



COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT

For the meeting of: December 3, 2012

Date: November 26, 2012
 To: Board of Supervisors
 From: Kevin Hamblin, Director of Planning and Building
 Subject: Continued Board Review of the Planning Commission Approved Draft General Plan, in particular, Chapter 5, Community Infrastructure and Services, Chapter 7, Circulation, Chapter 9, Economic Development and Chapter 4, Land Use

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the Board of Supervisors:

1. Open the public hearing and receive a staff report.
2. Receive public comments.
3. Close public comments.
4. Continue deliberation and straw voting on the goals, policies, standards and implementation measures of Chapter 5, Community Infrastructure and Services Element.
5. Begin deliberation and straw voting on Chapter 7 (Circulation) and Chapter 9, (Economic Development).
6. Continue deliberation and straw voting on Chapter 4, Land Use Element.
7. Continue the public hearing to December 17, 2012.

SOURCE OF FUNDING:

The cost of preparing this staff report was borne by the General Fund through the Planning and Building Department – Advance Planning Division's FY 2012-2013 budget and the General Plan user fees.

Prepared by _____
 Martha Spencer, Supervising Planner

CAO Approval _____

REVIEW:	Auditor _____	County Counsel _____	Personnel _____	Risk Manager _____	Other _____
---------	---------------	----------------------	-----------------	--------------------	-------------

TYPE OF ITEM:
 Consent
 Departmental
 Public Hearing
 Other _____

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT
 Upon motion of Supervisor _____
 Seconded by Supervisor _____
 Ayes _____
 Nays _____
 Abstain _____
 Absent _____

PREVIOUS ACTION/REFERRAL:

Board Order No. H-2, D-1, C-1, L-1, C-1, C-1, L-3, C-1, C-1, C-1, C-1, C-1, C-1 and C-1

and carried by those members present, the Board hereby approves the recommended action contained in this Board report.

Meeting of: June 12, June 18, June 25, July 10, July 16, July 23, July 24, August 13, September 10, September 17, October 1, October 15, November 5 and November 8, 2012

Dated: _____
 By: _____
Kathy Hayes, Clerk of the Board

DISCUSSION:

The Board continued deliberation on Chapter 5, the Infrastructure Element, at the November 8, 2012 meeting. Because this is an optional element (not required by state law), staff was directed to prepare recommendations for possible re-location or elimination of the policies and corresponding standards and implementation measures found in the Infrastructure Element (this was included as Attachment A of the October 15th Board report). The Board then chose to review this Element policy by policy in order to determine if the policies should be retained in the Plan, moved to a corresponding Element or eliminated entirely. The Board deferred the decision of elimination of the Element (or relocation of the remaining policies) until the comprehensive review was completed.

During the November 8th meeting, the Board suspended straw voting until the newly organized citizens group (introduced during the November 5th Board meeting) could provide recommendations on the Draft Plan. The Board did request that staff return with additional information on IS-PX2. *Fire Service Impacts from New Development* (which is discussed in greater detail below).

The citizens group has proposed to provide the Board with recommendations on the Draft Plan starting with the Circulation Element. Staff therefore recommends that your Board finish deliberation on the remainder of the Infrastructure Element (starting with IS-S1) and, if time allows, begin deliberation on the following policies for Chapters 9, (which were identified on the Key Issues "short list") during the December 3rd meeting:

Chapter 9, Economic

- ED-P6. Large Format Retail
- ED-S2. Large Format Retail
- ED-IM7. Large Format Retail

Staff also recommends that deliberation and straw voting commence on the Circulation Element at the next scheduled Board meeting after the citizens group has supplied the Board (and thus the public) with their recommendations.

Outstanding Issues

1. IS-PX2. Fire Service Impacts from New Development

Your Board was concerned that the recommendation from the fire chiefs relating to mitigation in IS-PX2, *Fire Service Impacts from New Development*, may be excessive or infeasible for project proponents. The Draft Plan currently reads:

Planning Commission Version

IS-PX2. Fire Service Impacts from New Development. During review of discretionary permits within fire related district boundaries or identified response areas, utilize recommendations from the appropriate local fire chief as feasible mitigation measures to reduce impacts to emergency response and fire suppression services from new development.

In response to these concerns, your Board discussed two possible changes to temper the impact of this policy. The proposed alternatives are as follows:

Suggested Revision Draft #1

IS-PX2. Fire Service Impacts from New Development. During review of discretionary permits within fire related district boundaries or identified response areas, ~~utilize~~ **consider** recommendations from the appropriate local fire chief as feasible mitigation measures to reduce impacts to emergency response and fire suppression services from new development.

