

Cotati General Plan Update

MEMORANDUM

October 1, 2012

TO: Planning Commissioners

FROM: Vicki Parker, Community Development Director
Beth Thompson and Ben Ritchie, De Novo Planning Group

SUBJECT: Review of Goal and Policy Sets – 4th review meeting

DATE: October 1, 2012

INTRODUCTION

This Planning Commission meeting will focus on reviewing the Land Use Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Actions (Goal and Policy set) and the Land Use Map. Please note that the reading materials (Goal and Policy sets and summary of Visioning and Planning Commission input) for this meeting were included in the August 6, 2012 packet.

GOAL AND POLICY SETS

Attachment A of the August 6, 2012 staff report includes the draft Goal and Policy sets for each element of the General Plan: Circulation, Community Health and Wellness, Community Services and Facilities, Conservation, Economic Vitality, Land Use, Noise, Open Space, and Safety, except Housing which was reviewed separately. As described in the August 6, 2012 staff report, each Goal and Policy set provides a framework of goals, objectives, policies, and actions that will serve as the backbone of the General Plan Update.

At the August 6, 2012 meeting, the Planning Commission provided comments on the Conservation and Noise Goal and Policy sets. At the September 4, 2012 meeting, the Planning Commission provided comments on the Open Space, Safety, and Community Services and Facilities Goal and Policy sets. At the September 17, 2012 meeting, the Planning Commission provided input on the Circulation, Community Health and Wellness, and Economic Vitality Goal and Policy sets. The Planning Commission will continue their review at the October 1, 2012 meeting, providing input on the Land Use Goal and Policy set, including the Land Use Map. After the Planning Commission has reviewed and commented on these documents, the goals, objectives, and policies will be incorporated into the elements of the General Plan Update in order to prepare the General Plan Update for public review and comment.

PRIORITIES AND ISSUES

As part of the General Plan Update process, four Visioning workshops were held between March and May 2011 to receive public and stakeholder input on the General Plan Update. The Planning Commission then held a series of meetings from July 2011 through February 2012 to identify priorities and issues for the General Plan Update to address. At each Planning Commission meeting held between July 2011 and February 2012, the Planning Commission was presented with a summary of the public input received on each General Plan topic during the Visioning Workshops. The Planning Commission considered this public input, and provided additional input and guidance regarding each General Plan topic. A summary of the priorities and issues identified through the

To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Review of Goal and Policy Sets (3rd review meeting)
Date: October 1, 2012
Page: 2 of 3

Visioning process and Planning Commission meetings is provided as Attachment B of the August 6, 2012 staff report.

REQUIRED READING

Prior to the meeting on October 1st, please review the following materials from the August 6, 2012 packet:

1. Land Use Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Actions (Attachment A)
2. Land Use Map – Alternatives A and B (Attachment A)
3. Cotati General Plan Update: Priorities and Issues (Attachment B)

WORK EXERCISE

After reading the materials identified above, please consider and be prepared to discuss the following questions for the Land Use Goal and Policy set, including the Land Use Map Alternatives. As you are reading through the identified Goal and Policy sets, please consider and come prepared to discuss the following:

- a.) Were there issues or concerns raised during the previous Planning Commission meetings regarding the General Plan Update that are not addressed or not adequately addressed in the draft policy documents? If so, please identify the specific issues or concerns.
- b.) Are there specific additions or corrections that you would suggest?
- c.) In reviewing the Land Use Map Alternatives, please consider the following:
 - a. Would it be appropriate to remove residential uses from the Commercial (C) designation or to reduce the extent to which residential uses are currently allowed in the Commercial designation? Residential uses would still be allowed in the Specific Plan areas (Downtown Specific Plan and Santero Way Specific Plan) as established by each specific plan.
 - b. Please identify two potential new sites to be designated High Density Residential. The Department of Housing and Community Development may require additional high density residential sites as part of its review of the Draft Housing Element.
 - c. Does the Residential Agricultural designation (see Policy LU 1.2 and Land Use Map Alternative B) provide the “feathering” or transition from urban to rural agricultural uses that was desired for the Sphere of Influence and Urban Growth Boundary area?
 - d. Please be prepared to discuss the types of land uses that should be allowed within the Residential Agricultural designation. For example, should agricultural based commercial activities (i.e., tasting rooms, food processing facilities, etc.) be allowed within this land use designation?
 - e. The land use designations proposed under Policy LU 1.2 would remove/eliminate the City’s existing General Industrial designation. Under this approach, which was a property owner suggestion, the lands shown as General Industrial on Land Use Map Alternatives A and B would be changed to Commercial/Industrial. The combined Commercial/Industrial designation would be a new land use designation in this General Plan Update. We would like to hear the Commission’s thoughts on the proposal.
 - f. The Office designation has been retained. However, is there a desire to streamline the land use designations and replace the Office designation with the Commercial

To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Review of Goal and Policy Sets (3rd review meeting)
Date: October 1, 2012
Page: 3 of 3

designation? Residential uses interspersed in the area currently designated Office would be redesignated to reflect the density of the development.

- g. Policy LU 3.6 requires that a specific plan be prepared in order to develop the Commercial/Industrial area south of Helman Lane. Should this approach be retained? Or, should this area south of Helman Lane be allowed to develop without the preparation of a specific plan?
- h. In order to accommodate parks in newly developing residential areas, should the residential land use designations be revised to identify parks as an allowed use?