

**HUMBOLDT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
GENERAL PLAN UPDATE**

**MEETING OF JANUARY 26, 2012
STAFF REPORT**

Revised Recommended Commission Agenda

For tonight's meeting staff recommends that the Commission:

1. Review the outstanding issue for Section 1.6, Economy (Narrative portion of Chapter 1).
2. Review the outstanding policy decisions for Chapter 11, Energy and Section 4.4, Rural Lands.
3. Allow time for public comments.
4. Receive a staff presentation on the proposed countywide mapping changes.
5. Allow time for public comments.
6. Review and deliberate the land use mapping changes.
7. Review and deliberate on Appendix C, Community Plan Policies.
8. Continue the hearing to February 2nd or other date chosen by the Commission.

Please Note: For background information on the proposed mapping changes, please see the December 8th, January 5th and January 24th Planning Commission Staff Report posted on www.planupdate.org)

Outstanding Issues for Chapter 1, Introduction

The Commission was concerned regarding the unemployment numbers included in the revised Section 1.6, Economy and requested that these be deleted. Staff has provided revised language for this section in Attachment 1.

Outstanding Issues for Chapter 12, Energy and Section 4.4, Rural Lands

E-S3. Wind Generating Facilities

The Commission asked staff to again revise E-S3 to address continuing concerns on the wording of provision C.3 regarding effects on coastal resources. Discussion has focused around the term "adverse" in C.3, with staff suggesting "avoidable" to allow for a statement of overriding considerations be made.

Perhaps at the core of the problems with this provision is that it came from our LCP, hence the reference to "coastal resources". It's been a required finding for more than 25 years, and is implemented in the Coastal Zoning Regulations with this language:

312-31.3.1 The facility will have no significant adverse impact on sensitive habitat resources.

Perhaps the clarification needed is that for sensitive resources within the coastal zone, the stricter finding will continue to apply.

The response to comments suggesting adding additional findings, staff believes it inappropriate to re-open the discussion of energy element policy. With this item, staff is returning with the language issue previously identified by the Commission; to add new issues into the mix would warrant re-noticing and agendaing a discussion of energy element policy. Staff recommends against doing so.

The current language for E-S3 is as:

E-S3. Wind Generating Facilities.

- A. Unless allowed by right pursuant to California Government Code, Section 65892.13(f) as amended, wind generating facilities shall be a conditionally permitted use in all land use designations except "resource dependent" (MR).
- B. The following shall be considered in reviewing proposed wind generating facilities: parcel size, relationship to other structures, effect on potential down-wind sites, compliance with Uniform Building Code and national Electrical Code, rotor and tower safety, noise, electromagnetic interference, utility notification, height, liability insurance, and appearance and design.
- C. Findings necessary for project approval shall be:
 - 1) The proposed use is not detrimental to the public health, convenience, safety, and welfare.
 - 2) That the use of the property for such purposes will not result in material damage or prejudice to other property in the vicinity.
 - 3) The project will not have a significant **adverse** effect on coastal resources, including wildlife **qualities**.

Staff recommends the following revisions:

E-S3. Wind Generating Facilities.

- D. Unless allowed by right pursuant to California Government Code, Section 65892.13(f) as amended, wind generating facilities shall be a conditionally permitted use in all land use designations except "resource dependent" (MR).
- E. The following shall be considered in reviewing proposed wind generating facilities: parcel size, relationship to other structures, effect on potential down-wind sites, compliance with Uniform Building Code and national Electrical Code, rotor and tower safety, noise, electromagnetic interference, utility notification, height, liability insurance, and appearance and design.
- F. Findings necessary for project approval shall be:
 - 4) The proposed use is not detrimental to the public health, convenience, safety, and welfare.
 - 5) That the use of the property for such purposes will not result in material damage or prejudice to other property in the vicinity.
 - 6) Within the coastal zone, the project will not have a significant **adverse** effect on **sensitive habitat resources,** ~~coastal resources, including wildlife qualities.~~

RL-IMx. Decrease/Increase Inventory of Rural Residential Lands.

The Commission asked to revisit the two RL-IMx alternatives during the map review phase. These implementation measures would initiate a program to increase (or decrease) the inventory of rural residential lands. These measures would be in addition to RL-IM1, which reads as follows:

RL-IM1 Inventory of Rural Residential Lands. Maintain searchable GIS inventory of lands planned Rural Residential (RR) and review during Housing Element Updates for adequacy to meet homestead development demands during the Housing Element planning period.

Staff believes the above implementation measure is adequate to address the rural lands inventory issue.

