Zoning Options/EDAC Concerns/Planning Commission Recommendation

Attachment D

| | Project Component Issues | Zoning Ordinance Sections | Description of Policy Issue | Draft Ordinance | EDAC Recommendation | Options/Comments | Planning Commission Recommendation |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| 1 | Multiple commercial zones | Chapter 17.22 | GP Provides for use of multiple commercial zones. | Commercial Zones similar to existing ordinance with deletion of CP zone and addition of Neighborhood Service zone | EDAC believes the limited number of commercial zones proposed in the ZO should be increased in compliance with this policy. | This is a fundamental change that will need to be decided upon by the PC/BOS or analyzed as an option in the EIR. | Utilize multiple zones to differentiate between commercial uses and development standards |
| 2 | Commercial, Industrial and Ag Support Uses or Zones | Chapters 17.21, 17.22 & 17.23 | Promote agriculture, resource and tourism industry in Rural Regions | Some additional uses permitted in the Agriculture and Resource zones by right, Administrative Permit, or CUP | EDAC supports inclusion of policy language in ZO that expands commercial and industrial uses in Rural Regions. In concert with GPA to allow Commercial and Industrial land uses within Rural Regions, draft ZO should be revised to allow Commercial, Industrial and Ag Support Uses within zone designations applicable to Rural Regions. | Expand potential uses permitted in the resource districts to provide greater opportunity for rural commerce without significant departure from fundamental concepts of General Plan and/or expand or create new Rural Centers. | Expand uses in Ag and Rural Land zones. Don't create a new commercial zone |
| 3 | Planned Development provisions | Chapter 17.28 | 30% open space requirement for PDs restricts development potential for urban infill and affordable housing. | Alternatives to on-site retention of 30% provided (modified common open space criteria, in-lieu fees, off-site acquisition or improvements, etc.) but maintains 30% requirement in general. | ZO should be revised to conform to GPAs for PDs recommended by EDAC. (Eliminate 30% open space requirement in favor of lesser amount of improved open space; eliminate requirement for PD where more than 50 lots or more than 2 DU/ac.) | Reduction or elimination of 30% requirement for specific types of development such as infill or affordable housing projects | Include in the analysis the potential for smaller area of active recreation rather than passive open space. |
| 4 | Table 2-4 Amendment | General Plan | Once ZO revisions are finalized, revisions to Table 2-4 will be required. | Table 2-4 conforms to draft ordinance | Table 2-4 to be revised reflecting proposed new zones | Staff concurs if changes made to list of zones, Table to be changed. | Amend the table consistent with the final list of zones |

| 5 | Home occupations | 17.40.170 | Greater flexibility needed to create opportunities for home-based businesses, reduce commuting. | Home occupation provisions expanded to provide greater flexibility. CUP required for employees | EDAC recommends the ZO allow provide for expanded home occupations, including employees in home occupations to the extent feasible in compliance with CEQA. This action will improve the jobs/housing balance, already addressed in GP Policy 10.1.7.4 | CEQA is not an issue. Need to consider use compatibility. Policy decision by County and extent of uses to be analyzed in EIR. | Create a range of home occupation uses based on size of parcel, location, etc. Develop varying standards that address use of accessory structures, employees, customers, and other concerns |
|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|
| 6 | Residences in TPZ | 17.40.350, Table 17.21.020 | Desire by large TPZ land owner to allow residences on TPZ by right. | Residence restriction retained from existing code based on Ag Commission recommendation | ZO should incorporate GP standards. Current ordinance and ZO update, as drafted, contains requirements more stringent than GP. EDAC recommends a consistency review process to develop on TPZ lands | GP does not address residences in TPZ, but does provide findings for discretionary development under Policy 8.4.2.1. Policy decision by County, but must be consistent with state law that only allows a residence if "necessary for the management of land zoned" TPZ (GC 51102(h). One option is to establish standards for housing to support timber operations. | Analyze the effect of additional recreational uses and residences by right in the EIR |
| 7 | Mixed Use Development (MUD 2) | 17.40.180 | Ability to create mixed use development constrained because of PD requirement under MUD 1. | Mixed use provisions deferred until later for thorough review and analysis of potential options. Standards for "by right" MUD development complex and time-consuming to prepare. | ZO should be revised to designate multiple Commercial/Industrial uses. Include "master" or "safe harbor" plans for residential component of C/MUD2. | Unclear how "safe harbor" plans will reduce need for discretionary review of residential mixed use projects. It is possible to develop standards for rental units in commercial but any subdivision will require discretionary approval. Previous direction was that MUD 2 would follow adoption of the comprehensive Zoning Ordinance update, due to the need for significant community involvement | Develop some limited standards that begins the process of MUD 2 |

