

**Planning Commission Comments  
General Plan Update  
Preliminary Hearing Draft  
Planning Commission Hearing 2/15/07 – Group 1**

<b>Planning Commissioner:</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Chapter 1</b>	
Dick Hansis -	<p>Are the Guiding Principles supposed to be broad, over-arching statements that will lead to more specifics?</p> <p><b>Response from staff:</b> Correct. Principles, Goals, Policies, Standards, and Implementation. The order is from general to specific.</p>
Scott Kelly -	<p>Implementation programs will be occurring alongside plan policies including the infrastructure study and timing?</p> <p><b>Response from staff:</b> Yes. Urban Study Area (USA) analysis will provide the basis for the Land Use inventory, costs of improvements, etc., and will drive your plan and zone maps. We don't have enough infrastructure right now to support development. The real question will be – will we be able to afford new infrastructure? We are taking a more detailed look at what is feasible within the Community Planning Areas (C PA) and it will guide us so that we don't plan areas for development that can't support it. Part of Group 7 – we'll see that in the fall.</p>
Smith –	<p>(Page 1.3) How are the guiding principles organized? What alternatives do they fall into? They're in here 3 places and I'm not sure which is the proposed set of guiding principles? Are you asking for vote on page 1.3 or a combination that is illustrated in the chart?</p> <p><b>Response from staff:</b> Kirk explained how these guiding principles are proposed to be incorporated into the plan and staff's recommendation for which plan alternative they should "fall" into. Action on B, then action on adequacy on the range of alternatives.</p>
Gearheart -	<p>Can we add our own wording or change the guiding principles?</p> <p><b>Response from staff:</b> Yes you could – we propose to provide comments on each of the submitted responses and will make revisions that are reasonable changes.</p>
Emad –	<p>This is a general plan and these guiding principles are general and not specific and we will work our way down to the specifics in our project decisions. But I am worried that these could be interpreted in the specific that could be different than what was intended.</p>
Herman –	<p>Let's use plain English. Use words that everyone understands. Think about the words you (staff) use so that a greater majority of people understand. For example, Guiding Principle.#1 - "unique" what does that mean? This guiding principle doesn't define anything when we get more specific. #2 – Keep these general principles very general. #6 – AG/TIMBER protection – describe how you will do this so you are not limited to these tools. Proposed revisions to #3, 5, 6 and 9 (submitted written comments)</p>
Murguia -	<p>The Guiding Principles began in the community hearings and evolved as a set of mandates. People were concerned about conversion of resource lands, open space, and sprawl. Each one of us could go through and come up with different wording. It was intended by the public as having an impact on the plan and the direction of development. Some of the wording has been changed through this process – some of the issues that were originally a part of the proposed plan are now found in Alternative A as the environmental superior alternative. We need clarity. If they are not going to affect the entire General Plan, why are they here? What happened to the comments that were captured in the</p>

	Critical Choices report?
Gearheart –	Let’s keep it simple and clear. We may need to move on and come back to the guiding principles later. We are spending too much time on “word-smithing” now. We can come back to it later.
Herman –	Agrees with Commissioner Gearheart that we should keep coming back to the Guiding Principles throughout the process. <b>Response from staff:</b> Staff – you have two jobs here, we need a good range of alternatives, if you can’t agree on the wording – just offer your own comments and move on.
Smith -	In the past, I have felt disappointment in how our plans have been interpreted differently than how I thought they would be, so we should be careful now when we craft them. #1 – “unique” what does this mean? Take out or leave in because it is not actionable. #2 plan must allow a sufficient range - “in the absence of scarcity – things are free” I am okay with Commissioner Herman’s wording for Guiding Principle #6 but add that protection from conversion to any other uses (also likes Herman’s #7 revisions).
Emad -	Make sure that we do not have unintended consequences. Guiding Principle #3 in particular. We create scarcity in how we attract people to this community. Economy of this community is changing – we need to think of all income groups.
Herman -	We need to provide an environment to attract all income levels.
PC5 Kelly	- #1 is ambiguous, not actionable. #2 – remove “scarcity” Agree w/ #8 to add feasible. #15 – like’s Steve’s Salzman’s modification.
PC6 Herman –	“Sustainable” development – I would like a definition or an example of terms. Murgia - suggest that staff brings this back with explanation of these terms.

<b>Planning Commissioner:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>
<b>Chapter 2 –</b>	
PC7 Herman –	Page 2.1 - take the two paragraphs out on the process of the update (doesn’t find this necessary for implementing the plan). Key terms – had problems with some of these.
Emad-	Are these maps very general? <b>Response from staff:</b> Yes - diagrams
PC8 Herman –	“Reduction in large lot residential development” concerned about taking away property rights. “Resource lands” – what is that? We are all concerned about conversion of resource lands – there are some uses that are compatible with timberlands. <b>Response from staff:</b> Kirk provided background information on how this process developed through community meetings and board action.
PC9 Murgia –	There were plenty of community meetings that proposed direction in preventing conversion of resource lands.
PC10 Kelly –	I am concerned with us morphing the direction of the guiding principles and the alternatives. It seems that we are now trying to morph our preferred alternative into something it was not intended to be. Putting houses into areas w/o services was something we talked about at length and I don’t want to change that direction.
PC11 Emad	I do not want to support an alternative that limits large lot development. Rich people need houses too.
Gearheart -	I am still not clear on the voting procedures. How do you see us compiling the voting on these policies? <b>Response from staff:</b> Tom gave a description on how voting will proceed. Majority vote will be reflected in the plan and the minority vote will be also presented to the board.
Murgia –	We need to keep a distinction between the alternatives and still provide a range. Can’t just morph them together.

Herman –	<p>Alternative B was supposed to have a range of development opportunities (“scalability”). Then the Planning Commission and Board could chose, like a cafeteria, on what the preferred alternative should be.</p> <p><b>Response from staff:</b>  Kirk – Alternative B is considered a scalable alternative as far as development goes. Did not see a cafeteria plan with Alternative B. We have heard that you want to make these guiding principles more clear. Some of these proposed revisions to the preliminary hearing draft actually change the direction of the plan. We may want to table this until the plan is written. In the end, if these guiding principles don’t fit – then go to board with recommended changes. We can clean them up but not change the basic tenor of the guiding principle.</p>
Hansis –	<p>I don’t see a discussion on the costs of these alternatives – beside the environmental costs.</p> <p><b>Response from staff:</b>  Infrastructure analysis will address some of this, but we are not proposing to do an economic analysis on difference in rural versus urban development. The board didn’t choose it because that is not the direction they want development to go. They have directed us to focus development in areas with services not the resource lands.</p>
PC12 Smith –	<p>I heard you say that we don’t have the infrastructure to support new development. So we may need to include large lot development that is not dependent of services</p>