stringent EPA standards for regulating emission. However, there is currently no provision to address retrofitting existing older models. In regard to the airborne dust created by the number of dirt roads in the area, the lack of enforcement of State laws requiring adequate dust control is a major element. By statute, the owners of the road must treat the road with a dust suppressant. This mandate applies to both public and private roads. Paving is generally regarded as the most cost-effective long-term means for dust suppression. Although the County currently maintains dirt roads in the study area the current County Subdivision Ordinance requires new subdivisions to provide paved roads in order to be accepted into the county road system. However, in the past the Board of Supervisors has granted waivers from the paving requirement if the roads are to remain private.

Lighting

On March 6, 1989, the County Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the County Zoning Ordinance which created a new section specifically addressing lighting. Due to Flagstaff's noted reputation as an outstanding area for astronomical observation and in an attempt to protect the observatories and still provide for reasonable growth, the new lighting ordinance was initiated. Other purposes served by the ordinance are reduction of energy consumption and elimination of unnecessary glare. The Ordinance adopted by the Board creates four (4) lighting zones with decreasing requirements as distance from the observatories increases. The Study Area is at closest less than four (4) miles from the naval Observatory which is located south of I-40 west of Flagstaff. The study area is identified as being within Lighting Zone 2. The Ordinance requirements emphasize the use of Low Pressure Sodium lighting and the shielding of fixtures to prevent the escape of direct illumination onto adjacent properties. Although the regulations are directed at commercial developments they are applicable to residential properties.

Aesthetics

The area described as the Highway 180 corridor currently provides one of the most scenic gateways into the City of Flagstaff. In entering the City from this northwestern direction travelers experience a range in vegetation type and geologic forms. The trip begins through Pinyon-Juniper vegetation at Valle, where 180 divides from Highway 64, heading south past Red Mountain through open meadow at Kendrick Park and ultimately Aspen-Fir forests which lead into the Fort Valley area. The vistas available on this route are unmatched, with the San Francisco Peaks providing the continual focal point.

With the increase of commercial development clustered at most of the other major entries into Flagstaff, the importance of preserving the natural beauty of this northwestern entrance becomes even more important. Methods of protecting this gateway from the influx of unsightly and/or inappropriate distractions include the adoption of Design Review Guidelines sensitive to the unique character of the area, preservation of existing vegetation and enforcement of County Zoning Ordinance screening requirements for outdoor storage.

Vegetation and Wildlife

Fort Valley area residents enjoy the benefits of living in part of the largest Ponderosa Pine forest in the United States. Benefits derived from this location include the natural vegetation associated with this forest and the use of the area by a variety of wildlife including elk, deer and even waterfowl.

Preserving the natural environment is important not only to provide for continued use by wildlife, but also by maintaining native vegetation or utilizing primarily indigenous plants, human residents benefit as well. Future development with this in mind will work to maintain the rural character of the area which attracted residents to begin with, in addition to help toward conservation of resources, such as water, which would otherwise be used in excess with the introduction of exotic plant species.

One concern addressed by the Committee was the overgrazing on private lands and the subsequent effects of loss of groundcover and soil degradation. Enforcement of County limits on the number per acre of farm type animals and education of area residents regarding the ill-effects of such activity would help address this situation.

Natural Resources and Recreation

Due to its location at the base of the San Francisco Peaks and its proximity to other National Forest land, concerns arise which are specific to the study area. Although the County has no jurisdictional authority over management of the adjacent Forest Service land, the impact of development or activities is directly felt by area residents and impacts the Fort Valley environment. The forest land in the area is under the control of the Coconino National Forest. Some of the activities which prompt concern involve timber sales, land exchanges, increasing use by transient population, the illegal dumping of solid waste and the development of recreational use facilities. The availability of public forest lands for year-round recreational activities is of prime concern for area residents, who enjoy easy accessibility to such areas, as well as residents of the Flagstaff community and visitors traveling through the area.

In addition to recreational availability of the nearby forest land there has been a movement within the Flagstaff Community to establish a State Park on property known as the Lockett Trust land which encumbers over 600 acres and constitutes the majority of undeveloped private land in the South Fort Valley area. Although the idea is in the conceptual stage and approval by the State Parks Board and acquisition of the land is still pending, the idea is for a regional recreational facility which would provide multiple type uses and further serve as an access to forest land adjacent to the north, including the Kachina Peaks Wilderness area, via the existing trail systems.

Environmental Policies

Air Quality

1. Residents desiring to purchase a wood stove shall be encouraged to purchase low pollution home heating and energy conserving units. Those residents with existing units shall be encouraged to retrofit existing units to minimize particulate emissions.
2. The County Highway Department shall be encouraged to provide dust free surfaces on county roadways, and private property owners should be encouraged to provide dust free surfaces on private easements.
3. Dust evaluation and mitigation measures shall be incorporated into the subdivision and major development review and approval process.
4. The County or School District is encouraged to disseminate information on the proper use of wood stoves to reduce air pollution.