The charts shown in Attachment 4 give the plan's buildout estimates for each of the alternatives. Alternative B provides an estimated 1,979 units of capacity in the Rural Residential (RR) land use classification. In the Resource Production classifications (T, AE, AG), Alternative B has an estimated capacity of 7,635 units.

Counties rely on the California Department of Finance Demographic Unit to provide population and growth estimates. According to their projections, about 13,000 more people will live in Humboldt County in 2030 than in 2010, requiring about 5,500 additional housing units countywide (assuming the existing average household size of 2.38 persons remains constant.) The County unincorporated share of this total housing need is expected to be 54 percent, or about 3,000 units. An estimate of what the County's share of regional housing needs for a 20 years period would be on the order of 6,000 units.

The current language for RL-IMx alternatives are as follows:

Alternative A:

RL-IMx. Decrease Inventory of Rural Residential Lands. Initiate a plan designation and zoning program to decrease the inventory of lands planned Rural Residential (RR) to meet homestead development demands.

Alternative C:

RL-IMx. Increase Inventory of Rural Residential Lands. Initiate a plan designation and zoning program to expand the inventory of lands planned Rural Residential (RR) to meet homestead development demands.

Staff recommends Alternative B, which omits both of the above provisions, but includes RL-IM1. In rural areas, the Rural Residential designated lands are the preferred areas to accommodate housing, rather than the resource production lands, so staff does not support decreasing the inventory of RR lands. Conversely, the planned inventory of such lands appears more than adequate to accommodate projected demand, so no demonstrated need exists to increase the inventory, either by adding more lands to the inventory or increasing densities. This issue can be reviewed more fully in the EIR.

Countywide Mapping Changes

Meeting Materials and Recommended Review Process

Map Books

Prior to the November 5th Planning Commission meeting, the Commission was provided three sets of Map Books that illustrated: 1) Alternative B (the proposed Alternative) Hearing Draft Maps dated October 2011; 2) the differences in Alternatives A, B and C; and 3) the differences in Alternative B with Alternative D (the existing Framework Plan). Electronic copies of the Map Books and proposed changes have been posted on the web, and hard copies are available for viewing at the public

library, Community Development Services department office and the Courthouse. Staff also provided an explanation of the Maps in a previous staff report and the Draft Planning Commission recommendations on Section 4.7 Land Use Classifications. This information is also available on the Department's website.

Voting Charts

A revised Draft Land Use Maps Voting Chart that denotes Commission action on the maps during the December 8th, January 5th and January 24th meeting is provided as Attachment 3. Please note that this is not the official record of action but is recommended to be used as a guide for the Commission during their deliberation for the remaining countywide mapping changes. It is set up similarly to the voting charts used by the Commission to record the straw votes for the draft General Plan policy choices. The chart has been revised to clearly indicate the staff recommendations for the individual land use request and the reason for that recommendation. For those items voted on previously by the Commission, the action has been indicated in the "vote" column on the far right.

It should also be noted that this is a countywide General Plan Update and the mapping changes recommended by staff should fit within the parameters given by the Board to staff when developing the draft policy recommendations and maps. These include:

- Focused development within existing urbanized areas with water and sewer service
- Mixed-use development to increase efficiency of land utilization, including density bonuses, second unit incentives, live-work commercial centers, etc.
- Reduction in existing large lot residential subdivision potential outside of community planning areas
- Increased resource production land protections such as: lowered planned densities, clustered development incentives, open space standards, conservation easements

For the individual land use requests, staff tried to utilize these guidelines when making recommendations. For those requests that either do not fit within these parameters or do not offer a change for the public good (versus the benefit only to the landowner), staff indicated that these should be handled separately outside of the General Plan Update process. Often these types of requests would warrant extensive CEQA review, noticing of the neighbors and opportunities for extensive public comments.

For the "global" changes for each geographic area, staff revised the charts to group these changes by the type of change (i.e. map correction, infill opportunities, change to reflect current land use, etc.) with staff notes describing the change for clarity. The "Map Reference" column corresponds to the location of the proposed change. For the changes from the existing plan, the "map reference" locator will be the name of the map previously provided to the Commission in the Map Book set. There is also an index number that is provided to find each proposed change.

