



IMPORTANT NOTICE REGARDING **Planning Commission Meetings**

This meeting is being conducted utilizing teleconferencing and electronic means consistent with State of California Executive Order N-29-20 dated March 17, 2020, regarding the COVID-19 pandemic. In accordance with Executive Order N-29-20, the public may only view the meeting online and not in the Commission Chamber.

Submission of Public Comments: Members of the public may give their comments verbally during the meeting or by submitting comments by email or hard copy prior to the meeting. Email and hard copy comments must be submitted to the City Planner a jlucchesi@mtshastaca.gov. All email comments must be submitted by 4 P.M. Pacific Time on the day of the meeting. All email comments shall be subject to the same rules as would otherwise govern speaker comments at the Commission meeting. Hard copies should be dropped off or mailed to City Hall, 305 N Mt. Shasta Blvd. Mt. Shasta, CA 96067 Attn: Juliana Lucchesi or Planning Department.

Reading of Public Comments: The City Planner shall read all email or hard copy comments which directly request to be read, provided that the reading shall not exceed three (3) minutes, or such other time as the Commission may provide, consistent with the time limit for speakers at a Commission meeting. The email and hard copy comments submitted shall become part of the record of the Commission meeting.

Mt. Shasta Continued Planning Commission Meeting Agenda

T u e s d a y , April 27, 2021; 6:00 p.m.

Please note that this meeting is being agendized to allow Commissioners, Staff, and the public to participate in this meeting via ZOOM, pursuant to the Governor’s Executive Order N-29-20. Members of the public may remotely listen to and participate in the meeting via the information below:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84647119432>

Or Telephone:

+1 253 215 8782 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 408 638 0968

Webinar ID: 846 4711 9432

Page	STANDING AGENDA ITEMS
	1. Call to Order and Flag Salute
	2. Roll call
	<p>3. Public Comment: This time is set aside for residents to address the Planning Commission on matters listed on items not included on the Regular Agenda. If your comments concern an agenda item noted on the regular agenda, please address the Commission when that item is open for public comment. Each speaker is allocated three (3) minutes to speak. Speakers may not cede their time. Comments should be limited to matters within the jurisdiction of the City. Commission discussion or action cannot be taken on items not listed on the agenda other than to receive comments.</p>
Pg 3	<p>4. Meeting Minutes a. Approval of Regular Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for March 16, 2021</p>
Presenta tion During Meeting	<p>5. General Plan 2045: Education Session on Plan process and public input Background: The City of Mt. Shasta began the process of a comprehensive update of the General Plan in 2018. The General Plan is a state mandated long-term planning document which addresses growth and development. This item will be a brief review of what is included in the General Plan, process for update, where we are in the process, and how to contribute meaningful public input.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Information Only</p>
Pg 7	<p>6. General Plan 2045 Schedule and Special Meeting discussion Background: The General Plan update includes a number of elements which have not been reviewed or opened to the public. This item will discuss the remaining items and potential scheduling of a joint City Council/Planning Commission workshop and special meetings to complete the General Plan 2045</p> <p>Action: Discussion and input on schedule</p>

Pg 8	<p>7. General Plan 2045: Land Use Element Second Draft</p> <p>Background: The Planning Commission reviewed the first draft of the Land Use Element and Land Use Designation Map at the March 16, 2021 meeting. The Land Use Element has been edited regarding comments and includes the a second draft of the land use map and zoning code changes.</p> <p>Action: Discussion and input</p>
	<p>8. Commission and Staff Comment</p>
	<p>9. Future Agenda Items – Future items are topics brought to the Planning Commission from a public petition, city staff, Planning Commission member(s), and City Council for review and action. All dates refer to first introductions to the Planning Commission and can be altered due to time and priority level.</p>
	<p>10. Adjourn Next regular meeting scheduled for Tuesday, May 18, 2021 at 6 P.M.</p> <p>Availability of Public Records: All public records related to an open session item on this agenda, which are not exempt from disclosure pursuant to the California Public Records Act, that are distributed to a majority of the legislative body will be available for public inspection at City Hall located at 305 North Mt. Shasta Blvd., Mt. Shasta, CA at the same time the public records are distributed or made available to the members of the legislative body. Agenda related writings or documents provided to a majority of the legislative body after distribution of the Agenda packet will be available for public review within a separate binder at City Hall at the same time as they are made available to the members of the legislative body.</p> <p>The City of Mt. Shasta does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, age or disability in employment or provision of services. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons requiring accommodations for a disability at a public meeting should notify the Deputy City Clerk at least 48 hours prior to the meeting at (530) 926-7510 in order to allow the City sufficient time to make reasonable arrangements to accommodate participation in this meeting.</p>

Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Planning Commission after distribution of the meeting Agenda Packet regarding any open session item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection during normal business hours within the binder entitled “Agenda Packet for Front Counter” located at City Hall at the desk on the right-hand side inside the front door.

Projects heard at this Planning Commission meeting may be subject to appeal. Please contact the Planning Department for information. Appeals must be submitted to the City Clerk’s office together with the appeal fee. If you challenge the environmental review of the project proposal in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues raised at the public hearing or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Department on, or prior to, closing of the public comment period.

Mt. Shasta Regular Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes

Zoom Meeting

Mt. Shasta Tuesday, March 16, 2021; 6:00 p.m.

Item	STANDING AGENDA ITEMS
1.	Call to Order and Flag Salute – Chair Findling called to order at 6:00PM
2.	Roll call Present: Chair Findling and Commissioners Saryon, McDowell, Kirby, Beck, Higuera, and Pardee Absent: None
3.	Public Comment: None
4.	Meeting Minutes: Meeting Minutes for Regular Meeting February 16, 2021 Chair Findling: Request to amend minutes to add “pedestrian pathway through property from the south to Starbucks Architectural agenda item” Minutes friendly amended. No dissent to amendment from Commission COMMISSION ACTION: Motion to approve meeting minutes as amended MOTION: Commissioner Higuera SECOND: Commissioner Saryon AYES: Chair Findling and Commissioners Beck, Saryon, Higuera, and Pardee NOES: ABSENT: ABSTAIN: Commissioner Kirby and McDowell
5.	Consent Agenda: A Consent Agenda is a space for Commission actions that are routine or there is Commission consensus on approval without individual motions and discussion. The Public may give public input on the Consent Agenda in the “General Public Comment” section. a. Short-Term Rental Ordinance (Creation of Chapter 5.50 “Short-Term Rental Licensing”) Discussion on item and moratorium at City Council level COMMISSION ACTION: Motion to remove from consent agenda an table to future meeting MOTION: Commissioner Pardee SECOND: Commissioner Beck AYES: Chair Findling and Commissioners Beck, Kirby, McDowell, Saryon, Higuera, and Pardee NOES: ABSENT: ABSTAIN:
6.	Architectural Design Application: Starbucks Renovation City Staff: Presentation of application and staff report Clarifying questions regarding American with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance of driveway on East Lake Street, traffic circulation onsite, parking spaces, irrigation, condition to add pedestrian plan for area behind bike racks, and western design of building.

Public Comment:

Applicant, Darren Dickerhoof: Clarification on trees, landscaping, design of outdoor patio, traffic flow, ladder access to roof, and design.

Applicant, Amber: Clarification on design, bike parking, and outdoor access on western side of building.

Johanna Altorfer: Supportive of project. Comments regarding outdoor seating. Comments on signage onsite to advertise other businesses.

Gino Fiorucci: Not supportive of City signage comment

Public comment Closed

Commissioner Kirby: Question on existing signage

Unanimous approval to adding March 16, 2021 meeting to third “WHEREAS,...” statement of Resolution.