| 8 | Animal Keeping | 17.40.080 | Provisions for keeping of animals on residential lots | Staff recommends deferral of Animal Keeping to separate ordinance. | EDAC agrees, provided that language as proposed (regarding slaughtering) is not included in ZO. | Slaughtering has been prohibited in R1 for many years through Director interpretation of existing code. No changes to existing procedures are recommended at this time. | Defer animal keeping provisions to a subsequent ordinance |
|----|--|-----------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 9 | Wetland/Rip arian Setbacks | 17.30.030. H | Implementation of GP policy regarding wetland and riparian setbacks | Criteria in draft ZO measure setbacks from "edge of riparian vegetation" rather than "top of bank" or "ordinary high water mark" as used in the Interim Guidelines adopted in 2006. | EDAC recommends revisions to ZO to conform to Interim Guidelines and Army Corps of Engineers wetland delineation standards. | Revisions to draft in process to incorporate Interim Guideline provisions for consistency. | Staff to continue working with EDAC to include provisions in revised draft |
| 10 | Zoning Map Update | Map | Conforming zoning map to GP land use designations | Map changes minimized while correcting inconsistencies, addressing deleted zones, and adding new zones per the rule set reviewed by PC & BOS | Significant issues remain, including appropriate designation of rolled-out AE (former Williamson Act Contract) lands and designation of multiple commercial zone districts. Also an issue with regard to eliminating conflicts between planned higher density housing and Ag zoned lands. | It is unclear what the issues are other than those that may be created if the PC/BOS decide to expand commercial/industrial zones. Staff to review draft maps to ensure all rolled-out AE in Community Regions are zoned appropriately. | Staff to continue to revise map to address existing agricultural operations on RA land, rolled out AE, and revise commercial zones |
| 11 | Ranch Marketing on Grazing Lands | 17.40.260 | Update ranch marketing provisions to address livestock and non-consumable products | Provisions updated based on committee recommendations. Livestock and other products deferred. | Incorporate standards into Ranch Marketing provisions to allow Ranch Marketing for livestock operations, including visitor-serving uses and direct sales. | Include suggested changes for livestock. Defer other issues. | Include suggested changes in the public review draft |
| 12 | Ag Zoning "Opt In" within Ag Districts and Rural Regions | Map | Potential for active agricultural uses to lose protections with elimination of RA zones | RA zones changed to FR or RL based on elevation and location. | Recommend an "Opt In" process for lands within Ag Districts and RA Lands in Rural Regions to continue agricultural protection of underlying land uses. | Identify (by Ag Dept) active ag lands not recommended for Ag zoning; consider RE- 10 zoned land in the agricultural districts; modify map accordingly. | Develop a process to ensure existing agricultural operators have the ability to request ag zoning |

| 13 | Agriculture | 17.40.050 | Provisions for | Provisions included. | Permitted under 10.1.6.1 and | No further action required | Include proposed |
|----|-------------|-----------|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| | Homestays | | Ag homestays | | 8.2.4.3 "lodging facilities". | with zoning ordinance | provisions in draft |
| | | | | | Can be addressed through | update. | ordinance |
| | | | | | Zoning Ordinance, but | | |
| | | | | | clarification through GPA | | |
| | | | | | might be helpful. [Jobs, | | |
| | | | | | Retail, Protection of RR] | | |