To summarize these changes countywide from Alternative D (existing plan) to Alternative B (proposed plan):

- 17 changes to support existing Agricultural operations - either prime land, zoned AE, or used for agriculture and proposed to be Planned AE or AG (5,691 acres)
- 4 changes of the Land Use designation to reflect existing zoning, plan policy, or existing use (698 acres)
- 6 changes due to a database error in the General Plan Update, not a proposed change (214 acres)
- 7 map corrections (668 acres)

- 3 changes to reflect areas that are planned for annexation by adjacent city (250 acres)
- 18 changes to the land use designation or density to reflect physical constraints (1,073 acres)
- 1 clean up of the boundaries of RCC or VC land use designations to reflect precise mapping (125 acres)
- 44 proposed land use designation changes to reflects current parcelization and use (4,090 acres)
- 32 proposed land use designation changes to reflects existing mix of housing and commercial, industrial reuse, or infill opportunity (432 acres)
- 7 proposed land use designation changes to reflects historic use and surrounding uses (45 acres)
- 25 proposed land use designation or boundary changes to reflects improved constraints mapping (787 acres)
- 4 proposed land use designation changes to reflect public or quasi public ownership or use (32 acres)
- 11 proposed land use designation changes to reflect surrounding residential uses and/or density (1,135 acres)
- 11 proposed density and land use designation changes intended to match parcel size standard of zoning classification (618 acres)
- 23 proposed Rural Residential land use designation applied where rural land is used primarily for residential purposes and area is zoned "U"(4,189 acres)

Proposed Review Process

For the hearing of January 26th staff will provide a presentation illustrating all the mapping changes proposed countywide. Staff has provided a summary of these changes noted above for Plan Alternative B (the proposed alternative). The Countywide changes are also included in the Voting Chart summarized for each geographic area by type of change (map correction, change reflects public ownership, etc.) and assigned index numbers to aid in review. Staff will highlight these changes during the presentation for better understanding by both the public and the Commission.

Staff believes these changes reflect the Board direction for the proposed plan. Staff therefore recommends that the Commission utilize the "short list" process for the map changes similar to those of the policy decisions. For those mapping changes not "pulled" by the staff or the Commission, these items are approved as a slate of mapping recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. All others will undergo Commission deliberation and straw votes.

Please Note: Because the Planning Commission deleted the Ranchlands (AGR) designation from the Planning Commission Hearing Draft as a Land Use Classification (see Attachment C), staff recommends that for those areas in Alternative B planned AGR on the maps, the Commission vote for the "C" Alternative mapping, where these lands are designated Agriculture Grazing (AG).

Appendix C –Community Area Plans Policy Extract

Appendix C contains the Community Area Plan policies "extracted" from the existing Community Plans. Appendix C was posted to the GPU website in 2008 and has been scheduled for review at the same time as the proposed map changes. Staff prepared a "strikethrough" version of the proposed plan policies in order to be transparent of any changes to the Community Plans. This was included as Attachment B in the January 24th staff report. Staff referenced in **red** the proposed changes to the policy language. If the existing language has been altered from the original text (or

deleted), staff also illustrated the change with strikethrough (for deletion) and underlining (for additions) in **red**, with a note **highlighted in yellow** explaining the change at the end of the policy.

Attachments:

- Attachment 1. Proposed Revisions to Section 1.6, Economy
- Attachment 2. Plan Development Capacity Estimates
- Attachment 3. Revised Voting chart

Previously Distributed Materials for Meeting:

Map Books (previously provided to the Commission):

- Countywide Maps containing Alternative B (the proposed alternative)
- Countywide Maps illustrating Alternatives A/B/C proposed designations
- Countywide Maps illustrating differences in Alternative B (the proposed alternative) with Alternative D (the Framework Plan)
- Maps of property owner land use requests Revised Voting Chart for proposed Map Changes (includes individual land use requests)
- Revised and/or additional Maps for the Land Use Requests

CD with land use request letters and index

Appendix C of 2008 Draft General Plan Update - Community Plan Extract

Compilation of existing Community Plan Policies – noting proposed changes

Draft Planning Commission recommendations on Section 4.7 Land Use Classifications, from the PC meeting September, 2010

Background information on the draft Land Use Maps

The draft land use maps) for each alternative, the Community Plan Policy Extract (Appendix) C and all Background reports can be found at Community Development Services, Planning Division, 3015 H Street, Eureka, California, and on the County's website at <http://www.planupdate.org>.

For more information, contact Martha Spencer, Senior Planner at (707) 268-3704 or m Spencer@co.humboldt.ca.us.

