

## **Land Use and Community Planning Element CPC Summary Sheet**

The Land Use and Community Planning Element of the General Plan contains policy direction for the implementing the City of Villages strategy, provides citywide land use policies, and establishes community plans as integral components of the General Plan. It includes a General Plan Land Use and Streets Map, which is a compilation of adopted community plan land use and circulation system maps.

The October 2006 Draft General Plan includes the following related to land use and community planning:

- Policies that support creating/strengthening mixed use village centers with public spaces
- Sets the stage for more focused community plans that will work in concert with the General Plan
- Categorizes 160 community plan designations currently in use into 26 recommended community plan designations for application in future community plan updates
- Relies upon community plan updates/amendments to designate village sites

CPC had significant issues with the Strategic Framework/Land Use Element that was a part of the July 2005 Draft General Plan. Key criticisms were that the Element needed to better delineate the role of the General Plan and community plans, and that village designations should occur only in community plans. Staff met with the full CPC on September 27, 2005 to propose a reorganization of the Strategic Framework/Land Use Element and to remove the City of Villages Map from the General Plan. CPC was supportive of these changes.

The CPC General Plan subcommittee first met on October 3, 2005. At this meeting the subcommittee provided general comments on the proposed organization and major purpose of the Land Use Element. Staff then prepared a working draft of a revised Land Use and Community Planning Element which was reviewed by the CPC General Plan Subcommittee on February 17, 2006. Major changes as compared to the July 2005 Draft included:

- Removal of the City of Villages Map
- Inclusion of a new Village Propensity Map based on existing conditions
- Expansion of the Community Planning section to better define the roles of the General Plan and community plans.
- Consolidation of public facilities policies into the Public Facilities, Services and Safety (Public Facilities) Element
- reorganization of discussion and policies originally contained within the Strategic Framework Element

On February 28<sup>th</sup>, 2006, the full board of the CPC reviewed and recommended edits to the February 2006 working draft of the Land Use and Community Planning Element. These recommendations are reflected in the attached table. The table also indicates staff's responses to the recommended edits, and tracks where policies noted are found in the October 2006 Draft General Plan.

## Land Use Element - CPC Summary Sheet Attachment

Land Use and Community Planning (LU) Element - CPC Meeting of February 28, 2006 (LU Element only: CPC comments refer to a February working draft)	Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations  References refer to October 2006 Draft General Plan Land Use and Community Planning Element
On p. 1, Plan Issues, shorten the sentence, to: "Land use designations are not standardized throughout the City." The motion was approved 15-8-0.	The Plan Issues section of the Land Use and Community Plan Element has been removed. Plan issues will be summarized at the community plan level once updates are underway.
<b>Subsection A.</b> Replace the word "should" with " <i>should or should not</i> " (approved 17-5-2)	The pertinent sentence read previously as "It is a strategy designed to allow each community to consciously determine where and how new growth should occur, and requires that new public facilities be in place as growth occurs." This sentence has been removed in the October 2006 Draft General Plan. Actual village locations will be designated in the community plans with input from recognized community planning groups and the general public (p. LU-9).
<b>Subsection A,</b> LU-A. 2 (p. 8). Add the sentence " <i>not every community will host a village</i> " (approved 18-6-0).	It should be noted that specific village locations will be determined at the community plan level with input from the recognized community planning group and the public-at-large. Therefore, the issue of "not every community will host a village" will be better and more specifically addressed at the community plan level. Policy LU-A.2. (p. LU-9).
<b>Subsection I,</b> LU-I.4 (p. 37), Add the clause: " <i>greater resources should be provided to communities where greater need exists,</i> " to the text of the policy goal (approved 12-8-0).	Edit was made. Policy LU-I.4. (p. LU-37).
<b>Subsection C,</b> p. 17, Regarding the implementation of community based goals, first paragraph, add: " <i>but only when infrastructure deficits are eliminated and infrastructure occurs concurrent with further development</i> " to the end of the sentence on overall density and housing capacity (approved 19-2-0).	The Community Planning section of the LU element already addresses the issue of infrastructure and the need to ensure that new development proposals do not compound existing public facility deficiencies. The section also calls for new development to provide public facilities commensurate with their level of impact. Policy LU-C.7. (LU-24). See also Public Facilities Element Policies PF-C.1 and C.4.
<b>Subsection A,</b> on p. 6, "Village Categories" (Neighborhood Village Centers): The word "should" in the first sentence was changed to " <i>could.</i> " The sentence formerly read: "Neighborhood Village Centers should be located in almost every community plan area" (approved 24-0-0)	This edit was not made. Note that the sentence now reads, "Community and Neighborhood Village Centers should be located in almost every community plan area." (p. LU-7).

