

FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 8, 2011

10. WORKSHOP

General Plan Workshop; Review and receive public comment on the project description for the Targeted General Plan Amendment and comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Update components, as directed by the Board of Supervisors on July 25, 2011 (See Board Agenda Items 1 & 2, Legistar File #11-0356.) Planning Commission to provide a recommendation to the Board on potential policy and land use map amendments and Zoning Ordinance components that address issues raised in the General Plan Five-Year Review; relating to housing for moderate-income families, creation of jobs, retention of sales tax revenue, and maintaining the agriculture and natural resource-based industries. [*Contact: Peter Maurer*]

Peter Maurer stated that staff was requesting the Commission provide a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors on a project description for the Targeted General Plan Amendments and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Chair Heflin announced that the workshop would be broken up into two subject sections and they would start with the Targeted General Plan Amendments.

Shawna Purvines conducted a PowerPoint presentation and staff answered various questions from the Commission that included the definition of “complete streets”; inclusion of Tahoe transportation; Ag District expansion; Community Regions and Rural Center boundaries; and Mixed Use Development.

Jim Brunello/EDAC distributed handouts to the Commission and provided an overview which included a PowerPoint presentation on Targeted General Plan Amendments. The following individuals discussed their specific topics and answered questions posed by the Commission:

- Valerie Zentner: Ag Issues;
- Linnea Marenco: Rural Lands;
- Cindy Shaffer: Low Density Residential Lands;
- Noah Briel: Commercial and Mixed Use Development; and
- Gail Gebhardt: Industrial.

[Clerk's Note: Meeting recessed for lunch and Commissioner Tolhurst did not return.]

Lindell Price spoke on the circulation element. She voiced concern on sidewalks being on one side as it may increase pedestrian street-crossing, which statistics show has more accidents than when the pedestrian is walking on the side of a street.

Sue Taylor made the following comments:

- Would like to see more “liveable” roads (i.e. Tahoe area) instead of the large roads (i.e. Missouri Flat Road);
- Ag lands shouldn't be viewed as a placeholder for future development;
- Questioned why AE was being eliminated;

- Concerned that trees being logged from the County were being milled out of the area;
- Requested that Commercial and Industrial located in Ag lands be less general and more clarified;
- High density projects need to have open space;
- Generating jobs through this process should be a high priority;
- Inquired on the order of development when commercial and residential are together;
- Retail leakage should be analyzed;
- Requested that public have access to the maps; and
- Suggested that Camino/Pollock Pines be removed from this and processed separately.

Mr. Maurer responded that if Camino/Pollock Pines was not included with this project, then it would happen at a later time since the Board of Supervisors has already identified other items with a higher priority.

Art Marinaccio made the following comments:

- AE: Preserve and Contract are two separate legal entities and the County has historically dealt with them as AE being the preserve. If AE is eliminated, the preserves may be eliminated but the contracts would still be in place. Staff needs to analyze this further before action is taken.
- Mixed Use Development: General Plan discussed it as it applied to a parcel but this is expanding it to an “area” and gives flexibility on what is on each parcel but still having a plan. These areas need to be looked at comprehensively.
- Industrial/Commercial: Within Industrial there are very few sites that are truly Industrial that need to be protected from encroaching uses. Most Commercial are currently being used as Commercial. If the maps are not going to be fixed, then the General Plan wording needs to be fixed. Referenced General Plan Policy 2.2.5.3 which defines 19 items that need to be studied at a very minimum in order to rezone a property. For Commercial, the number one need is to clearly identify and protect those parcels available for large retail.
- When researching more of the far-flung economic opportunities for changing communities to something significant, a small package sewer plant needs to be part of the process of expanding what they are and should be considered in the General Plan so it is precluded.
- Need to determine how to have the Board of Supervisors decide what the direction is going to be and then get the rules in place to allow it to happen.
- Any process that doesn’t include the property owners as the main participants is a waste of time and money.

Kathye Russell made the following comments:

- Rural/Commercial Split: A split between when the commercial and residential are done can change depending on if serving a regional need or a tighter project need. Most developers don’t have the funds to do the “good” commercial until the homes are built. Concept of the Commercial effort, in regards to the large anchor stores, is to preserve those spaces in order to address the significant retail jobs loss the County has experienced.

- Traffic: Smart growth planning is putting high density predominately in community regions, which is what the County has done. However, rural commerce is a large amount of land that is job-producing or residential in nature on large parcels and keeping traffic in that specific area would reduce traffic.
- Rural Lands: General Plan was very good in defining rural lands but did not define it as rural regions. Referred to previous designations using “AL” vs “al” and suggested that in the future, Rural Lands be identified as “RL” and have zones address the uses.

Chair Heflin announced that due to the lateness of the day, they would not be able to begin discussion on the Zoning Ordinance Update. It was determined to finish discussing the Targeted General Plan Amendments and then continue the rest of the workshop to the September 22, 2011 meeting.

The Commission addressed each issue identified in Attachment 1 of the Staff Memo and provided direction to staff. Staff will return to the Commission with identified changes to the following Issues: #1, #6, #8 (deferred), #11, #16, and #22.