COMMISSION ACTION: Motion to approve PCR-21-02 and add the following condition to conditions of approval:

The Applicant shall install a pedestrian and cyclist access path from the facility to the south end of the property at the time of adjacent property development or at the time of the Centennial Park development to ensure contiguous access to the facility from the south.

Motioned: Commissioner Higuera

Second: Commissioner Kirby

AYES: Chair Findling, Commissioners Beck, Higuera, McDowell, Kirby, Saryon, and Pardee

NAYS:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

7. General Plan 2045: Land Use Element Draft with Land Use Map and Zoning Code Changes

City Staff: Presentation of draft Land Use Element and Land Use Map

Clarifying questions on higher density, number of units and lot size, utility capacity, and redevelopment.

Discussion on land use assignment of Commercial and Industrial Base and Water Resource Area purposes and locations.

Public Comment:

Betty Kreeger: Concerned about higher density areas. Request for focus on high density away from single-family neighborhoods. Not in favor of increasing heights. Water Resource Area may be too widely applied. Eskaton as Village Residential and build out is confusing.

Johanna Altorfer: Pine Street as residential as opposed to neighborhood commercial. Wants Golden Eagle Charter School area to be water resource area.

Greg Messer: Desire for downtown to be an area to park a car and walk around more. Support for density. Concerned over what more people in the city would do for work. Question about expanding the downtown district. Question about parking as more people come into town to live

and visit. Support for more transit options.

Public comment Closed

Discussion and general support for direction. Discussion and comments on Water Resource Area application and somewhat counterproductive to effective use of land for more housing. Would like time to review more and provide more feedback on Land Use draft. Continue item to future meeting.

8. General Plan 2045 Schedule and Special Meeting discussion

City Staff: Presentation of staff report

Information Only. No discussion or action

9. Staff and Member Comments

Commissioner Saryon: Question on activity at old Coffee Connection Building. City Staff clarification on new coffee/food business

Commissioner Beck: Discussion and request for sidewalk on Rockfellow to connect sidewalk for school kids. City Staff response that if the City has received enough funding for sidewalk to prioritize that section of sidewalk.

10. Future Agenda Items – Future items are topics brought to the Planning Commission from a public petition, city staff, Planning Commission member(s), and City Council for review and action. All dates refer to first introductions to the Planning Commission and can be altered due to time and priority level. **Items that are bolded correlate with the General Plan Revision Process**

- a. Joint Meeting with City Council on Planned Unit Development: Roseburg Commer**
North of Springhill– 3/29/2021
- b. General Plan 2045 Draft – 4/20/2021**
- c. City Street Tree Guide Update – 5/18/2021

8. Adjourn – Adjourned at 9:38 P.M.

Agenda Item # 6
Staff Report

Meeting Date: April 20, 2021
To: Planning Commission
From: Planning Department
Subject: General Plan Schedule

Recommended Action:

Discussion

General Plan Schedule

After the March meeting, the Planning Department met with a Housing and Community Development and TRC Solutions, Inc. to discuss a schedule extension for the General Plan process. The City currently has grant funding related to the General Plan update that reduces the fiscal impact to the City. The Senate Bill 2 grant is the primary grant that will help with the cost of the Land Use Element and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) costs: approximately \$250,000. The grant sum is \$160,000 and the final date for the grant to be completed in December 31, 2022. The remaining costs would be covered by the City's general fund. If the City cannot meet the grant deadline then we will have to reimburse the state for funds that we have requested or lose funds that we have not claimed. The grant is a reimbursement based grant.

With those limitations in mind, City staff are recommending extending the schedule for a draft General Plan approved by City Council at the end of June 2021. This would allow TRC and the Planning Department to start the EIR process in July 2021. The EIR process can take 12 to 18 months which would be a final EIR and final general plan review between July 2022 and December 2022.

Planning Projects

Under direction of the City Manager, all other planning projects and ordinances are on hold (including Shor-term Rental Ordinance) until Planning Commission feels comfortable with the draft General Plan. The Planning Department will continue to process planning application and projects and schedule those with Planning Commission. There is no anticipated large scale project to be presented in the next 6 to 8 months.