Aesthetics

1. Because of the importance of Highway 180 as a gateway to the City of Flagstaff, the County should adopt design review guidelines for multiple family residential and commercial projects.
2. The County should adopt a landscape amendment to the Zoning Ordinance emphasizing the use of native and drought tolerant plant species and encouraging the retention of existing native vegetation.
3. New freestanding signs shall be of the monument type, shall be limited to six(6) feet in height and a maximum of 20 square feet in area.
4. Outdoor storage areas in all zones, i.e. storage of materials such as lumber, auto parts or household appliances etc. but not including such things as operable personal vehicles, shall be screened or landscaped.
5. The County shall encourage the Forest Service to provide adequate buffering of roadways during timber sales. A sufficient depth of timber should be retained to provide adequate screening from the roadway.

Vegetation and Wildlife

1. Developers of all properties, including single family residential, shall be encouraged to preserve as much existing native vegetation as possible.
2. The County shall coordinate with state and federal wildlife management agencies, conservation groups, and land management agencies in the interest of preserving important habitat areas.
3. A landscaping plan shall be required as part of the application submittal for all projects requiring review and approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission. The use of indigenous, low water using plants shall be encouraged for all new landscaping.

Natural Resources and Recreation

1. Significant archeological sites on public land should be preserved by the U.S. Forest Service and should not be included in the base for exchange in subsequent forest plans.
2. The County shall cooperate with the City of Flagstaff and the Forest Service in the extension of the City's urban trail system into the study area.

Roads

The development of the roadway system in North and South Fort Valley has evolved in response to the transition and intensification of land uses. The earliest roads were developed to provide access to the area's ranches and the national forest. As the larger tracts were divided and residences established, the number of local roads grew. Subdivisions developed in the 1950's, 60's and 70's were established with roads constructed to county design standards. Other portions of the study area, particularly the Mt. Elden area, have developed in a spontaneous manner without benefit of proper design standards. Road conditions in those areas are typically undersized and poorly surfaced, impassable in poor weather. Since the residential population growth of Fort Valley has occurred slowly, the proliferation of inadequate roads has been as severe as elsewhere in the County.

Residents' perceptions of the condition of the road system in Fort Valley varies depending on the portion of the Valley they live in. Based on survey results, residents of North Fort Valley generally appear satisfied with the road situation. In contrast, residents of South Fort Valley appear more concerned about road issues. When asked to prioritize the main issue for consideration by the Study Committee, road development and maintenance was ranked first by South Fort Valley respondents. Similarly, a majority of residents felt that more roads should be paved and most frequently cited Elden Lookout Road. Residents valley wide expressed concerns about congestion and safety of Fort Valley Road/Highway 180.

The bulk of the public roadways in the study area are the responsibility of the Coconino County Highway Department. The County classifies roads under a 3-tier system. The first type is a Forest Service Co-op road which the forest service owns the right-of-way but the County maintains under a contractual agreement. Co-op roads within the study area include Fort Valley Ranch and Roundtree Roads and a portion of Mt. Elden Lookout Road. The second type of road is a grandfathered road. Arizona Revised Statutes allow counties to provide maintenance on roads that have been maintained 10 years or more prior to 1960. Maintenance is limited to blading, no new materials may be added. Examples include South Snow Bowl Road and Country Club Spur. The third type is a County road, dedicated to and accepted by the Board of Supervisors. Examples include Harmony Lane, Forest Hills Road as well as all roads within County approved subdivisions. Paved County roads in the study area include Magdalena, Bader, Cassette, Antoinette, Suzette and Chambers Roads.

The County has a 5-year plan identifying roads that warrant major improvements. The criteria for inclusion are average daily traffic volume, maintenance classification, bus route and road rating. No roads in Fort Valley are presently included in the 5 year plan. The County also has a Maintenance Management Program which categorizes all roads. All roadways in Fort Valley are B roads, meaning twice monthly blading.

The Committee discussed the County Subdivision Regulations in conjunction with roads. The primary focus of discussion surrounded the improvement standards for local streets in new subdivisions. These standards require a 60 foot right-of-way and a 28 foot paved surface. The Ordinance allows this requirement to be waived for private roads where lot sizes exceed 5 acres. The consensus of the group was that this requirement is too stringent. Consequently, the Committee recommended relaxing the paving requirement for subdivisions with lot sizes of 2.5 acres or larger. No other changes to the Subdivision Ordinance were recommended.

The Committee spent considerable time discussing the abundance of private roads and easements, many of which are merely dirt access ways. Problems with these roads include inconsistent width, poor surface, lack of street addressing and difficulty in providing emergency service vehicle access. The problem is particularly acute in the Mt. Elden area and hidden hollow and Fort Valley Ranch to a lesser extent. Recognizing that the root of the problem is the unregulated lot splits and the lack of County review, the Committee realized their input would have little impact. Possible solutions discussed included the utilization of County improvement Districts for dust suppression or paving and the requirement that private easements be developed to a width and surface adequate to provide emergency vehicle access.

