



# Mountainaire Area Plan



**An Amendment to the Coconino County Comprehensive Plan**

**Development by the Residents of the Mountainaire Community  
with assistance of the County Community Development Department**

**Approved by the Coconino County Board of Supervisors on December 16, 1991**

# Mountainaie Area Plan

## **Committee Members**

William Wood, Chairman  
Mike Donald  
Margaret Keener  
Barbara Kuhlman  
David Robbins  
Suzanne Romero

## **Approved by:**

Mountainaie Planning Committee  
September 17, 1991

Coconino County Planning and Zoning Commission  
October 29, 1991

Coconino County Board of Supervisors  
Resolution No. 91-67  
December 16, 1991

# Table of Contents

<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Study Area .....	1
Land Use Survey .....	1
Resident Survey .....	1
Implementation .....	2
<b>LAND USE</b> .....	<b>3</b>
Background - Existing Land Use .....	3
<i>Mountaineire</i> .....	3
<i>Surrounding Properties</i> .....	3
Future Land Uses .....	4
Single Family Residential .....	4
<i>Mountaineire</i> .....	4
<i>Surrounding Properties</i> .....	5
Mobile Homes .....	6
Multiple Family Residential .....	6
Planned Residential Developments .....	6
Commercial Uses .....	6
Industrial .....	7
Design Review .....	7
Home Occupations .....	7
Open Space .....	8
Forest Service Exchange Lands .....	8
Land Use Policies .....	9
<i>Single Family Residential</i> .....	9
<i>Multiple Family Developments</i> .....	10
<i>Mobile Home Parks</i> .....	10
<i>Commercial</i> .....	11
<i>Industrial</i> .....	11
<i>Other Factors</i> .....	11
<b>NATURAL RESOURCES &amp; ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY</b> .....	<b>12</b>
General Physical Characteristics .....	12
Air Quality .....	12
Aesthetics .....	13
Lighting .....	13
Forest Issues .....	14
Environmental Policies .....	14
<b>WATER QUALITY &amp; QUANTITY</b> .....	<b>16</b>
Surface Water .....	16
Groundwater .....	16
Future Expansion .....	17
Policies .....	18

<b>WASTEWATER</b> .....	<b>19</b>
Policies .....	21
<b>ROADS</b> .....	<b>22</b>
Policies .....	24
<b>SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS</b> .....	<b>25</b>
Fire Protection .....	25
Policies.....	25
Zoning Enforcement/Animal Control .....	26
Policies.....	27
<b>APPENDICES</b> .....	<b>28</b>
Appendix "A" - Commercial Uses Listing .....	28
Appendix "B" - Design Review Overlay Guidelines .....	30
Appendix "C" - Resident Survey Results .....	33

**NOTE:** The Mountaineer Study Area Map is not included in this electronic copy of the Area Plan. It may be obtained from the Community Development Department.

# **INTRODUCTION**

On November 5, 1990, the Board of Supervisors appointed a six-member citizens' committee to study various planning-related issues and to develop policies to guide future growth and development within Mountaineire subdivision and on nearby private lands. The committee selected the issues of concern which included future land use, water, wastewater, roads, fire protection and environmental quality. The committee met for the first time on December 11, 1990 and 14 more times through September, 1991.

## **Study Area**

The study area was established by the committee at its first meeting. The area decided upon was the area within the Mountaineire Fire District boundaries excluding the eastern row of sections which are accessed via Lake Mary Road. I-17 provides the westerly boundary, the City of Flagstaff Corporate limits is the northern boundary, the township line is the southern boundary and the east boundary is the east section line of Sections 14, 23, 26, and 35.

## **Land Use Survey**

In February, 1991 Community Development staff made a land use survey of all private properties within the study area. The land use survey identified existing land uses and was used by the Committee to results are contained in the next section.

## **Resident Survey**

In February, 1990 a questionnaire, which was developed by the Mountaineire Community Association, was distributed to residents within the Mountaineire subdivision by representatives of the property owners' association. There were 108 questionnaires returned and the results are included in Appendix "C" of this Plan. Since the respondents are presumably a mix of property owners and renters, the survey results should not be relied on too heavily but rather be considered for informational purposes as representing some general feelings of area residents.

## Implementation

Upon adoption, this Plan becomes a part of the Coconino County 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 must be denied or be accompanied by a request to amend the plan.

# LAND USE

## Background - Existing Land Use

The study area consists of approximately 1095 acres of private land within a 16 square mile area in Township 20 North, Range 7 East. The private land is situated on five separate inholdings within the Coconino National Forest in Sections 15, 20, 26, 28 and 34. The study area limits were based on the Mountaineire Fire District boundaries and the potential impact future development would have on the Mountaineire Community proper. All of the property in the study area is accessed via Mountaineire Road.

### ***Mountaineire***

A portion of one of these inholdings is developed with the Mountaineire subdivision, consisting of 140 acres zoned RS-6,000 (Residential Single Family, 6,000 sq. ft. minimum lot size). This acreage is split into 5 units with a total of 792 lots, each averaging 5,000 square feet. All of the units were platted between 1960 and 1964, prior to the adoption of County Zoning and Subdivision regulations. Unit 5 was recorded the same month that the County's first Zoning Ordinance became effective (October, 1964). A resubdivision of part of Unit 5 was done in 1983.

Due to the relative small size of the lots within the subdivision, many property owners have acquired more than 1 lot and combined their property to provide more flexibility in developing it and, in many cases, to have enough room to establish an on-site septic system. The residential lots are primarily developed with site built single family dwellings which is consistent with the current RS-6,000 Zoning. A field survey done in the spring of 1991 resulted in a count of 375 site built single family residences, 38 mobile homes/travel trailers and 275 undeveloped lots remaining. The mobile homes were established under previous zoning regulations. A conditional use permit is required to replace a non-conforming mobile with another mobile home.

The fact that Mountaineire was designed as a summer home subdivision but has evolved into a year-round residential area is no doubt the cause for the problems it is experiencing now, e.g. septic tank failures, water shortages, and road conditions.

### ***Surrounding Properties***

The majority of the private property within the study area outside of the subdivision is in the General Zone which is a very low density agricultural residential zoning classification. Either site built or mobile/manufactured homes are permitted in the General Zone. These properties were originally zoned A-General with the adoption of the

first County Zoning Ordinance in 1964. The A-General zoning and corresponding 1-acre minimum lot size remained in effect through August, 1981 when the Board of Supervisors adopted the most recent zoning ordinance which included a County-wide rezoning of lands in the A-General Zone to G-General. The most significant change realized with that rezoning was the increase to 10 acres for the minimum parcel size. With this change, the potential density for development in these areas was decreased dramatically.