Recommended Discussion: How does Planning Commission feel about the expanded schedule?

Agenda Item # 7
Staff Report

Meeting Date: April 20, 2021
To: Planning Commission
From: Planning Department
Subject: Second Draft Land Use Element

Recommended Action:

Discussion and Input

Background:

The Land Use Element is one section of the General Plan 2045. The Land Use Element contains information on land uses such as residential, commercial, open space, and more. The Land Use is one of the two fundamental Elements, Circulation being the other, that have the greatest impact on future growth and development. The Land Use Element asks the question “What are we going to put where?”. The proposed Land Use Element for the City of Mt. Shasta also includes a more robust section on urban design due to the high interest of the public in town character and how future development will fit into the existing neighborhoods. Urban design is a topic that was not broached in the 2007 General Plan. Urban design is the overarching term for how buildings and public spaces look aesthetically.

The Planning Commission from November 2020 to this meeting have actively reviewed potential land uses for the update that aim to meet the 2045 vision. The 2045 vision was created through surveying, public workshops, and public meetings in 2018. The vision is the context to the plan and help inform the proposed land use designations, goals, policies, and programs within the Plan. The 2045 vision is:

The City of Mt. Shasta is a diverse, innovative, and walkable small town surrounded by breathtaking natural beauty that is easily accessible from a vibrant downtown full of strong locally-owned businesses.

The City takes pride in the ability of its residents to connect with each other as well as its own capacity to support local industry and provide cutting edge infrastructure while preserving the rich, natural environment.

In addition to the vision, the Land Use Element considers state requirements beginning in Government Code Section § 65302(a) and continues throughout the Government Code. The

Governor’s Office of Planning and Research 2017 General Plan Guidelines includes goals for the Element such as “promotion of thoughtful, equitable, and accessible distribution of different land uses...” and “... a tool to improve public health, reduce infrastructure costs, enhance local economies, and address long-term environmental issues such as climate change and water resources.” (Page 42, OPR 2017 General Plan Guidelines).

The Planning Commission at the March 16, 2021 meeting reviewed the first draft of the Land Use Element with a Land Use Map distributing the land use designations. The discussion and input collected at the meeting was supportive of the direction of the Land Use Element . The comments on the first draft primarily focused on the change in densities for residential uses and the application of the Water Resource Area. Planning Commission concluded the item with the comment that time between meetings would help for further review.

Nonconforming Uses

Throughout the proposed Land Use Element, there are situations where the lots assigned a land use designation will be out of compliance. For example, if a 2 acre lot in the county is assigned Rural Residential which requires a minimum lot of 5 acres. The lot would still be allowed to develop, but the land use designation would prevent further subdivision at this time. Similar to other situations in the City where there is existing development that will not match the proposed plan. These uses, lots, and buildings will be able to continue as there are or develop to come into compliance if able. If a disaster occurs existing buildings will be allowed to rebuild as they are, but they will need to come into compliance with the Building and Fire Codes at the times of the rebuild. Additionally, lower density uses will not be required to increase density if already developed.

The General Plan again is an aspiration for the future. Existing uses can fit into that future or property owners may see the changes as positive and move to improve the lot to come into compliance. The City uses zoning codes, development standards, and programs to encourage properties to come into compliance but will allow existing uses and lots to continue to develop.

Review of Public & Outside Agency Comment:

The initial public engagement plan was to create a mailer for parcel owners to notify them of the potential changes to their property. The mailer would have been sent out between the March and April Planning Commission meeting with listening sessions scheduled to collect input during that time. In the interim there has been miscommunication on the plan purpose, what the plan includes, and where we are in the drafting and public engagement process. This has resulted in a backtrack of the public engagement plan and extension of the project schedule.