Fort Valley Road/Highway 180 is the sole arterial providing access to the entire study area as well as being the main route to the Grand Canyon. The roadway is two (2) lanes in width and according to the Flagstaff and Coconino Transportation Study, is "congested." The combination of insufficient design capacity and high traffic volumes, contribute to a roadway that is unsafe and inefficient. In response to this perceived problem, representatives of the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and City of Flagstaff Planning and Engineering Departments made presentations to the Study Committee. Due to problems involved with widening Humphreys Street, ADOT's position is to not significantly expand Fort Valley Road/Highway 180. The selected alternative north-south arterial is Gemini Parkway, a proposed roadway running from I-40 over Switzer Mesa to Elden Lookout Road, ultimately connecting with Fort Valley Road/Highway 180 at Cheshire. While alternative alignments were considered, both the City and State have committed to this choice. The City has allocated funding via the bond election in 1988 for partial construction funding. The remainder of the roadway will be constructed with private developer funding.

The Study Committee uniformly recognized the problems of Fort Valley Road/Highway 180. Concerns about Gemini were registered primarily from those members residing in South Fort Valley, particularly the impacts on existing residences and the potential for intensified commercial land uses. The Committee expressed interest in city, county and state agencies further examining a west side alternative.

Inspired by a presentation by a local cycling advocate, Elson Miles, the Study Committee discussed the demand, types of design and various applications of bike paths. The current preferred design is a 3 to 5 foot wide shoulder addition instead of a distinct path known as a bikeway. Consensus was formed on the need for bike/pedestrian routes on new and existing roadways being upgraded.

Road Policies

1. The County shall review dangerous intersections such as Hidden Hollow, Snow Bowl and Bader Roads with Highway 180 and make a formal recommendation to the State Transportation Board regarding possible improvements.
2. Future land uses should be coordinated with existing and proposed roadways.
3. All subdivisions developed within the study area shall be developed in accordance with Section 6.4 of the Subdivision ordinance. Waivers requesting relaxation of paving should be considered for parcels 2.5 acres or larger.
4. Traffic studies shall be required in conjunction with all preliminary subdivision plat applications.
5. Bike lanes/pedestrian lanes/safety shoulders shall be encouraged along all new arterial and collector roadways developed within the study areas. Bike lanes/pedestrian lanes/safety shoulders shall be added to existing arterials, collectors and highways whether city, county or state in conjunction with any future widening or improvement projects.
6. Property owners splitting land through the Minor Land Division process shall be required to reserve sufficient right-of-way for existing county standards.
7. The Coconino County Department of Community Development or Highway Department should adopt, implement and administer a road naming and street numbering system. In addition, the County should promote the use of a uniform street signage system in the study area. In naming

new streets, local flora, fauna, history, and geography are preferred over the use of personal names.

8. The Department of Community Development and Highway Department shall conduct a feasibility study on the designation of U.S. Highway 180 through the study area, or portion thereof, for scenic highway designation.

9. Property owners shall be encouraged to form road improvement districts for paving or dust suppression programs.

10. Development of Gemini Parkway as a local street and landscaped parkway should be considered.

11. In reviewing requests for new subdivisions, zoning changes or other major development, the County shall consider the proposal in relation to the proposed Gemini Parkway route.

12. The State Transportation Board and the ADOT District Engineer shall be encouraged to explore the possibility of a west side roadway alignment connecting I-40 and U.S. Highway 180.

Land Use

Land use in the Fort Valley area is generally characterized by rural large lot single family residential uses. Homes are scattered around large undeveloped tracts enhancing the rural character. There are very few mobile homes and no multiple family residential developments. There are only four commercial uses and no industrial uses. Factors affecting past, current, and future development include water availability, wastewater concerns, and large lot agricultural residential zoning.

Background - 1969 Zoning

Three years after zoning was first established in the County in 1964, a letter was submitted by Edward Danson, Harold Colton, and Clay Lockett requesting a study in the Fort Valley area for possible rezoning. At that time, the entire area was zoned A-General, and their interest primarily concerned the South Fort Valley area in the vicinity of the Museum of Northern Arizona. On June 25, 1968, the Planning and Zoning Commission placed the Fort Valley Land Use and Zoning Plan as the top priority for Commission and staff action.

A survey was conducted of all property owners, about 100, to determine each property owner's desired zoning. The focus was minimum parcel size. There were five public hearings at regularly scheduled Planning and Zoning Commission meetings between January and September, 1969 as well as three Board of Supervisors hearings. The zoning adopted by the Board on November 3, 1969, established one-acre zoning in much of South Fort Valley, 2 ½ acre zoning in North Fort Valley, commercial zoning at Northland Press, Purcell's and Stilley's property, and half-acre zoning south of the Museum. The only zone change that has been approved since 1969 occurred in 1979 and involved 10 acres at the corner of Snow Bowl Road for the store and parking area.

Single Family Residential Uses

A land use survey conducted during the summer of 1988 determined that there were 253 residential dwelling units including six mobile homes. A majority of these units are on unsubdivided acreage. Within the study area, there are only four subdivisions approved by the Board of Supervisors:

Subdivision	No. of Lots	No. of Homes	Year Approved
Forest Hills	12	9	1957
Fort Valley Trails	29	19	1964
Fort Valley Estates	43	29	1972
Baderville	10	10	1963

Much of the area has been developed through the lot splitting process rather than through platted and recorded subdivisions. Because state subdivision regulations allow parcels to be split three ways, successive owners can split large parcels down to minimum lot zoning without the dedication or construction of roadways and without the installation of utilities. The result is usually substandard private easements, 20 feet in width, which are often no more than extended driveways. Every owner is responsible for providing his own water and wastewater systems and for extending utility lines to his property.