Suggested Revision Draft #2

IS-PX2. Fire Service Impacts from New Development. During review of discretionary permits within fire related district boundaries or identified response areas, utilize recommendations from the appropriate local fire chief ~~as~~ **where** feasible **as** mitigation measures to reduce impacts to emergency response and fire suppression services from new development.

This policy was included in the Community Infrastructure and Services Element at the request of fire chiefs who participated in meetings to resolve concerns at the Planning Commission relating to two fire standards (*IS-S4. Subdivisions Outside of Fire District Boundaries, and IS-S5. Other Development Outside of Fire District Boundaries*). Your Board asked staff to forward the two suggested policy revisions to the fire chiefs for their comment.

Responses from four fire chiefs were received and indicated that there is not a history of excessive mitigation requests from fire chiefs in Humboldt County. In addition, the fire chiefs felt that the suggested revisions water down the original intent of the policy. They continue to support the original language, but consider Suggested Revision Draft #2 to be more acceptable if the policy is to be changed. In addition, they provided the following list of typical mitigation recommendations made by fire chiefs in Humboldt County:

- adding hydrants or standpipes,
- wider road or turn around,
- additional or larger rural tanks etc
- easements for emergency ingress / egress;
- ladders when proposed buildings are higher than current;
- land for fire service infrastructure (large developments)

Staff continues to recommend the Planning Commission's Draft Plan language for IS-PX2.

Continued Review of the Draft Plan:

The Board recommended continued deliberation on Chapter 5 (Infrastructure), Chapter 7 (Circulation) and Chapter 9, (Economic Development) on the approved Key Issues "short list" (with the allowance for discussion of all items in Chapter 5 if need be) for the December 3rd Board meeting. Staff recommends that deliberation on the Circulation Element be delayed to a Board meeting after the citizens group has supplied the Board (and thus the public) with their recommendations. At the time this report was prepared, staff has not received the recommendations on the Circulation Element from the newly formed citizens group.

Following deliberation of these chapters, the Board requested to return to deliberation of the remainder of the Chapter 4, the Land Use Element, starting with the two remaining Urban Lands policies (UL-P4 and P12) and the then moving to the outstanding policy discussion of Section 4.5, Agricultural Resources. A revised schedule with the Key Issues "short list" items is found in Attachment B.

As an alternative to the straw voting process the Board may wish to move the discussion forward by considering the items included in the Board approved "short list" of issues and review process.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

Awarded grants, General Plan user fees, and the General Fund contribution to the Advanced Planning Division has paid for the costs of the General Plan Update Program to date.

This project fits into the County's Strategic Framework in several ways.

- The project is consistent with the Mission Statement; the General Plan Update will serve the needs and concerns of the community, and enhance their quality of life. It provides a framework for strategically pursuing a broad range of services provided by the County and other agencies, and guiding new development toward the goals presented in the Plan.
- The General Plan Update supports the self reliance of the community by clarifying County policy and regulations in a broad number of subject areas, and presenting them in a format that is easy to understand and available on the internet.
- The General Plan Update will safeguard the public trust by establishing clear County policy and regulations guiding new development.
- The proposed implementation measures of the General Plan Update ensure its sustainability over time.
- The General Plan Update increases the transparency, accessibility, and accountability of the services provided by the County by establishing clear roles and procedures, using language that is easy to understand and available on the internet. The General Plan Update promotes interjurisdictional and regional cooperation.
- The General Plan Update is intended to be "an effective voice for our community in areas outside traditional mandates". The General Plan Update includes provisions for public involvement that extend far beyond the requirements of state law. Public involvement encouraged by the General Plan Update will include discussions of natural resource and the County's economic future. The General Plan Update also intends to engage new partners through its implementation measures.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:

The General Plan Update program has been a multi-year project. Multiple agencies have been involved in the review and preparation of the Planning Commission approved Draft General Plan. The County has been in communication with the Planning Commissioners, County Counsel and the County Administrator's office on the transmittal of these draft documents.

ALTERNATIVES TO STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Board's discretion.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Attachment A Staff suggested policy re-location chart for Chapter 5 (Infrastructure Element) with a tally of the Board's straw votes from the October 15th, 2012 meeting
- Attachment B Revised Board review schedule