Of the 823.5 acres in the study area which are currently zoned General, there are 78 parcels established with 25 site built single family dwellings and 3 mobile homes.

There is on 80 acre parcel under private ownership which is zoned OS (Open Space). All of the Forest Service land in the study area is zoned OS.

The remaining property in the study area is located on the entrance road to Mountainaire and consists of approximately 48 acres zoned CG-10,000 (Commercial General 10,000 square feet minimum parcel size).

Existing commercial land uses include the Mountainaire Tavern, Mountainaire Store and a retail craft shop operated out of one of the three (3) residences established in the CG-10,000 Zone.

Ponderosa Utility, the local water company, maintains a well and water storage site in the commercial zoned area. An additional storage facility is located at the northeastern corner of the subdivision of 1.89 acres in the PS (Public Service) Zone.

## **Future Land Uses**

### **Single Family Residential**

#### ***Mountainaire***

Lots within Mountainaire subdivision proper will no doubt continue to be developed as they have in the past. However, with the current requirements for on-site septic systems, it is possible that more lots will have to be combined to accommodate development. The alternative is the establishment of a central sewer system for the community. The existing mobile homes within the subdivision should ultimately be replaced with site built or modular homes consistent with the current zoning.



## **Surrounding Properties**

Future residential development of the portion of the study area which is zoned General is dependent on many factors. Due to the fact that both County and State subdivision regulations do not consider Forest Service roads as legal access roads for new subdivisions, the lands within the study area located in Sections 26 and 15 will probably retain the current low density zoning. Since most of the existing parcels in Section 26 are already substandard in size (having been grandfathered in under the previous 1-acre zoning) development of these lots will be dependent on the desires of the individual property owners. Of the 39 parcels, 11 have homes on them and approximately 6 of these are year-round residences. Lack of utilities to the area coupled with problems in accessing through minimally improved privately maintained roads limits the developability of this land.

The private land just south of and abutting Mountainaire in Section 28 could conceivably be rezoned and subdivided for development at a higher density than the current General Zoning allows. Once again, developability would be dictated by the availability of utilities and ability of the subdivider to provide such. For development of a Schedule C subdivision, where the average lot size is greater than 5 acres, electrical and communication facilities must be provided to each lot and each lot must be of sufficient size to accommodate an on-site sewage disposal system. However, no water distribution system is required and a waiver from the paving requirements for interior roads can be granted if they will be privately maintained. In a Schedule B subdivision, where the average lot size is over one acre and up to five acres, a community water distribution system is required as well as water storage and hydrants for fire protection. Paving can be waived for private roads in subdivisions of 2 ½ acre or larger lots. Development requirements for Schedule A subdivisions are most restrictive. These are for developments where the average lot size is one acre or less. In addition to paved roads and domestic water supply and distribution system, a community sewer system is required and the subdivision must be served by a fire district.

The area in Section 34 southeast of Mountainaire would only be able to be subdivided if access could be obtained through the private property directly south of Mountainaire.

The area northwest of Mountainaire and directly east of I-17 is also accessed by a Forest Service Road (Old Munds Highway), although it is maintained by the County under a cooperative agreement. This road would have to be dedicated to the County by both private property owners and the Forest Service and then accepted by the County for maintenance in order to facilitate subdivision in this area.

## **Mobile Homes**

There are no existing mobile home parks within the study area and only a limited number of mobile homes established on the individual parcels. As already noted, the RS-6,000 Zoning for the residential lots in Mountaineire allows only site built or modular residential units. If other portions of the study area have deed restrictions prohibiting mobile homes, those property owners may wish to pursue rezoning to an RR-10 (Rural Residential, 10 acre minimum parcel size) which would not allow mobile homes. The current General Zone allows site built, modular and mobile homes for residential units. Due to the obvious absence of mobile homes in the study area now, a mobile home park would not be a compatible development. Furthermore, mobile home parks are generally high density (over 8 units per acre) with high demands on water and sewer services. This would compound the problem of developing a park within the study area.

## **Multiple Family Residential**

There is currently no property zoned for multiple family developments and no legally established multiple family uses in the study area. Due to the intensity of services needed to support such a use, specifically water for both domestic consumption and fire supply, the feasibility of such a development in the study area is limited under current conditions. However, if a development could be self-supporting with a separate water supply and sewer system, there is property on Mountaineire Road which might be suitable for low density multiple family developments.

## **Planned Residential Developments**

One method for developing multiple family areas is through the PRD (Planned Residential Development) special purpose zone. PRD zoning is based on a master plan of development and has specific requirements for open space (35% of the total area). A PRD could be developed under one ownership for rental residences or in conjunction with a subdivision plat with individual ownerships. Once again, property adjacent to Mountaineire Road between Mountaineire and the Interstate may be appropriate for such developments.

## **Commercial Uses**

With over 40 acres of commercially zoned property existing in the study area and with commercial uses established on little over an acre, there is great potential for the remaining commercial property to be developed. Since the commercial area is 1 mile from I-17, it is not highly desirable to develop commercial uses aimed at highway travelers. The preferable uses for the commercial area are neighborhood-oriented, providing services directed toward the area

residents. Also, uses which are compatible with the rural environment and/or recreation oriented would be appropriate. This could include a broad range of uses from equestrian stables such as that approved by a conditional use permit for property on Old Munds Highway, to overnight lodging facilities geared toward recreational use of adjacent Forest Service land. The commercially zoned land could also be a good location for siting some of the owner/operator businesses which are currently operated as home occupations within the subdivision, but which exceed the limits of these uses as provided by the Zoning Ordinance. Due to the prominent location of the existing commercially zoned land, any development should conform to specific design and appearance criteria. Due to the significant amount of commercially zoned property already in the study area, there does not seem to be a need for any additional commercial land.

## **Industrial**

There is currently no industrially zoned land within the study area and no legally established industrial uses. Generally, locating these uses within the established city limits is more desirable due to the availability of fire protection, water and sewer service, and other amenities.

## **Design Review**

In order to protect and enhance the visual quality of certain areas, a special Design Review Overlay (DRO) Zone may be adopted by the Board of Supervisors. Specific guidelines for development must be adopted as part of the DRO and would address acceptable architectural and design styles; materials, textures and colors for buildings, structures and signs; and additional landscaping and open space standards. Where adopted, the DRO guidelines are applicable only to multiple family developments, commercial or industrial establishments, and public or semi-public uses and all signing for such uses.

## **Home Occupations**

Home occupations are permitted in both the General and RS Zones 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. A permit is required for such uses, issued by the Department of Community Development.