Virtually all of the study area is zoned Agricultural Residential with varying minimum parcel sizes. The AR zone permits both site built single family residences as well as mobile homes. Perhaps because of the high cost of land which generally leads to larger, more expensive houses, there are very few mobile homes in the area. Some areas within Fort Valley are deed restricted against mobiles, however, deed restrictions are not enforceable by the county and can only be enforced by the property owners where the restrictions apply. Rezoning to Residential Single Family, which prohibits mobiles, may be appropriate in some areas.

Home Occupations

Home occupations seem to have become more prevalent in the last 10 years of so with the need for most households to have two incomes, the high cost of commercial land, and quite simply the desire to work at home. Such pursuits are permissible in the county if they do not change the residential character of the property, if there are no outside employees, and if there is no undue impact on neighboring properties. Uses which have generated complaints include trucking operations, a cabinet shop, and a home office with numerous employees. Such violations are handled by the Zoning Enforcement Officer.

Multiple Family Residential Uses

There are no legally established multiple family residential uses in the study area. There may be a handful of illegal duplexes, triplexes, and rental guest houses. The only multiple family zoning is located on the west side of Fort Valley north of Stevanna Way. This property is not likely to be developed with a high density apartment complex unless annexed by the City of Flagstaff.

Commercial Uses

In South Fort Valley, there are two legally established commercial uses: Northland Press and the Peak View Store. Across from Northland Press is a single family dwelling which was approved for commercial zoning only for establishment of an art gallery and sculpting studio. There is a rather sizable amount of commercially zoned property, however. The art gallery is on 2.07 acres, and Northland Press occupies approximately 1 acre of 7.62 acres which is zoned commercial. Peak View Store is on 20 commercial acres. In addition, there is a 12 acre triangular piece bounded by Fort Valley Road, Schultz Pass Road, and the gas line easement which is zoned commercial and is currently vacant.

In North Fort Valley, Ski Lift Lodge occupies a small portion of a 6.53 acre parcel. The Snow Bowl Store and bus maintenance building are on 3.1 commercial acres, while 6.9 acres are zoned for parking.

Future Uses

Requested changes in current land use patterns can be foreseen in a few areas. Areas adjacent to the City Limits which are therefore potentially subject of annexation requests may be developed at much higher densities than current zoning allows. If high-density residential development occurred, requests for commercial zoning would undoubtedly follow. Development of Gemini Parkway could stimulate this type of change. The Lockett property, consisting of approximately 764 acres, is the most likely for single family residential development at urban densities, currently about 5 units per acre.

Ultimately, growth in the study area may stimulate commercial development on vacant but commercially zoned properties on the north side of Fort Valley Road between Schultz Pass Road and Magdalena Road. Likely businesses include both those serving local residents and those designed for tourists.

In the North Fort Valley area, all highway frontage is subject to requests for zoning changes. In addition there are a few large undeveloped properties where the economics of creating a legal subdivision with all the required infrastructure may cause requests for higher density. The 2 and 2 ½ acre minimum lot zoning has been in place for 20 years, however, and the reasons given for establishing that zoning, water and wastewater, are still valid.

Open Space

Most of the recreational land use occurs on National Forest land. Because there is so much public land surrounding the study area, there does not appear to be a need to develop a county park. According to the questionnaire, there is a strong desire to protect the National Forest land.

Consideration is being given to creating a large state park on the Lockett property which is adjacent to the City and also adjacent to Buffalo Park. Such a park is envisioned as being a gateway to the San Francisco Peaks utilizing the recently developed trail system in the Elden District of the Coconino National Forest. A State Park could very likely become a major draw for tourists.

Land Use Policies

Single Family Residential

1. Use of Agricultural Residential (AR) Zones for the construction or emplacement of mobile homes, modular homes, manufactured or factory built homes is discouraged. The use of AR Zones for the following is discouraged: lumber mills and processing plants, sanitary landfill operations, mineral extraction operations, borrow pits, and firewood storage and sales yards. The Board of Supervisors is specifically requested to create provisions in the zoning code, such as the creation of a Rural Residential (RR) zoning category, which will reflect this desire.
2. The current minimum parcel sizes in the study area shall remain in place unless they conflict with other policy recommendations.
3. New subdivision proposals shall be scrutinized with primary concern placed on water availability and wastewater disposal. Any new subdivision proposals with parcels less than 2 ½ acres average lot size should conform with all requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance, and waivers shall be discouraged.

4. Master planned development of large parcels for residential purposes under single ownership may be considered under the Planned Residential Development (PRD) Zone. No PRD shall be considered with a density of greater than one unit per acre.

Multiple Family Residential

1. Rezoning to multiple family residential shall be held in disfavor taking into consideration the survey results; if such rezonings are allowed, development shall be of a design which is compatible with the rural character of Fort Valley and shall not be a stress on the water supply and sewage disposal.

Mobile Home Parks

1. Mobile Home Parks and mobile home subdivisions shall not be allowed within the study area.

Commercial

1. Development of existing commercially-zoned areas should be limited to low water consuming uses; neighborhood-type commercial businesses rather than those proposing regional commercial uses which would be better located within the city; and, developments which show sensitivity to the natural environment.