<p><b>Subsection B</b>, Policy LU-B.8, (p. 15), the word “incompatible” was added, so the policy goal reads: “Protect key employment areas from encroachment from <i>incompatible</i> non-industrial uses while providing areas for secondary employment and supporting uses.” (approved 24-0-0)</p>	<p>The proposed policy is no longer included in the Land Use and Community Planning Element. However, the discussion of the encroachment of non-industrial uses is discussed in the Economic Prosperity Element.</p>
<p><b>Subsection C</b>, on p. 16, “Community Planning” (Goals): Two words were added, so that the fourth bullet point reads: “Community plans that maintain or increase planned density of residential, <i>and employment</i>, land uses in appropriate locations.” (approved 24-0-0)</p>	<p>This is a focused goal (p. LU-20) that addresses residential density to ensure that community plans maintain consistency with the Housing Element and state law. Therefore, the edit was not incorporated.</p>
<p><b>Subsection C</b>, on p. 21, “Community Plan Land Use Designation” Table, under “Scientific Research” and “Light Industrial,” the office use allowed was expanded so that it was not limited to corporate headquarters, and would apply to all accessory office use. (approved 24-0-0)</p>	<p>Current draft allows limited office uses under “Scientific Research” and “Light Industrial,” such as corporate headquarters, accessory office uses to the primary use or as direct support for scientific research uses. A “Business Park” designation is also proposed that would allow office uses other than just corporate headquarters or accessory uses to the primary use. Therefore, staff has not made the change. (p. LU-18-19)</p>
<p><b>Subsection C</b>, p. 23, “Community Planning (Evaluating New Growth): In the second paragraph, second sentence, it states: “Historically, communities have not fully welcomed the idea of new growth when public facilities deficiencies exist.” An additional sentence was added: “<i>New development should not be allowed where existing public facilities are not sufficient to support it.</i>” (approved 24-0-0)</p>	<p>The LU element emphasizes that new development needs to be evaluated to determine both its benefit to, and impact upon the community to ensure that it contributes to public facilities commensurate with the level of impact (p. LU-22). See also Public Facilities Element Section C – Evaluation of Growth, Facilities and Services.</p>
<p><b>Subsection C</b>, on p. 24, “Community Planning” (Community Facilities Prioritization): The words “or <i>applicable community plan</i>” were added to the sentence in the middle of the paragraph which states: “Individual new development proposals will be evaluated to determine if the proposals will or will not adversely affect the General Plan, <i>or applicable community plans</i>, and to ensure that they do not compound existing public facility deficiencies.” (approved 24-0-0)</p>	<p>The sentence has been removed and but the language has been incorporated in Policy LU-C.7. (p. LU-24).</p>

<p><b>Subsection C</b>, Policy LU-C.6 (p. 25) - the words “and applicable community plan” were added, so that it reads: “Evaluate individual new development proposals to determine if the proposals will or will not adversely affect the General Plan, <i>and applicable community plan</i>, and to ensure that they do not compound existing public facility deficiencies.” (approved 24-0-0)</p>	<p>Staff has revised the policy in accordance with the motion. Policy LU-C.7. (p. LU-24).</p>
<p><b>Subsection D</b> “Plan Amendment Process” Policy LU-D.7 (p. 27) – recommend deletion of the following: “Initiate a technical amendment without the need for a public Planning Commission hearing when the Planning Department determines, through a single discipline Preliminary Review, that the proposed amendment is necessary to ensure the public health, safety and welfare.” (approved 24-0-0)</p>	<p>This is only pertaining to the foregoing an initiation hearing with the Planning Commission, the actual amendment would still go through public hearing process which would allow the opportunity for public input as well as input from the recognized community planning group. Therefore, this policy has not been deleted. Policy LU-D.6. (p. LU-26).</p>
<p><b>Subsection G</b>, Policy LU-G.1 (p. 34) - to the end of the policy add: “Work with the ALUC to develop policies that are consistent with the state and federal guidelines and that balance airport land use compatibility goals with other citywide and regional goals, taking into account that public safety should be the most important consideration.” (approved 24-0-0)</p>	<p>All four compatibility factors are equally important (safety, air space protection, noise, and overflights). Instead of “taking into account that public safety should be the most important consideration.” insert “and that emphasize the major airport land use compatibility factors.” Policy LU-G.1. (p. LU-32).</p>
<p><b>Subsection I</b>, Policy LU-I.4 (p. 37) - add the clause: “<i>greater resources should be provided to communities where greater need exists,</i>” to the text of the policy. (approved 24-0-0)</p>	<p>Edit was made. Policy LU-I.4. (p. LU-37).</p>
<p><b>Subsection I</b>, Policy LU-I.5 (p. 37) – replace the word “Guarantee” at the beginning of the sentence with the phrase “<i>Strive to achieve.</i>” The policy goal formerly read: “Guarantee meaningful participation for all community residents in the siting and design of public facilities.” (approved 24-0-0)</p>	<p>Edit was made. Policy LU-I.5. (p. LU-37).</p>