Attachment C

2004 General Plan "5-Year Review" Issue Areas for Potential Amendments - Draft May 10, 2010					
Issue Area	**Policy(ies)**	**Alternatives**	**Ramifications**		**Recommendation**
			Pros	**Cons**	
Mandatory 30% open space/planned development requirements	Obj. 2.2.3, 2.2.5.4	No change	Ensures sufficient open space within project boundaries. Restricts urban densities.	Policies make infill and small-scale projects in urban areas difficult or infeasible	
		Eliminate for MFR/HDR	Provides greater density options, reduces costs, ability to meet housing requirements	Higher densities have greater need for accessible open space	
		Modify to provide for off-site open space, or other alternative "public benefit"	Enhances quality of life in subdivisions	Increases costs of development	
Community Region boundary amendments - Do existing boundaries represent desire of County for growth?	Obj. 2.1.1	No change	Provides for continued development as envisioned when plan adopted; growth accommodating; market driven land use pattern	Desire by some residents to revisit growth patterns of their community	
		Add or reduce land from Community Regions	Update land use to reflect current desires, growth trends	Opens up land use debates; potentially costly and time-consuming	
Land Use Designations	Obj. 2.2.1				
Community identity	Obj. 2.4.1, 2.5.1, 7.5.2				
Mixed Use Development Phase 2 - How will the County address unique characteristics of individual communities? How will that inform adopting "by-right" mixed use standards?	2.1.1.3				
Grading on 30% slopes - Is the threshold too low?	2.3.2.1, 7.1.2.1				
Agricultural district boundaries					

Issue Area	Policy(ies)	Alternatives	Ramifications		Recommendation
			Pros	Cons	
Density bonus - Does the program provide the benefits desired?					
Commercial land use designations - Is there sufficient land in the right locations to support commercial and employment needs in the County?					
Transfer of Development Rights - Does it work in EDC?	2.2.3.4				
Public sewer in Community Regions and Rural Centers - conflicting standards for Rural Centers, Community Regions and Rural Areas	5.3.1.3, 5.3.1.7, 5.3.2.3				
SUP required for all wireless facilities - Is this necessary to protect public welfare?	5.6.1.4				
Energy conserving landscape plans - How is this applied?	5.6.2.1				
Noise policies - Are our noise standards appropriate?	Tables 6.1 and 6.2				
Mineral Resources Buffer - 20-acre buffer adjacent to MR	7.2.2.1				
Wetland setbacks	7.3.3.4				
Cultural resources - Should the Cultural Preservation Commission be re-established? Cultural Resources ordiance	7.5.1.1, 7.5.1.5				
Public Facilities and Services Financing Plan - When should this be required	10.2.1.5				
Oak tree ordinance	7.4.5.2				

Issue Area	Policy(ies)	Alternatives	Ramifications		Recommendation
			Pros	Cons	
Rare and Endangered Plants (Gabbro)	7.4.4.1, 7.4.1.3, 7.4.1.4				
Grazing land	Obj. 8.1.2				
Ag Threshold of Significance (LESA System)	8.1.3.4				
Ag Buffers	8.1.3.1, 8.1.3.2				
LOS Standards	TC-X				
General Plan Consistency Review	2.2.5.20				
Use Permit Process - Admin or Minor use permits					

General Plan Issue Matrix
BOS Agenda 05/10/10