2. Commercial rezonings for spot and strip commercial development are prohibited. New commercial rezonings are not recommended.

3. A DRO addressing building design (including height), site planning, landscaping and signing shall be adopted applicable to multiple-family residential, planned residential, and commercial developments.

Industrial

1. Industrial rezonings shall be discouraged within the study area.

Open Space

1. The development of a State Park on Lockett Trust property is supported. Review of such a proposal by the Planning Commission shall be encouraged. If a State Park is developed within the Study Area it should be respectful of the natural environment and emphasize rural recreational activities. Any development should be in consideration of adjacent and nearby residents.
2. National Forest land exchanges to private ownership adjacent to the Highway 180 study area shall be discouraged.

Special Considerations

Historical and Cultural Resources

Preservation of cultural and historical resources is important for educational and scientific purposes and to promote the economic and general welfare of the county. Both archeological as well as more recent historical resources exist in the Fort Valley study area. The former are protected on National Forest lands through the Federal Antiquities Act and other regulations.

More recent historical sites include old ranch buildings and other structures, some of which date back as much as 100 years. In addition to the structures, there are historical routes and trails through and near the study area. The Beale Wagon Road, which preceded the construction of the railroad, passes through Flagstaff just south of the study area. One of the Flagstaff to Grand Canyon stage coach routes is signed from near the end of Roundtree Road up to Hart Prairie.

These and other cultural resources can be protected by careful consideration and planning prior to and during development on or near such sites. Assistance is available from other governmental entities including the land management agencies and the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office.

Policy

1. To the extent possible, historical and cultural sites shall be preserved and protected. Where feasible, significant historical structures shall be incorporated into development plans for properties where such structures exist.

Appendix: Property Owner Survey

To obtain the views and attitudes of property owners in the Fort Valley area, the committee decided to distribute a questionnaire to all property owners. The survey included questions related to lot size, future land uses, roads, environmental issues, zoning enforcement, and parks and recreation. Open-ended questions asked respondents to rank the most important issues and to list special characteristics of the area. Approximately 500 surveys were mailed to all owners of record and 206 were returned, representing a response rate of 41%. The committee decided to tabulate responses by North Fort Valley and South Fort Valley. There were 132 responses from the former and 74 from the latter.

In North Fort Valley, water supply was the number one priority issue by far. This was followed by preservation of rural character and then by zoning and planning. In South Fort Valley, roads were the number one priority. Zoning and commercial development were number two. These were followed by Highway 180 traffic, density, and protection of rural character.

Almost all respondents thought there were special characteristics worthy of preservation. Those most often mentioned included rural character, forest/trees, low density, views, natural beauty, and quiet.

A significant majority (85%) in both areas supported current large lot zoning. In South Fort Valley, the preferred minimum parcel size was 2 acres (by 72%). Eighteen percent supported 1 acre or half-acre, and 9% supported a minimum of 5 acres. In North Fort Valley, 48% supported a minimum lot size of 1 acre or less, and 52% supported 2 acres or more.

By about 2 to 1 in South Fort Valley and 2.6 to 1 in North Fort Valley, respondents did not think additional commercial uses are needed. Of those who do, Snow Bowl Road was the most recommended location followed by Schultz Pass Road. Again, of those who do, appropriate commercial uses most mentioned included restaurants, small retail, grocery, and motel. Industry was cited as most in appropriate.

Multiple family residential developments were opposed by a 4 to 1 margin, industry by a 10 to 1 margin, and there was virtually no support for new mobile home parks.

More specific guidelines to control architectural style, height, and other design features for all uses except single family residential were supported 2 to 1 in South Fort Valley and 3 to 1 in North Fort Valley. Many respondents cited signs and height as the two most important aspects to control.

A landscaping ordinance was supported by about a 2 to 1 margin in both areas.

Few people thought the county should be less active in zoning enforcement. A little less than half (41%) thought enforcement should be at the same level with the remainder saying that the county should be more active. Problems cited included junk, commercial use of residential property, and multiple dwelling units.

In South Fort Valley, a majority (58%) thought more roads should be paved. Elden Lookout Road was by far the most frequently mentioned. In North Fort Valley, a majority (57%) did not think more roads should be paved. Of those who did, South Snow Bowl Road and Suzette were most frequently named.

In South Fort Valley, a slight majority (54%) would be willing to have their property assessed for road paving, with half willing to spend \$1,000 to \$2,500. In North Fort Valley, a 2 to 1 majority was not willing to be assessed.

Gemini Parkway, the City of Flagstaff's proposed north-south road which would connect Santa Fe Avenue at Enterprise with Highway 180 at Schultz Pass Road, was opposed by 55% in South Fort Valley and supported by 62% in North Fort Valley. Overall, 56% of those responding to the questions supported the road. Many thought that an alternate route should be considered, with most listing a route north from the A-1 Mountain Interchange on Interstate 40. Thirty-six percent would use the north-south road as proposed regularly, 35% infrequently, and 27% almost never.

In North Fort Valley, the top 5 environmental concerns in priority order were water availability, water quality, water source, air quality, and National Forest protection. In South Fort Valley, the top 5 concerns were water availability, National Forest protection, water source, water quality, and air quality.