## **Open Space**

Most of the recreational land use occurs on National Forest land. Although a questionnaire circulated to Mountainaire residents indicated a strong desire for a community park in the subdivision, there is at present no publicly-owned land available for such a use. Also, given the significant amount of public land surrounding the study area there does not appear to be a significant need for a County park at this time. There are other concerns with current and future use of the Forest Service land, e.g. grazing and timber sales, which need to consider the human use of the land and potential impacts on the residential areas.

## **Forest Service Exchange Lands**

The Coconino National Forest currently has land within the study area (Sections 17 and 20) identified in their Base-in-Exchange Program and, in fact, there is a tentative trade pending. The land identified for trade is in the northwestern corner of the study area. This land is currently zoned OS (Open Space). When it does become privately owned it will have to go through the rezoning process. Due to the location of the property adjacent to I-17 and directly south of Flagstaff Pulliam Airport there is potential for major development of the property. Since the proposed trade also includes Forest land contiguous to the Section within the study area but within the City of Flagstaff Corporate boundaries, it is possible that a new owner might pursue annexation prior to or in conjunction with a development plan. Factors which need to be considered with future development proposals for this property include: location at "gateway" to Flagstaff, compatibility with adjacent land uses (i.e. airport), location of Runway Protection Zones, access, and ability to provide adequate infrastructure. In light of the wide range in potential development of this property, it is possible that the policies adopted with this plan may seem unduly restrictive at some future date. It is possible that a plan amendment would be appropriate to accommodate a viable development plan for this property.

The two smaller pieces available for trade in Section 20 should be limited to rezoning which allow development subject to the same conditions as the existing private property in this section.

## **Land Use Policies**

### ***Single Family Residential***

1. Within the Mountaineire subdivision, property owners shall be encouraged to combine adjacent lots where feasible to alleviate the problem of inadequate site area for the establishment of septic systems.
2. Within the Mountaineire subdivision, where nonconforming mobile homes are existing when they are eventually removed they should be replaced with site built or modular homes in conformance with the current zoning.
3. On the private inholdings which can be accessed only by U.S. Forest Service roads the current very low density residential zoning shall be maintained.
4. Rezoning to accommodate higher densities shall not be considered except in conjunction with a subdivision plat.
5. New subdivision proposals shall be scrutinized with primary concern placed on water availability, wastewater disposal and access. Any new subdivision proposals with parcels less than 2 ½ acres average lot size shall conform with all requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance.
6. Any development proposing a density of between one (1) unit per 2 ½ acres through one (1) unit per 1 acre shall be approved through the PRD (Planned Residential Development) zoning process. In addition to the requirements specified in Section 13.2 (PRD) of the Zoning Ordinance, the following development requirements shall also apply:
  - a. Open Space: PRD developments located in treed areas shall have a minimum of 35% open space. In treeless areas, greater open space percentages shall be encouraged. All lots shall have, either direct or via easement, access to open space areas. Access to adjacent Forest Service land should be incorporated into the Open Space area.
  - b. Vegetation: Preserving the natural vegetation of the area should be encouraged at all times.
  - c. Density: Maximum density determination shall be made on a case by case basis considering open space requirements, environmental determinants, physical constraints, sewage disposal, and vegetative cover. No development shall have a density greater than one (1) unit per acre.

d. Floodplain: No development shall be allowed in County restricted floodplains. Floodplain areas shall be reserved for open space and pedestrian/equestrian easements.

e. Lighting: Outdoor lighting shall be discouraged, but, if outdoor lighting is provided, it shall be low pressure sodium.

f. Development Concept: All PRD's with an underlying theme or concept shall be compatible with the rural residential character of Mountaineire.

g. Livestock: The Planning and Zoning Commission and the Board of Supervisors shall require all new subdivisions or development in the Planning Area adjacent to Federal lands to provide adequate protection from livestock intrusion using Forest Service fencing standards or equal.

### ***Multiple Family Developments***

1. Multiple family developments shall be limited to areas with access directly from a major arterial (Highway 17) or collector street (Mountaineire Road).

2. Multiple family developments shall not exceed a density of ten (10) units per acre and shall be done through the PRD zoning process. The development requirements outlined above shall be applied.

3. Multiple family developments must conform to specific design review guidelines adopted with the Mountaineire DRO (Design Review Overlay) Zone. These guidelines shall address building design, site planning, landscaping and signing.

4. Multiple family developments should be designed with smaller units (e.g. duplexes or triplexes) as opposed to large apartment buildings.

### ***Mobile Home Parks***

1. The future development of mobile home parks shall be discouraged within the study area unless density limits and other criteria of the single family residential policies adopted with this Plan can be met.

## **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. Also uses consistent with the rural area, and, developments which show sensitivity to the natural environment may be appropriate. Examples of desirable future commercial uses include, but are not limited to: hardware store, daycare center, rental cabins. Desirable and undesirable future commercial uses are listed in Appendix A of this Plan.

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

3. Future commercial development must conform to specific Design Review guidelines adopted with the Mountaineer DRO (Design Review Overlay) Zone. These guidelines which address building design, site planning, landscaping, signing, lighting, and screening are set forth in Appendix B of the Plan.

4. All commercial development accessed off a paved road should require paved access and parking lot.

## **Industrial**

1. Industrial rezonings are considered inappropriate and shall be discouraged within the study area.

## **Other Factors**

1. Any development along the I-17 corridor should be given careful consideration, due to its "gateway" location, to insure that such developments are compatible and attractive.

# NATURAL RESOURCES & ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

## General Physical Characteristics

The natural environment of the study area is typical of Flagstaff and surrounding areas. Vegetation is predominantly ponderosa pine with gamble oak and some pinon and juniper. Grasses in the area include Arizona fescue and blue gramma. Elevations range from 6740 to 7100'. Soils in the area support such uses as timber production, summer rangeland, wildlife habitat, and recreation. Annual precipitation ranges for 18-26 inches. The private land within the study area is located in and around open meadows or "parks." Mountaineire subdivision, however, is more varied, commencing in the flat floodplain area at its west end then making a rise of 140 ft. and leveling out on top of the ridge. Basalt outcroppings are frequent throughout the study area. The most predominant of the limestone escarpments is found in the Schoolhouse Draw area which bisects the northern portion of the study area in an east-west direction. Schoolhouse Draw is one of the two major drainages within the study area. The majority of the Mountaineire subdivision (the Westerly portion) drains into Schoolhouse Draw which is a major tributary to Pumphouse Wash. Pumphouse Wash runs along the western boundary of the study area, paralleling I-17 and crossing under the Interstate approximately one-half mile north of the Kachina Village/Mountaineire Interchange. Pumphouse Wash ultimately feeds into Oak Creek.