Attachment 1

Proposed Revisions to Section 1.6, Economy

Please note: underline denotes additions, strikethrough denotes deletions

1.6 Economy

The Humboldt County economy has undergone significant diversification and restructuring. Resource production has declined but timber, dairy farming, cattle ranching, and fishing continue to contribute substantially to the economy and serve as its export base, while new local industries have emerged that generate more knowledge-based, specialty, and technology-driven products and services. Habitat restoration, sustainable forest management, organic milk production, and computer network services are all examples of innovative local products and services.

In the Framework General Plan of 1984, the economic development element reflected the realities of the downturn in the timber and fishing industries. The contraction of these sectors has leveled off in the last decade. The fishing industry has shrunk by two-thirds. Though hit hard by the recent national recession, the forest products industry has provided approximately 11% of the direct payroll in the County today, about equal to the education and research and health care industries.

Though the traditional resource production industries have declined, they still play a vital role in the local economy. Their contributions are substantial and can remain so for many decades to come. Therefore, it is vital that the County retain an essential quantity, or "critical mass," of land and infrastructure to allow the forest products, agriculture, and fishing industries to remain viable.

Quality of life is one of Humboldt County's most important assets for economic development. "Quality of life" can relate to almost every aspect of our lives, from public safety to natural beauty, and may be defined differently for different people. In economic terms, quality of life is primarily and inextricably linked to the workforce. It is about the value inherent in the natural, the built, and the cultural environments that attract creative, entrepreneurial talent. Research on rural economies consistently shows that rivers, beaches, forests, mountains, and a community "sense of place" are highly attractive to talented, innovative, creative people who are deciding where to live and start a business. In short, communities that emphasize social and cultural amenities are attractive to talented workers and entrepreneurial businesses.

Attachment 2 Plan Development Capacity Estimates

Table 4-1 Land Use Designation	Alternative A			Alternative C		
	Acres	Units at Buildout		Acres	Units at Buildout	
		Expected	Maximum		Expected	Maximum
Residential						
RM	568	1,659	6,669	701	2,658	9,815
RL	9,783	7,565	26,108	10,372	9,306	32,128
Sub Total	10,351	9,224	32,777	11,072	11,964	41,943
RE	10,209	496	1,462	14,249	837	3,769
RR	158,042	1,923	3,767	164,569	2,193	5,240
Sub Total	168,250	2,419	5,229	178,818	3,030	9,009
Total Residential	178,601	11,643	38,006	189,891	14,994	50,952
Commercial						
CG	341	0	0	415	0	0
CS	353	0	0	528	0	0
CR	1,411	0	0	1,582	0	0
Total Commercial	2,104	0	0	2,525	0	0
Mixed Use & Urban Reserve						
MU	421	496	4,498	8	0	34
VC	293	19	307	167	6	89
RCC	1,439	128	2,968	1,801	177	3,829
UR	121	4	191	265	49	685
Total Mixed Use/UR	2,274	647	7,964	2,241	232	4,637
Industrial						
IG or MG	1,787	0	0	2,276	0	0
IR	178	0	0	270	0	0
MC	513	0	0	944	0	0
MB	44	0	0	30	0	0
Total Industrial	2,522	0	0	3,519	0	0
Resource Production						
T	895,226	1,628	2,879	888,679	5,734	19,781
AE	63,455	308	153	63,137	305	1,610
AG or AGR	392,736	2,244	2,157	387,153	2,597	16,751
Total Resource Prod.	1,351,417	4,180	5,189	1,338,969	8,636	38,142
Open Space						
CF	2,678	0	0	2,610	0	0
CFR	603	0	0	603	0	0
NR	9,207	0	0	9,132	0	0
OS	489	0	0	285	0	0
PF	4,631	0	0	4,630	0	0
P	565,361	0	0	565,544	0	0
PR	11,672	0	0	11,612	0	0
Other	136,112	0	0	136,112	0	0
Total Open Space	730,753	0	0	730,526	0	0
Grand Total	2,267,672	16,470	51,159	2,267,672	23,862	93,731