Public feedback on the first draft has primarily been negative with some positive comments. Some of the negative feedback has been based on misinformation on the process and content of the

General Plan. Outside of the misinformation, public comment is primarily concerned with densifying existing single-family neighborhoods. These neighborhoods with a high concentration of negative comments are exclusively single-family neighborhoods and primarily single-family neighborhoods. The residents of these neighborhoods do not wish to change the exclusive single-family nature. These types of comments are common and to be expected.

Guiding Principle: Sustainability through Density

Sustainability through Density is a recommended guiding principle included in the Introduction of the General Plan 2045. The guiding principle was added to achieve several aspects of the 2045 vision:

- Higher density development has a lower per capita resource usage of water, lower impact on existing City services, lower CO2 production, lower energy consumption, and lowers the Vehicle Miles Traveled of a household.
- On average, people who live in denser neighborhoods are physically healthier, happier, and more productive.
- Local government pay less in infrastructure costs to support higher density area than suburban development
- Increased density to mimic older style neighborhoods and communities with mixed uses lead to more social interaction and less crime.

As stated in the last bullet, the combination of increased density and mixed uses would lead to achieving the social connection discussed in the 2045 vision. Planning Commission may amend the list of guiding principles if it feels that the principle no longer serves the plan or city as part of this General Plan process.

Density, mixture of uses, and mixture of housing types is a change from the current make-up of the existing neighborhoods in the City. The proposal is a mixture of housing type for the exclusively single-family neighborhoods focuses on duplex, triplex, 4-plex, and cottage cluster housing types. This would shift the City away from exclusionary zoning to inclusionary zoning.

Exclusionary Zoning

Exclusionary zoning is the planning practice of allowing only one type of development in an area. Exclusionary zoning is an older planning practice that has resulted in neighborhoods that keep affordable housing away through the use of land use restrictions and building code requirements. There is little influence the City can take on the building code, so we will focus on land use in this circumstance.

Whether deliberate or not, exclusionary zoning has been used to keep lower-income and/or racial minorities out of wealthier and middle-class neighborhoods. This has a negative impact on lower income families that do not have access to the same amenities and services as the wealthier population. The other impact is that neighborhoods are created in a monoculture type way that lower the diversity of the area. It is important to discuss and tackle this issue in the General Planning process because “diversity” is part of the 2045 vision.

Exclusionary zoning has existed in various forms throughout the United States’ history. The birth of exclusionary zoning was a result of the early twentieth century racial discrimination. City zoning at this time created a legal avenue to prohibit minorities and non-nuclear families from occupying traditional, white neighborhoods. This zoning practice became illegal in 1917 with the passage of *Buchanan v. Warley*. *Buchanan v. Warley* was the first in a series of U.S. Supreme Court cases that limited housing discrimination and resulted in the 1968 Fair Housing Act.

The Fair Housing Act prohibits discrimination based on race, color, national origin, sex, ability, and familial status. Unfortunately, it did not prohibit discrimination based on income-class which provided a loop-hole for cities and government agencies to prevent integration of neighborhoods through economic tactics such as large minimum lot sizes, “red lining”, single residence per lot requirements, and high interest on mortgages for people of color and non-traditional family make-ups. In addition to this, large lot sizes reduce the supply of available land and drive up housing costs. It should be noted that some of the discussed exclusionary practices have since been deemed illegal by the U.S. Supreme Court; specifically, “red lining”.

But that was then, and this is now, so why does this matter? Keeping exclusionary zoning will continue to create inequitable neighborhoods throughout the whole City of Mt. Shasta and the Sphere of Influence. Again, going back to the vision 2045, diversity is an aspiration for the City to achieve by 2045. To do that, we need to have a full conversation about what aspect of our planning and zoning that are keeping us from achieving that goal and what changes are recommended to get there. This does not mean that we cannot refine the proposed Land Use Element to better meet the needs of the community but serves as a reminder that our existing regulations may be working against a more equitable, diverse community.