Priest Draw is the second major drainage, commencing southeast of Mountaineire. Most of the eastern portion of the study area south of Schoolhouse Draw runs into Priest Draw which merges with Howard Draw and feeds into Lower Lake Mary.

## Air Quality

Air quality problems within the study area are generally limited to dust, woodstove smoke and smoke from the controlled slash burns on Forest Service land. The air quality problem is most severe in the winter time and in the low area near the interstate. With the exception of the Mountaineire access road, all roads in the study area are dirt or cinder. Due to the relative low density in the outlying areas, dust is not a major problem except within the Mountaineire subdivision proper. Under current standards, subdivisions with a density less than 1 unit per 2 ½ acres must provide paved roads. Methods of addressing the current dust problem include the formation of a dust control or paving district. The Arizona Department of Environmental Quality has enforcement jurisdiction over air quality standards. State law requires that municipalities and counties take "reasonable measures" to mitigate dust. Governments may be cited by ADEQ or the EPA if roads in their jurisdiction are in violation of applicable standards.



In regard to woodstove smoke, the problem has been partially addressed through more stringent standards required by EPA for all new woodstoves sold after January 1989; even more restrictive emission standards will go into effect in July, 1991. There are no provisions, however, for retrofitting or replacing older models. The Committee also identified coal burning as a nuisance due to the acrid sulphur emissions and the general lack of adequate scrubbers on residential coal-burning units. Smoke from the controlled burns of slash on forest Service land has been an intermittent problem over the past few years. However, the Forest Service is addressing the issue through air quality control measures.

## **Aesthetics**

Much of the attraction for current and future residents to make their homes within the study area is the natural environment which provides a rural atmosphere conducive to a particular lifestyle. Protection and maintenance of these intrinsic qualities is necessary for preserving this rural way of life. Aesthetic considerations gain further importance when considering that a four-mile stretch of the study area parallels I-17 and could be considered as a "gateway" to the City of Flagstaff. One way of maintaining the rural character is through the adoption of a Design Review Overlay Zone with specific design guidelines which would address appropriated architectural style and design, materials, textures, colors and lighting. These standards can be applied to buildings, structures, signs, landscaping, site layout and use relationships for multi-family, commercial and public or semi-public uses.

## **Lighting**

One aspect of the rural environment enjoyed by residents within the study area is the relatively unspoiled night skyview. Light pollution has not been a major problem, although with further development in the area, such degradation is a possibility. Outdoor area lighting within the study area must comply with the County Lighting Ordinance. Due to Flagstaff's reputation as an outstanding area for astronomical observation, the lighting ordinance was developed in an attempt to protect the observatories and still provide for reasonable growth. Other purposes served by the Ordinance are energy conservation and elimination of unnecessary glare. The Ordinance requirements emphasize the use of low pressure sodium lighting and the shielding of fixtures to prevent escape of direct illumination onto adjacent properties. The County is divided into four lighting zones with decreasing requirements as distance from the observatories increases. The majority of the study area is in Zone II, due to its proximity to the Naval Observatory located approximately 6 miles northwest on I-40 and also the Lowell Observatory on Anderson Mesa, approximately 4 ½ miles to the east. The southwesterly portion of the study area is in Zone III.

## **Forest Issues**

The public land, which comprises the largest portion of the study area, is under the jurisdiction of the Coconino National Forest. The primary uses of this forest land have been grazing, timber harvesting, recreation, fuelwood cutting and hunting. Impacts of these uses are felt throughout the study area. There have been problems with trespassing onto private land by both cows and humans. This becomes a major concern when it involves hunters, who are either unaware of the private ownership or don't care. Perimeter fencing to keep cattle out is the responsibility of the private property owner. Although timber harvesting will remain ongoing within the area, no new timber sales are planned in the study area for the next twenty years. There will continue to be prescribed burning and mistletoe control. Other impacts created by these major uses of Forest Land deal with disturbance of vegetation and wildlife habitat and increase in soil erosion. Keeping recreational users and hunters restricted to existing roads and trails would help tremendously, especially with motorized ORVs (off road vehicles). Continuing the policy of rotating grazing areas for cattle probably helps to some extent. Stricter enforcement of the restrictions on fuelwood cutting could help to decrease illegal cutting, which in turn could mitigate destruction of wildlife habitats.

## **Environmental Policies**

1. Residents shall be encouraged to buy low particulate emissive woodstoves and/or retrofit existing units to minimize particulate emissions (e.g. by adding catalytic converter).
2. The County and fire district are encouraged to disseminate information on the proper use of woodstoves to reduce air pollution.
3. The use of coal as a heating fuel is discouraged.
4. Dust evaluation and mitigation measures shall be incorporated into the subdivision and major development review and approval process.
5. The County shall encourage, through the provision of information, the formation of a road improvement district as a means of resolving dust problems.
6. The County Highway Department should pursue aggressive dust control efforts on existing unpaved roads within the Mountaineire Subdivision.
7. The County shall adopt the Design Review Guidelines included with this plan for application to all commercial, multiple family, and public or semi-public uses.

8. The County shall adopt a landscape amendment, emphasizing the use of native and drought tolerant plant species and encouraging the retention of existing native vegetation.

9. The use of underground electric and communication lines should be required in all new commercial and multiple family developments and all subdivisions with parcel sizes under five (5) acres.

10. All residential lighting shall be encouraged to conform with the provisions for shielding required for astronomical Zone II.

# **WATER QUALITY & QUANTITY**

## **Surface Water**

The study area is somewhat unique in that it is located in two watersheds, Oak Creek and Lower Lake Mary. Both of these watersheds are significant, Oak Creek having been designated as a unique water by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) and Lower Lake Mary serving as one of the City of Flagstaff's main water sources. Thus, discharges into their tributaries are of great concern.

Discharges are permitted by a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit issued by ADEQ (Arizona Department of Environmental Quality). Water discharges must conform to state and federal quality requirements for nitrates, fecal coliform, biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) and suspended solids. Monitoring also includes testing for viral diseases and heavy metals such as lead, mercury or arsenic. The Oak Creek Water Quality Management Plan, which was adopted in 1984 as an amendment to the NACOG (Northern Arizona Council of Governments) 208 Plan provided that "No new NPDES permits should be issued for direct discharges into Oak Creek or its tributaries." NPDES permits regulate point source discharges but there is currently no formal regulation of non-point source pollutants. These could include runoff from failing septic, grazing and timber activity on Forest Service land, and oil and other residue from roadways.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has designated six (6) drainage areas as subject to 100-year flooding. These include Schoolhouse Draw, Pumphouse Wash, Priest Draw and three unnamed washes. Two drain into Howard Draw on the east side of the study area and the third is the floodplain area bordering the western edge of Mountaineire draining into Schoolhouse Draw. No detailed flood studies have been done for any of these areas.