A significant majority (67%) did not think there is a need for a public park in the Fort Valley area.

Finally, over two thirds thought there should be a limit on the number of dogs per parcel with over half of those in favor supporting a limit of 2.

North Fort Valley Questionnaire and Results

Survey of Fort Valley - Highway 180 Corridor Property Owners – North Fort Valley

1. What street is your property on? **Fort Valley Ranch - 11, South Snow Bowl - 10, Fort Valley Estates - 7, Suzette - 23, Abert - 3, Fort Valley Trails - 25, Bader Road - 11, Chambers - 1, Antoinette - 10, Roundtree - 12, Ridgeway - 2, Harmony - 7, Ft. Valley Road/Highway 180 -11.**

If you are not on a street and not in the Fire District, in what general area is your property?

2. Are you a:

71 Resident

12 Absentee Home Owner

49 Absentee Owner of Undeveloped Land

3. Is your Land:

2 Less than 1 acre

59 1 to 2 ½ acres

55 2 ½ acres to 10 acres

16 Greater than 10 acres

4. What are some of the main issues that should be considered by the Fort Valley Planning Committee? Please rank.

1. Water Supply / Availability / Rights

2. Preservation of Rural Character

3. Zoning

4. Planning / Land Use

5 Lot Size / Density

6 Protection of Environment

7. Roads / Traffic

8. Building Quality

5. Which of the following do you feel are important environmental concerns? Please rank in order of importance.

- | | |
|----------------------|---|
| None | 5 National Forest Protection |
| 4 Air Quality | 6 Vegetation |
| 2 Water Quality | 7 Noise |
| 8 Dust | 9 Waste/Trash Disposal |
| 1 Water Availability | Other - Wastewater, Zoning, Light, Junk, Roads, Unconfined Animals, Commercial Development, Transients, Snow Removal |
| 3 Water Source | |

6. Should the county control the preservation of natural vegetation (for example with a tree ordinance or landscape ordinance)?

Yes **88** No **35**

7. Currently most of the South Fort Valley area is zoned for 1 and 2 acre minimum lots, and most of the North Fort Valley - Baderville areas is zoned for 2 and 2 ½ acre minimum lots. Do you think smaller lot sizes would be acceptable in certain designated areas?

Yes **21** No **109**

8. Do you think there should be an established minimum lot size for the whole area?

Yes **106** No **23**

If yes, which of the following would you prefer?

- 4** Regular subdivision lot (10,000 square feet)
- 7** ½ acre
- 41** 1 acre
- 33** 2 acres
- 13** 5 acres
- 10** Other (2 ½ -5, 1 ½ - 1, 2-5 - 3)

9. Do you think there is a need for additional commercial uses along the Highway 180 corridor?

Yes **35** No **92**

If yes, where (check any that apply)

- 14** Schultz Pass Road
- 6** Fremont

3 Magdalena or Peak View

1 Hidden Hollow Road

24 Snow Bowl Road

13 Bader or Roundtree

3 Elsewhere (Any site along 180)

If yes, what types of commercial uses would be appropriate? **Restaurant - 17, Grocery -11, Motel -10, Retail - 8, Gas - 6, Shopping Center - 3, Convenience Market - 3, Laundry - 2, Hardware - 2, Service Business - 2, Gallery - 2, Ski Store - 2. Others with One Vote: Book Store, Clothing, Bank, Museum, Office, Golf Course, Condos.**

Are there any that are not appropriate? **Industry - 13, Hotel - 5, RV Park - 4, Shopping Center - 4, Condos - 4, Gas - 3, Mobile Home Park - 3, Bars - 3, Junkyards - 2. Others: Circle K, Kmart, Hardware, Auto Repair, Auto Sales, Contractor's Yards, Liquor Store, Real Estate Office, Restaurant.**

10. Are you in favor of commercial development in certain locations?

Yes **43** No **81**

If yes, where? **On 180 - 12, Snow Bowl Corner - 10, Existing Commercial Locations - 2, 180 and Bader - 1, Peak View - 1, Schultz Pass - 1, Near Museum - 1.**

11. Are you in favor of multiple family residential development in certain locations?

Yes **24** No **104**

If yes, where? **Snow Bowl Road - 5, US 180 - 2, Bader and 180 - 2, Below Suzette - 1, Just outside City Limits - 1.**

12. Are you in favor of mobile home parks in certain locations?

Yes **2** No **128**

If yes, where?

13. Are you in favor of industrially zoned land for such uses as light manufacturing, cabinet-making, machine shops, contractors' yards, etc.?

Yes **11** No **117**

If yes, where? **US 180 - 2, Baderville - 1, Peak View - 1.**

14. Except for single family dwelling homes are you in favor of more specific guidelines to control the architectural style, height and color of buildings, as well as signs?