Inclusionary Zoning and Gentle Density

Inclusionary zoning is the opposite of exclusionary zoning. Inclusionary zoning looks at diverse housing options for all income levels in one neighborhood. Inclusionary zoning has been proven successful for maintaining neighborhood character when partnered with design standards. The pairing of these two planning tools has resulted in a new planning term “Gentle density”. Gentle Density is the increase in housing units to include townhouses, cottage clusters, duplex, triplexes, and small scale ground-oriented developments. Accessory Dwelling Units which are allowed by right on single-family parcels are another example of gentle density. Accessory Dwelling Units,

also referred to as mother-in-law units or granny flats, are single housing units that can be attached or detached to a single family home. These types of units can range in size from 400 sq ft to 1200 sq ft. Accessory Dwelling Units are restricted to long-term rentals or additional units for mixed generational housing. Mixed generational housing is when multiple generations live on one lot. Mixed generational housing has become more popular with the Baby Boomer generation aging and needed additional family care and Millennials who have returned home after college or are subsidizing their lifestyles to save money. The importance to gentle density is to maintain neighborhood/town character through “housing-scale” design standards. Housing-scale looks at designing these higher density housing types at the size and scale of surrounding single-family homes. Partnered with Mt. Shasta specific urban design concepts, higher density could be planned in a way that does not detract from town character.

Town Character

Town character is a common statement and theme of the public comments. Many commenters voiced the opinion that “Mt. Shasta is a village not a city” or “we are a rural town not an urban city”. Some of this is an indication that the inclusion of more design discussion is needed and education on the semantics of planning. “Urban” is the technical planning term for an area that is development with city services include police, fire, water, wastewater, and transit. By that definition, Mt. Shasta is an urban community. There are City services in a majority of the City Limits and some of the Sphere of Influence. We do not use “urban” in this circumstance to refer to Mt. Shasta like we do San Francisco. Same for the term “City”. In California, all incorporated areas are referred to as “Cities”. If the general public would like to rename the “City” to “Village” it would not change its status of a city with the state or federal government. The name change would also not relieve the city of any requirements from the state that is specifically imposed on cities.

With the semantics out of the way, town character and the comments around the feeling and look of the community is a topic worth exploring. As referenced earlier in this report, urban design (again “urban design” is the technical term for blending architecture, landscape architecture, and city planning together to make areas functional and attractive) has been included and explored more in this update for the General Plan.

The City of Mt. Shasta has a set of design guidelines that were developed in 2010. The design guidelines discuss the desired features and look of the City but lacks some specific in the way of what the definition of what “mountain village” or “alpine village” means. The public comments received bring up these terms with very few commenters elaborating on what they mean. The General Plan 2045 process has included some urban design public engagement but can include more. Planning Commission can discuss options for exploring this area further with surveying, more workshopping, and other public engagement.

Residential Land Uses:

There are a series of options for Planning Commission consideration to refine the residential land uses (Rural, Village, and Central Residential). Planning Commission as always may propose other options not listed or do a combination of options.

Option 1: No Change

Option is very straight forward and would not change the proposed housing unit density in any of the proposed residential land uses. This option is not recommended by Staff.

Option 2: Reduce Minimum Density

Option 2 looks at reducing the minimum density of the proposed residential land uses. The City has not received any negative comments concerning residential density in commercial areas. The majority of comments have been concerned with the minimum density of the Village Residential land use. The proposed minimum density is 12 units per acre which would result in a maximum lot size of 3,630 sq. ft. for a single-family unit. The Village Residential land use does not explicitly prohibit single-family homes but proposed a smaller lot and house size. The maximum house size with the proposed 70% maximum lot coverage would be 2,541 sq ft. The lot width, setbacks, and other lot design standards can be created in a way that allow for flexible designs of the housing and yard. Planning Commission may change the maximum lot coverage and/or minimum units per acre to address public comment.