## **Groundwater**

Groundwater is found in the regional aquifer. The one existing well within the local water utility's system is 800 feet deep. Due to the depth to groundwater, potential contaminants tend to be filtered out through the percolation process. The main water quality problem has been complaints of turbidity. Some concerns have been expressed by area residents regarding the concentration of septic systems in Mountaineire.

Water quantity, however, has become of great concern to on-line customers. The problems experienced range from low pressure to no water due to line breaks and shutdowns. The system currently serves approximately 430 customers (meters) and, given current well production and storage capacity, will be at its maximum level at 500

connections. The owner of the water company estimates that this figure will be reached sometime in 1996-97. Although not all of the study area is within the franchise boundaries of the Ponderosa Utility Corporation, the private water company, virtually all developed properties obtain their water from it, either by direct line connection or through hauling.

The single well which serves the system produces at a rate of 125 gallons per minute (gpm), according to the operator. This was increased from 90 gpm within the last year with the upgrading of the submersible pump. The well is located northwest of the Mountaineire subdivision in the flat meadow area. There is a total of 175,000 gallons of storage and usage averages 90,000 gallons per day (gpd). There are three small storage tanks at the well site (6500, 7500 and 8500 gallons). Water is pumped from the three storage tanks to the main 125,000 gallon storage facility at the Kiowa Street station which is the primary station supplying the entire system. The other storage facility is in the highest zone in the service area at the northeast corner of the subdivision on Fox Street. A standpipe for water sales is at the Fox Street station. There is a 1" meter affixed to the standpipe and it is counted as one customer, although several households are hauling from the site to areas outside the certificated boundaries.

Initially the system wasn't designed to handle fire flow, but some of the lines have been upgraded and there are 6 hydrants on-line. Other upgrades to the system include the installation of clean-outs at dead-end lines and the addition of five valves so that only partial shut-downs occur when repairs are needed.

## **Future Expansion**

Due to the impending maximization of the system, the water company officials are trying to get approval for rate increases to finance construction of a new well. Preliminary investigations have commenced for finding an adequate well site. Water company officials speculate that the addition of a new well onto the system could serve 400-500 more households, depending on capacity. In the meantime, the utility needs to add more storage to meet the minimum 24-hr. reserve required by ADEQ to help alleviate current problems.

Since the current system was not designed to accommodate high intensity commercial water users or multi-family developments, in all likelihood such uses would have to develop their own well and water system. Those parcels outside of the certificated area, if developed under the current low density zoning, will most likely continue to rely on hauled water rather than go to the expense of establishing private wells.

Due to the expense involved in line extensions it is probably not cost-effective to expand the certificated area and run lines to the outlying inholdings.

## **Policies**

1. Commercial development shall be limited to low-volume water users.

2. Use of water conserving plumbing fixtures shall be required for all commercial and multi-family development and encouraged for single family development.

3. The use of drought tolerant/low water using plants shall be required for landscaping for all development other than single family dwellings and encouraged for single family development.

4. The Department of Water Resources (DWR) shall be encouraged to conduct a comprehensive hydrology study of Pumphouse Wash, Schoolhouse Draw, and the unnamed floodplain bordering the west end of Mountainaire.

5. Substantiation of a reliable water supply for domestic use and fire flow shall be required prior to County approval of subdivisions, multiple family, or commercial developments.

6. The County shall take into consideration the potential for non-point source pollutants when reviewing applications for major developments.

# WASTEWATER

One of the biggest problems within Mountainaire subdivision is wastewater disposal. Although respondents to the questionnaire rated sewage in a tie for sixth place (it tied with building and fire code enforcement) out of 8 problem issues, it is truly a bigger problem than many of the others due to limitations on feasible solutions. Also, since the questionnaire was primarily distributed to residents, the results do not reflect the views of owners of vacant land, much of which is vacant due to the inability of the sites to accommodate an individual disposal system. Since the average lot size is 5,000 square feet, the developable area is already limited just by size alone. Further constraints are the geological conditions in the area including rock and impervious soils which will not percolate.

Units 1, 2 and 3 of Mountainaire were recorded in 1960, 1961 and 1962 respectively and apparently obtained State approval for individual septic systems. Unit 4, which was recorded in 1964, was approved by the State Bureau of Environmental Health for the use of septic tanks on only a temporary basis, until a proposed community sewer system and treatment facility was developed (this of course never happened). Unit 5 was recorded in 1964 without any State approval for water service or wastewater disposal. In 1983, 30 of the original 119 lots in Unit 5 were resubdivided into 20 lots averaging 7,500 square feet in size. Several other lots, which were not a part of the resubdivision, have also been combined in order to have enough land to facilitate the siting of a septic system. For lots which cannot accommodate a conventional septic tank leach field system, an alternate on-site system may be acceptable.

Septic failures are of concern due to the potential threat to public health and possibility of surface or groundwater contamination. The average life expectancy of a conventional septic system is 20-40 years. With the age of the subdivision reaching the 30-year mark, there will probably be an increasing number of failures annually. The County Environmental Health Department issues repair permits, but has speculated that county-wide only about 25% of failed septic systems obtain the requisite permits.

In addition to the possible contamination of surface and groundwater through failing septic systems, there is also a concern of degradation of water quality merely by the large number of septic tanks concentrated in one area. The Arizona Department of Environmental Quality currently identifies acceptable discharge levels at 1200 gallons per day per acre (approximately three, 2-bedroom residences). With the current density allowed by zoning, Mountainaire could well exceed this level by 125 to 150 percent. The groundwater quality is monitored by the State through requirements on the local water utility. To date there have been no violations of acceptable nitrate levels, which would indicate contamination. This is no doubt in part

due to the distance of the water table (approximately 1000 feet) and the ability for impurities to be filtered out. Mountainaire has not yet been identified as a special study area by ADEQ, but due to the density and number of system failures, it is possible it could be designated such at some future time. If groundwater degradation was found, the State would require a remedy, through legal action if necessary.