Yes **90** No **29**

Comments? **Signs - 9, Height - 9, Compatible with Area - 5, Architectural Style - 3, Native Materials - 2, Regulate Single Family also - 2, Lights, Color, Landscaping, View Protection.**

15. Should the county be more active or less active in enforcing zoning regulations?

More **70** Less **4** About the Same **47**

If more, what are some of the enforcement and zoning violation problems? **Junk - 12, Multiple Dwelling/Rentals - 7, Illegal Commercial - 5, Animals - 3, Setbacks, Illegal Subdivision, Parking, Unfinished Buildings, Sewage Disposal, Raft Storage, Signs, Trailers for Visitors, Dogs.**

16. Should more of the roads in the Fort Valley area be paved?

Yes **50** No **67**

If yes, which ones? **South Snow Bowl - 13, Suzette - 10, Snow Bowl - 6, All - 5, Harmony - 2, Bridle Trail - 2, Roundtree - 2, Main Roads - 2. Other: Lake, Antoinette, Saddle, Ridgeway, Chambers.**

17. If you live on an unpaved road, would you be willing to be assessed to pave the road?

Yes **38** No **66**

If yes, how much?

\$500-1,000 **16**
\$1,000-2,500 **14**
\$2,500-3,000 **3**
\$5,000-10,000 **1**
\$10,000+ **0**

18. Are you in favor of construction of the north-south road (Gemini Parkway) as proposed by the City of Flagstaff?

Yes **64** No **39**

If no, should there be an alternative connection from Highway 180 to I-40?

Yes **24** No **24**

If yes, where? **A-1 Mtn. - 10, West of City - 3. Others with One Vote: FS 174, FS 222, 2 Blocks West of Humphreys, Parks, Woody Mtn. North, Hidden Hollow, 180 to 89 North of Parks.**

19. If the road is constructed, would you use it:

Regularly (at least once/day) **37**
Infrequently **43**
Almost Never **30**

20. Do you think there should be a limit on the number of dogs allowed on each parcel?

Yes **82** No **34**

If yes, how many?

Zero **3**
One **19**
Two **38**
Three **11**
Four **6**
Other **1 (5)**

21. Is there a need for a public park in the Fort Valley area?

Yes **34** No **91**

If yes, where? **Along US 180, Bader/Roundtree, Hidden Hollow, Sled Hill, S. Fort Valley, Baderville, Snow Bowl, Near Colton House, N. Fort Valley, Water Site, Tedeman Ranch, Across from Snow Bowl Road, at Former Curve in US 180.**

22. Are there any special characteristics of the Fort Valley area which should be preserved?

Yes **85** No **6**

If yes, what are they? **Rural Character - 26, Low Density - 13, Forest/Trees - 12, Views - 11, Noncommercial - 10, Open Space - 9, Quiet - 6, AR Zoning - 5, Historic Sites - 4, National Forest Access - 2, Residential - 2, Natural Beauty - 2. Others: Water, Natural Environment, Air Quality, Water Quality, No Mobiles.**

23. Are there any other issues or concerns which have not been addressed in this questionnaire?

Canyon Squire Water Use, Sewer/Septic Problems, More Local Control, Property Taxes, Guest Houses, Soil, Fort Valley Road Widening, Natural Gas, Horses per Acre, Bike Paths, AMA, Transients, Lighting, Woodstove Control, Fort Moroni, Illegal Hunting, Trash Removal, Commercial Kennels, ORVs, Open Wells, Fence Guidelines, Animal Control, Commercial Logging, Highway Safety, Lack of Ability of Landscape.

South Fort Valley Questionnaire and Results

Survey of Fort Valley - Highway 180 Corridor Property Owners – South Fort Valley

1. What street is your property on? **Mt. Elden Lookout - 33, Schultz Pass - 11, Hidden Hollow - 14, Magdalena/Van Sickle - 11, Forest Hills - 7, Colton - 7.**

If you are not on a street and not in the Fire District, in what general area is your property?

2. Are you a:

58 Resident

5 Absentee Home Owner

11 Absentee Owner of Undeveloped Land

3. Is your Land:

1 Less than 1 acre

30 1 to 2 ½ acres

26 2 ½ acres to 10 acres

17 Greater than 10 acres

4. What are some of the main issues that should be considered by the Fort Valley Planning Committee? Please rank.

- 1. Road Development / Maintenance**
- 2. Zoning / Commercial Development**
- 3. Route 180 Traffic / Alternate Route**
- 4. Density / Lot Size**
- 5. Protection of Rural Character**
- 6. Land Use Planning**
- 7. National Forest Protection**
- 8. Water Availability**

5. Which of the following do you feel are important environmental concerns? Please rank in order of importance.

None	2 National Forest Protection
5 Air Quality	6 Vegetation
4 Water Quality	7 Noise
8 Dust	9 Waste/Trash Disposal
1 Water Availability	Other - Development Density, Wildlife.
3 Water Source	

6. Should the county control the preservation of natural vegetation (for example with a tree ordinance or landscape ordinance)?

Yes **43** No **23**

7. Currently most of the South Fort Valley area is zoned for 1 and 2 acre minimum lots, and most of the North Fort Valley - Baderville areas is zoned for 2 and 2 ½ acre minimum lots. Do you think smaller lot sizes would be acceptable in certain designated areas?

Yes **9** No **61**

8. Do you think there should be an established minimum lot size for the whole area?

Yes **63** No **8**

If yes, which of the following would you prefer?