Option 3: Eliminate Minimum Density

The current 2007 General Plan does not include a unit minimum. A unit minimum is a planning tool that requires a set level of density for an area. This type of tool is considered part of the inclusionary zoning family as a disincentive to lower density development. If the City is trying to control development in a way that provides more housing while using existing infrastructure a minimum would help achieve that goal. This disincentive would be partnered with other incentives and programs like reduced connection fees for affordable, higher density units. Planning Commission may eliminate the minimum density for the Village Residential and/or Central Residential if desired.

Option 4: Creation of Sub-urban Style Land Use Designation

The final option, which was discussed at the previous meeting and brought up in public comment, is to create a fourth sub-urban style land use designation that would be between rural and village residential. If this is the desired route of the Commission, City Staff recommend discussing the purpose of this land use type, what types of commercial uses could be allowed either by right or as a conditional use, and what types of housing styles are desired. City Staff do not recommend

an exclusionary zone as stated for the discussion above, but the housing types could be limited to single-family, duplex, triplex, and four-plexes to reduce impact to existing neighborhoods.

Commercial Uses within Residential Areas:

A concern brought by the public is the inclusion of commercial uses by right in the Village residential land use. The current proposal is to allow small-scale commercial uses such as restaurants, office buildings, retail shops, and daycares. Public commenters are concerned that this will take away from the residential neighborhoods that currently exist.

Mixed use neighborhoods integrate residential, commercial, agricultural, and other types of uses together in a neighborhood to promote pedestrian access to commercial stores, workplaces, and social amenities while reducing the need to use a car. Mixed use neighborhoods also increase active transportation such as biking and have been shown to allow for more social interactions between neighborhoods and the outside community. Mixed use neighborhoods can reduce congestions on streets, boost local economy and businesses, create safer people-oriented streets, and provide space for social entertainment. Here is an infographic with information on the benefits of mixed use neighborhoods: [https://www.bluezones.com/2020/07/what-is-a-mixed-use-neighborhood/#:~:text=Mixed%2Duse%20neighborhoods%20\(also%20referred,encouraging%20social%20connections%2C%20walkability%2C%20and](https://www.bluezones.com/2020/07/what-is-a-mixed-use-neighborhood/#:~:text=Mixed%2Duse%20neighborhoods%20(also%20referred,encouraging%20social%20connections%2C%20walkability%2C%20and)

Planning Commission may make these uses conditional, impose additional restrictions on size and operations, or remove from the land use entirely. City Staff does not recommend removing commercial uses entirely due to the guiding principle of mixed use neighborhoods. Planning Commission may also recommend additional public engagement to determine which types of commercial uses are desired or not desired in mixed use neighborhoods.

Water Resource Area Land Use Designation:

The discussion around the Water Resource Area (WRA) land use designation at the last Planning Commission meeting has resulted in the recommendation to remove the WRA from the land use designations. The original intent of the WRA was to limit development on properties with water features such as streams, wetlands, and lakes. WRA as a land use designation may not be the best option for achieving the goals outlined in the Water Resource Element.

The Planning Department consulted with other planners on options for the WRA. We explored having two land uses assigned to one property and removing the land use designation. The assignment of two land uses for one property poses some issues that would make implementation difficult. For example, land use designations that do not follow property lines would result in questions on the actual boundaries of each zone. If we had a property that was both WRA and Village Residential the question comes up where does WRA stop and Village Residential start. This will cause future conflict in interpretation of where each land use is on one property.

The recommendation to eliminate the land use designation does not mean that the intent would be lost. The recommendation would include creating a water resource area ordinance that would include an overlay of water resource features and applying specific setbacks and design standards to limit impact on these important features. Planning Commission may keep the WRA as is, recommend assigning two land use designations to properties, or move forward with the staff recommendation of removing the land use designation for other types of planning tools.

Proposed Land Use Map Changes for Second Draft

Based on Planning Commission discussion and public input, changes will be made to the Land Use Element and Map post meeting. There are many topics that can be covered during this discussion which are not present in this Staff Report. Planning Commission may request additional information for a future meeting, discuss an item related to the Land Use Element and public comments during the meeting, or make recommendations on the direction of the Land Use Element.