There are really no easy answers for resolving the wastewater disposal problems. The most obvious is of course the development of a community sewer system and treatment plant which was proposed almost 30 years ago with the subdivision of Unit 4. The biggest problem with this is cost. Estimates for the cost of a system range from 2 to 5 million dollars for wastewater disposal and treatment works (not including a collection system). If a system similar to Kachina Village were designed with a wetlands/marsh area, some funding may be available through the federal government. Procedurally, a special improvement district would have to be formed with over 50% of the property owners voting in favor. Costs would be assessed per lot. The financial feasibility is questionable due in part to the relative minimal investment many property owners have in their lots when compared with possible assessments. This is particularly true for absentee landlords who do not personally experience the frustrations of a failed system. Another alternative which has been suggested involves the clustering of failing systems and transporting the effluent to a community treatment facility which would include an oversize leach field. Problems involved in this are available site location and costs, which would only be shared by a portion of the community. This method and continual repair of failing systems are both really only band-aid approaches toward resolving the problem.

or the outlying areas on-site wastewater disposal is not as big of a problem. Although many of the areas share the same physical constraints of clay soils and rock, the parcels are generally large enough that suitable soil conditions can be found somewhere to accommodate a system.

In regard to future commercial and higher density residential developments, these would have to meet all current State and County health department requirements. If a development were to be proposed near Mountainaire which would include a community sewer system, some incentives could be provided to include Mountainaire on a system. Such a joint venture could go a long way toward off-setting the otherwise extreme costs.



## **Policies**

1. The County shall require that all building permit applications for new construction and expansion of existing structures include a complete site plan showing the location of the septic tank and leach field.
2. In an effort to decrease the number and intensity of failures, the County shall work with residents within Mountainaire in providing information regarding proper maintenance of septic systems and information on low-flush toilets and low water using appliances.
3. All new development shall conform with all Federal, State and County requirements for wastewater disposal. No development shall be considered unless adequate sewage disposal facilities can be provided.
4. Where feasible, any projects approved with wastewater treatment plants should be required to reuse wastewater for irrigation purposes subject to ADEQ approval.
5. Review and approval of any subdivisions or major developments proposing a sewer treatment facility shall consider the feasibility of developing a system which could include Mountainaire. Amendments to increase this Plan's density policies may be appropriate if such an alternative would be accommodated.
6. The County Health and Building Departments shall continue to enforce the policy requiring upgrading septic systems for bedroom additions.

## ROADS

Roads within the study area are a mix of County Roads (Mountainaire Road and those within the Mountainaire subdivision), Forest Service Roads (providing access to the outlying areas), a Forest Service road maintained by the County under a cooperative agreement (Old Munds Highway), and private easements providing access to the parcels in the outlying and unsubdivided areas.

The County is responsible for maintenance on the roads serving the majority of residences within the study area. Although the roads within Mountainaire subdivision are dedicated and accepted County roads, they do not meet current standards for grade or surfacing. The County has a five-year plan to identify roads that warrant major improvements. Road improvements included in the 5-year plan are primarily correction of design problems, and major maintenance projects (e.g. chip-seal, resurfacing). To make this determination, the County looks at average daily traffic counts, maintenance classification, school bus routes, and road rating. No roads within the study area are included in the current five (5) year plan.

The Forest Service roads within the study area provide access to the outlying parcels. These public roads are also used by recreationists, hunters, fuel wood gatherers and loggers. Forest Service roads obtain only minimal maintenance. One issue which complicates future development of the outlying area is the fact that Forest Service roads cannot be considered permanent legal access roads per State subdivision laws. The Forest Service has plans for closure and obliteration of some of their roads with the study area. None of the changes should affect access to the outlying areas.

The majority of private access easements are found in Section 26, in the area commonly known as Woodland Estates. This quarter-section of residential lots is probably the most remote with the study area with year-round residents. Other areas with private easements are in Section 20 for access off Old Munds Highway and Section 34. Maintenance of private access easements is the responsibility of property owners.

Roads and associated dust pollution was ranked number 1 out of 8 problem areas by respondents to the survey. Mountainaire Road is the only paved road in the study area. The 4.71 miles of roads within the subdivision are cinder roads and this, coupled with the high residential density and its attendant traffic, make dust control a major concern to the residents. One method for addressing the dust problem as it relates to roads is the formation of improvement districts. Two alternatives discussed by the Committee were paving and dust control districts. There are currently no dust control districts in Coconino County so the actual operation of such would have to be determined through the formation process. However, the intent of such

a district is that the property owners are taxed for the cost of materials and applications of dust palliatives not currently included in the County's maintenance program. Frequency of application would depend on stability of the materials used and costs. Formation of a special improvement district must be initiated by the property owners and requires consent of over 50% of owners within the project boundaries. Although paving is generally considered the most cost effective long-term means for dust suppression, a specific cost-benefit analysis has not been done for paving vs. other dust mitigation methods for the Mountaineire subdivision. Some of the committee members had concerns about paving, due to the grade of some of the roads and their feeling that this may increase the potential for hazardous conditions in the winter months (e.g. ice buildups). If the roads were to be paved, all other current design standards (such as grade) could not feasibly be met due to existing development. Another factor to consider in weighing the pros and cons of paving vs. dust control is the time frame. With an improvement district for paving, the cost is a one-time expense, spread out over a specified time period (10 or 20 years). With a dust control district, expenses would be ongoing permanently and would most likely increase with inflation, changes in palliative technology, and in response to continuing stringent EPA requirements. A third aspect of paving vs. other dust control is with the maintenance. There is generally a trade-off of less grading with the application of a palliative since the grading would disturb its usefulness. A decision regarding frequency of treatments would have to be made.

According to the survey results, over 57% of respondents favored the paving of roads in Mountaineire. Of those, 74% would be willing to pay a special district assessment. Over 80% of the respondents favored the oiling of more roads in Mountaineire and of those, over 82% would be willing to pay a special assessment. It should be noted that the survey was circulated among the residents of Mountaineire, not all of whom are property owners.

In addition to dust as an issue with roads, the lack of an identified secondary access road is of concern, primarily in the case of emergency situations. Existing Forest Service roads which tie in with Old Munds Highway both north and south of Mountaineire provide some mitigation to this problem. However, minimal maintenance and lack of signing on these roads, along with the fact that many residents probably don't even know they exist, indicate a need for a thorough plan to address this key issue.

## **Policies**

1. Developers shall be responsible for road improvements necessary to provide safe and adequate access to proposed developments.
2. The impact of proposed developments on the existing roadway network shall be evaluated prior to approval and, if necessary, conditions of approval shall be stipulated to mitigate impacts.
3. Developments proposing heavy through traffic in residential neighborhoods shall be strongly discouraged.
4. Adequate off-street parking shall be required for all new developments.
5. All new subdivisions within the study area shall be developed in accordance with Section 6.4 of the County Subdivision Ordinance. Subdivisions with parcel sizes of 2 ½ acres or greater may be granted a waiver from the paving requirement if the roadways are to be privately owned and maintained.
6. All roadways shall be developed and maintained so as to provide adequate access for emergency vehicles.
7. The County shall pursue investigation of potential alternatives for development of a secondary emergency access road.
8. A secondary access road shall be required for any major development for which Mountainaire road provides the primary access.
9. The County roads within the Mountainaire Study Area shall be assessed for inclusion within the County Highway Department 5-year plan.