- 0 Regular subdivision lot (10,000 square feet)
- 3 ½ acre
- 9 1 acre
- 48 2 acres
- 6 5 acres
- 1 Other

9. Do you think there is a need for additional commercial uses along the Highway 180 corridor?

Yes **25** No **47**

If yes, where (check any that apply)

- 14 Schultz Pass Road
- 13 Fremont
- 9 Magdalena or Peak View
- 2 Hidden Hollow Road
- 18 Snow Bowl Road
- 0 Bader or Roundtree
- 0 Elsewhere

If yes, what types of commercial uses would be appropriate? **Restaurant - 9, Small Shopping Center - 8, Stores - 8, Motel - 5, Convenience Mart - 5, Service Businesses - 4, Theaters - 3, Gas - 3, Grocery - 2, Hardware - 2, Car Wash - 2. Others with One Vote: Ski Rental, Ski Lodge, Gallery, Feed Store.**

Are there any that are not appropriate? **Industry - 12, Shopping Center - 8, Bars - 4, Hotels - 3, RV Parks - 3, Gas - 2, Car Sales - 2,**

Polluting Business - 2. Others with One Vote: Boutiques, Kmart, Fast Food, Convenience Mart, Church.

10. Are you in favor of commercial development in certain locations?

Yes **31** No **38**

If yes, where? **Snow Bowl Road - 5, Route 180 - 3, Schultz Pass Road - 3, Fremont - 2, Major Intersections - 1, at Existing Commercial Locations - 1.**

11. Are you in favor of multiple family residential development in certain locations?

Yes **16** No **54**

If yes, where? **Along US 180 - 3, Schultz Pass/Fremont - 2, Snow Bowl - 1.**

12. Are you in favor of mobile home parks in certain locations?

Yes **3** No **68**

If yes, where? **Baderville - 1.**

13. Are you in favor of industrially zoned land for such uses as light manufacturing, cabinet-making, machine shops, contractors' yards, etc.?

Yes **8** No **62**

If yes, where? **On US 180 - 1, Off US 180 - 1, Baderville - 1, More than 1000' from Residences - 1.**

14. Except for single family dwelling homes are you in favor of more specific guidelines to control the architectural style, height and color of buildings, as well as signs?

Yes **47** No **22**

Comments? **Signs Only - 8, Control Height - 3. Also: Preserve Views, Rural Design to Fit Forest Environment, Natural Colors, Nonglare Lighting, Floor Size, Rustic and Rural Character, Sign Height.**

15. Should the county be more active or less active in enforcing zoning regulations?

More **37** Less **0** About the Same **30**

If more, what are some of the enforcement and zoning violation problems? **Commercial Use of Residential Property - 5, Outdoor Storage - 2, Illegal Subdivisions - 2, Building Codes - 1, Dumping on National Forest - 1.**

16. Should more of the roads in the Fort Valley area be paved?

Yes **37** No **27**

If yes, which ones? **Elden Lookout - 23, Forest Hills - 4, Hidden Hollow - 4, Van Sickle - 4, Snow Bowl - 2.**

17. If you live on an unpaved road, would you be willing to be assessed to pave the road?

Yes **29** No **25**

If yes, how much?

\$500-1,000 **5**
\$1,000-2,500 **13**
\$2,500-3,000 **3**
\$5,000-10,000 **4**
\$10,000+ **1**

18. Are you in favor of construction of the north-south road (Gemini Parkway) as proposed by the City of Flagstaff?

Yes **29** No **35**

If no, should there be an alternative connection from Highway 180 to I-40?

Yes **26** No **15**

If yes, where? **A-1 Mtn. - 10, West of Town - 4, Woody Mtn. North - 2. Others: Behind Cheshire, Baderville to Flag Ranch, Baderville to Bellemont, Through Government Prairie, I-40 to Hidden Hollow, Schultz Pass to Fourth St., Extension of Turquoise.**

19. If the road is constructed, would you use it:

Regularly (at least once/day) **27**
Infrequently **22**
Almost Never **16**
Never **1**

20. Do you think there should be a limit on the number of dogs allowed on each parcel?

Yes **41** No **24**

If yes, how many?

Zero **0** One **5** Two **26** Three **4** Four **2** Other **2** (**2 per 2 ½ acres, 2 per 5 acres**)

21. Is there a need for a public park in the Fort Valley area?

Yes **29** No **38**

If yes, where? **Avery's CCC - 9, Schultz Pass - 3, Lockett - 2, Near MNA - 2. Others: Former Curve in US 180, Baderville, Public Land, Gemini Parkway Area, Snow Bowl Turnoff, Near High Density Housing.**

22. Are there any special characteristics of the Fort Valley area which should be preserved?

Yes **63** No **5**

If yes, what are they? **Rural Atmosphere - 20, Forests - 18, Vegetation - 9, Peaks View - 7, Natural Beauty - 7, Quiet - 6, Low Density - 6, Open Areas - 5, Horses - 4, Wildlife - 4, Horse and Foot Trails - 4, National Forest Access - 2, Greenbelt - 2.**

23. Are there any other issues or concerns which have not been addressed in this questionnaire?

ORVs, Woodsmoke, Trash in Forest, US 180 Turn Lanes, Transients, Shooting, Tax Assessments, Bike Paths, Light Pollution, Sheriff Patrols, Fire Protection, USFS Exchanges, Wildlife, US 180 Speed Limit, Natural Gas, Access to Forest, Underground Utilities, Property Values.