# **SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

## **Fire Protection**

The entire Mountaineer Study Area is within the boundaries of the Mountaineer Fire District which is served by a volunteer fire department. The Forest Service has primary jurisdiction for fire prevention/suppression on the forest land within the study area. However, the Mountaineer Fire Department also responds to wildland fires, particularly those endangering the private lands. The major concern of the Fire Department is the need for a secondary access out of the Mountaineer subdivision. Due to the high density of residential development in such a concentrated area, problems could arise if there was ever a need to evacuate the community or if Mountaineer Road were blocked for any period of time. Inadequacy of the water supply and the lack of 24-hour coverage by the Fire Department are the other two main concerns. The Committee shared this concern regarding the lack of 24-hour coverage for both fire protection and emergency medical and supported changes to the fire district operations to address these matters. Other issues related to fire protection include adequate display of addresses on homes, the use of wood shake shingles and rough-cut lumber, cleared areas around homes, separation of woodpiles, implementation of the Uniform Fire Code for new construction, and public education regarding fire safety and prevention.

The Mountaineer Fire District is participating on the Ponderosa Fire Advisory Council (PFAC) which is developing rural fire protection standards to be implemented County-wide, with some tailoring to meet the special needs of the individual districts. The Mountaineer Fire District is also anticipating developing a Wildland-Urban Interface Plan with the Forest Service which would address specific concerns and policies for implementation within the District. The plan would include prevention, suppression and suppression strategies.

## ***Policies***

1. The County shall work with the Ponderosa Fire Advisory Council in adopting and implementing uniform fire protection standards for rural areas.
2. The use of shake shingle roofs and rough-cut lumber shall be discouraged.
3. Property owners shall be encouraged to improve private driveways and access roads to a width of 20 feet with an all weather surface.

4. Property owners shall be encouraged to maintain their property free of hazardous materials, debris, weeds, and other flammable materials, and to maintain adequate separation between structures and woodpiles.
5. All new major development shall have ample emergency access. A secondary access route shall be required for any major development for which Mountaineire Road provides the primary access.
6. The Mountaineire Fire District should be encouraged to implement a fire prevention education program.
7. The County shall require that all new major developments and commercial properties comply with the provisions of the Uniform Fire Code as adopted by the County.
8. New developments, including subdivisions, major commercial and multiple family, shall provide fire hydrants in accordance with County subdivision standards and/or to the specifications of the Fire Chief.

## **Zoning Enforcement/Animal Control**

Within the Mountaineire Study Area there are three types of zoning violations which are predominant. These are unscreened and/or excessive outdoor storage of building materials, household rubbish, vehicle parts or accessories and unlicensed/inoperable vehicles; commercial businesses within the residential zone without the requisite home occupation permit; and keeping animals other than pets in Mountaineire, e.g. poultry, goats, etc. Most of the study area is located in the G (General) Zone which allows horses, poultry, rabbits and other farm-type animals under certain limitations. However, such animals are not permitted in the Mountaineire subdivision which is located in the RS-6000 Zone. The exception is for 4-H projects.

Section 19.7-6 of the Zoning Ordinance allows for 4-H and similar educational agricultural and/or animal husbandry projects to be permitted in any zone. This has proven to be problematic in areas such as Mountaineire, where the lots are relatively small for the keeping of numerous farm-type animals. Generally in the County a minimum of one (1) acre is required before such animals can be kept. The intent and purpose of the 4-H exception is supported, but the vague language needs to be clarified with possible limits on the number of animals based on the size of the lot.

Zoning enforcement in the County is done primarily on a complaint-response basis. That is, once a complaint is filed the violation is verified by a field investigation. Once a violation is confirmed, notification and a deadline for compliance is given. If the violation is not resolved, enforcement action culminates in a hearing before a Hearing Officer who is authorized by State law to impose monetary fines.

Another problem in the study area involves dogs running loose. Although a leash law has been adopted by the County, unrestrained dogs running loose continue to cause problems. A lack of staff results in inadequate enforcement by County animal control officers.

### ***Policies***

1. The County should help facilitate greater public awareness that zoning regulations exist and will be enforced and violators fined.
2. The County should strictly enforce the leash law.
3. The County should encourage population control of domestic animals by reducing the license fees for spayed or neutered pets.
4. The 4-H exemption for the keeping of farm animals should be clarified and expanded to include limitations on numbers based on the size of the parcel.

# APPENDICES

## Appendix "A" – Commercial Uses Listing

The following is the list of conditional uses allowed in the CG-10,000 (Commercial General) Zone from Section 11.1 of the Coconino County Zoning Ordinance. In order to determine appropriate future commercial development, the Committee considered each use individually. The results are listed below, "yes" next to the listed use means it would be appropriate for the area, "no" means the Committee determined it to be an inappropriate use. This list does not include those uses which are permitted in the CG-10,000 Zone without a conditional use permit.

### General Commercial Uses

Auction houses/store - no  
Auto lubrication and oil change operation - no  
Automotive repair garag - yes  
Automotive service station - no  
Automobile sales and services, including rental agencies - no  
Bakeries, wholesale - no  
Boat and camper sales and services - no  
Bowling alleys and billiard halls - no  
Campgrounds - no  
Car washes - no  
Ceramic studio with outdoor kiln - yes  
Cocktail lounges and bars - no  
Contractor's yards - no  
Convenience market - no  
Drive-in theaters - no  
Farm implement and machine sales, rental and repairs - yes  
Feed stores - yes  
Hotels and motels - yes, subject to restrictions  
Laundry pick-up and delivery agencies and self-service laundries -  
yes, with water-conserving plumbing devices  
Mortuaries - no  
Motorcycle sales and service - no  
Nurseries and garden supply stores - no  
Public storage facilities (mini-storages) - yes, with conditions  
Recreational vehicle sales and service - no  
Recreational vehicle and travel trailer parks - no  
Skating rinks - no  
Stone and monument yards - no  
Theatres - no  
Tire sales and service - no  
Truck and trailer rental, sales and service - no  
Veterinarian office and small animal hospitals - yes  
Vehicular storage yards - no



## Public and Semi-Public Uses

Day care centers and preschools - yes  
Churches - yes  
Clubs and lodges including YMCA, YWCA and similar youth group uses -  
yes  
Convalescent homes and hospital - no  
Educational institutions, public or private - yes  
Libraries and museums, public or private - yes  
Parks and recreational facilities, public or private, including  
tennis, racquetball and handball clubs and facilities - yes, with  
conditions  
Public utility installations - yes

## **Appendix "B" – Design Review Overlay Guidelines**

### **For the Mountaineer Study Area**

#### **I. Building and Site Design**

1. Building design shall consider the surrounding natural environment and be consistent with the rural character of the area.
2. External building materials should be compatible with the natural landscape. Examples are native stone, logs and wood. Use of highly reflective metals, plastic and fiberglass is not permitted except where demonstrated that such materials are desirable for the type of use proposed (e.g. greenhouses).
3. Earthtone colors that blend with the surrounding natural environment shall be utilized. Roofs must meet the color requirements as well.
4. Buildings and structures (not including signs) shall be limited to a maximum height of two (2) stories or 30 feet above grade.
5. Developments shall be designed to include smaller, clustered buildings rather than single massive structures which would detract from the rural character of the area and obliterate the natural viewshed.
6. The siting of structures shall take into consideration the natural physical features of the property. Existing vegetation shall be retained to the extent possible and natural grades should not be significantly modified.
7. Sufficient setbacks providing access to light, air, landscaping and views shall be incorporated into site plan design. Minimum setback requirements of the Coconino County Zoning Ordinance shall be maintained.
8. Vehicle and pedestrian ways shall be clearly delineated to prevent congestion and conflicts. Service vehicle areas shall be located such that they are screened from view of public ways and private property.
9. Utilities such as meter boxes, mechanical installations and trash containers shall be screened with landscaping and materials complementary to the building design. On-site electrical wiring shall be underground.

10. Landscaping shall be provided in all required front and street side setback areas and should emphasize the use of drought-tolerant and native plants.

11. All outdoor lighting shall comply with the requirements set forth in Section 17 of the Zoning Ordinance for Zone II. In addition to these requirements, all fixtures shall be fully shielded. Light standards shall not exceed a maximum height of 15 feet.

12. Site coverage shall not exceed 35% of gross acreage in impervious surface areas. Impervious surface is defined as all buildings, and paved areas including parking lots, driveways, roads, sidewalks, and any other impervious surfaces that do not allow water absorption.

## II. Signs

1. All provisions of Section 16, Signs, shall be applicable except as may be modified herein.

2. Signs shall not be attached to or painted on natural objects such as trees or rocks

3. Portable sandwich-typed signs shall not be permitted except for real estate "open house" signs identifying property which is for sale or lease.

4. Signs with highly reflective surfaces or bright metal shall not be permitted.

5. Sign colors shall be muted and shall be consistent with the architectural style of the building or portion thereof to which it relates.

6. All lighted signs shall be lighted by means of internal illumination; however, externally lighted signs may be permitted for signs constructed of natural materials providing such lighting is directed downward and is shielded so that direct rays do not project above the horizontal or reflect onto adjacent properties or rights-of-way.

7. For each use, one single-faced wall or canopy sign, not exceeding one square foot for each lineal foot of building frontage or portion thereof, may be placed on each side of the building fronting on a street, parking lot or mall up to a maximum of 50 square feet per sign; provided, however, there shall be no more than two such signs per use. A minimum sign area of 20 square feet is permitted for any business.

8. For each property, one freestanding sign 20 feet in area for each street frontage; provided, however, that there be no more than one sign per lot or parcel of land except for corner lots where a maximum of two such signs will be permitted. Where more than one business is being conducted on a single lot or parcel of land, the permitted sign area for each business shall be combined up to a maximum combined area of 60 square feet.

9. The maximum height of a freestanding sign shall be eight feet above grade

10. The base of a freestanding sign shall be located in a planter box or landscaped area.

# Appendix "C" – Resident Survey Results

## Mountainaire Questionnaire 2/90

1. How many years have you lived in Mountainaire? Avg. 6.7
2. On what street is your property?
3. What are some of the problems and issues you see in the Mountainaire area? Please rank with #1 as most important, #2 second, etc.

Ranking: (Lowest Numeric Value is of Most Concern)

- 4.5 Sewage
- 3.0 Land Use or Zoning
- 4.3 Water
- 3.8 Junk Cars
- 1.8 Roads & Dust Pollution
- 4.5 Building & Fire Code Enforcement
- 3.2 Loose Dogs
- 5.1 Emergency Services

4. Do you feel the following public services are adequate and meet your needs?

- a. Water Yes 76.0% No 24.0%
- b. Fire Protection Yes 90.3% No 9.7%
- c. Emergency Medical Yes 84.8% No 15.2%
- d. Police Protection Yes 81.1% No 18.9%
- e. Should there be a Sewage System Yes 35.1% No 64.9%

5. Do you feel there is a need for additional commercial land in the Mountainaire area?

Yes 22.7% No 77.3%

6. Do you think there is a need for multiple family residential developments (apts or townhouses)?

Yes 4.1% No 95.9%

7. Do you think the county should be more active in enforcing zoning and fire code regulations?

Yes 64.8% No 35.2%

8. Do you feel that more of the roads in Mountainaire should be paved?

Yes 57.3% No 42.7%

If 'yes', would you be willing to pay a special district assessment?

Yes 74.0% No 26.0%

9. Do you feel that more of the roads in Mountainaire should be oiled (with EPA approved dust control materials)?

Yes 80.6% No 19.4%

If 'yes', would you be willing to pay a special district assessment?

Yes 82.3% No 17.7%

10. Concerning fire protection, currently we have a fire chief who works 20 hours per week and the remaining coverage is volunteer fire fighters. The volunteer coverage is mainly at night. Would you be willing to pay an additional \$20.00 per year for full time day coverage?

Yes 80.6% No 19.4%

11. What do you feel is the most important environmental concern in Mountainaire? Rank with #1 being the most important, #2 ,second, etc.

Ranking (Lowest Numeric Value is of Most Concern)

1.8	Dust
3.8	Wildlife
3.4	Water Utility
2.8	Air Quality
2.7	Forest
4.2	Native Vegetation
2.2	Other

12. Do you feel there is a domestic animal control problem?

Yes 75.7% No 24.3%

13. Do you feel there is a need for a park in the Mountainaire community?

Yes 61.6% No 38.4%

14. Are there any special characteristics of the Mountainaire community which should be preserved?

15. Do you want street lights in Mountainaire?

Yes 17.4% No 82.6%

16. Do you have any concerns about future single family housing development?

Yes 60.0% No 40.0%