Table 4-2 Land Use Designation	Framework General Plan			Proposed General Plan Update		
	Acres	Units		Acres	Units	
		Expected	Max Buildout		Expected	Max Buildout
Residential						
RM	521	1,176	5,895	632	2,191	8,129
RL	11,444	5,311	27,327	10,057	8,342	28,877
Sub Total	11,965	6,487	33,222	10,689	10,533	37,006
RE	13,530	871	2,945	12,230	571	1,834
RR	168,133	2,064	4,400	159,844	1,979	4,210
Sub Total	181,663	2,935	7,345	172,074	2,550	6,044
Total Residential	193,628	9,422	40,567	182,763	13,083	43,050
Commercial						
CG	413	0	0	350	0	0
CS	592	1	0	448	0	0
CR	1,277	0	0	1,450	0	0
Total Commercial	2,282	1	0	2,249	0	0
Mixed Use & Urban Reserve						
MU	3	0	0	351	410	3,849
VC	177	6	10	293	19	307
RCC	939	87	180	1,710	168	3,654
UR	50	1	32	337	52	884
Total Mixed Use/UR	1,168	94	222	2,691	649	8,694
Industrial						
IG or MG	3,530	0	0	1,869	0	0
IR	136	0	0	191	0	0
MC	1,206	0	0	899	0	0
MB	30	0	0	44	0	0
Total Industrial	4,902	0	0	3,003	0	0
Resource Production						
T	900,978	5,872	19,601	893,470	5,058	19,892
AE	63,006	347	884	64,230	309	1,631
AG or AGR	414,617	2,737	17,341	388,944	2,268	5,042
Total Resource Prod.	1,378,600	8,956	37,826	1,346,644	7,635	26,565
Open Space						
CF	1,256	69	0	2,610	0	0
CFR	314	0	0	603	0	0
NR	12,484	6	0	9,169	0	0
OS	0	0	0	339	0	0
PF	5,612	0	0	4,631	0	0
P	529,801	1	0	565,361	0	0
PR	9,581	0	0	11,607	0	0
Other	128,043	0	0	136,002	0	0
Total Open Space	687,091	76	0	730,322	0	0
Grand Total	2,267,672	18,549	78,615	2,267,672	21,367	78,309

Land Use and Development Estimates

Existing land use conditions represent on-the-ground uses in 2008 as reported in County assessor's data. This EIR uses the existing land use conditions data as a baseline from which to determine environmental impacts of the proposed General Plan Update and its alternatives.

To project the density and intensity of development under Alternatives A, B, C, and D, two assumptions are made: (1) Future development will occur at the same densities and intensities at which current land uses have developed; and (2) all developable property will be developed by 2030.

Expected vs. Maximum Buildout Estimates

To estimate population, dwelling units, and commercial space at buildout of the GPU alternatives, the County used the midpoint of the permitted density/intensity range for each land use category based on the estimated net developable acreage for that category (after subtracting physical constraints). The use of the midpoint was based on an analysis of past developed patterns. Development in unincorporated Humboldt County tends to be at the midpoint or less of the permitted General Plan density/intensity ranges. Values generated (referred to as "Expected") for both the Proposed Plan and the Alternatives are used to describe the density and intensity of development in the environmental impact analysis described in Chapter 3 and in this Chapter.

Maximum Buildout estimates are also presented for each alternative and represent the highest theoretical amount of development that would be possible under each alternative. These estimates use the highest density and intensity allowed by the plan to predict buildout. The Maximum Buildout estimates generate substantially more dwelling units, commercial square footage, and population growth than the predicted ("Expected") capacity of each alternative. Although it is extremely unlikely that maximum buildout could occur, such a scenario must be analyzed to demonstrate the highest possible level of environmental impact that could result from the project. For this reason, the Maximum Buildout estimates are also utilized in analyses contained in this EIR.

**Attachment 3
Revised Voting Chart**

Draft Land Use Maps – PC Voting Charts – for January 24, 2012 PC Meeting

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas				PC Vote R,M,D
Humboldt Bay Area: <i>Includes Unincorporated Eureka, Arcata, Fields Landing, Manila/Samoa, Freshwater/Indianola and Surrounding Areas</i>				
Land use Requests – staff supports				
Index #	Property Owner	Proposed GPU and Requested Change	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	
1	BI INVESTMENTS LLC (Mike Atkins)	Alternative B is RR 5-20, owner wants a "T" designation to reflect conservation easement	Request consistent with Proposed Plan - staff supports change	
9	Jacoby Creek valley (Lisa Brown)	Alternative B is RR5-20, commenter wants Alternative A (AE)	Plan could allow request - Commission consideration needed	12-08-11 Yes – change to AE
Land Use Requests – Commission decision				
Index #	Property Owner	Proposed GPU and Requested Change	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	
2	BUTLER HAROLD F & SHIRLEY E TR	Alternative B is AE; owner wants to maintain subdivision rights associated with existing AG zoning	Commission consideration needed	12-08-11 Alt B; No change keep AE
3	KONICKE RONALD G & BARBARA A TR	Alternative B is CR, Owner wants IG	Existing Coastal Plan is CR, staff recommends no change, warrants project level review	
4	MONTGOMERY H LARRY & FRANCES	Alternative B is AEG160; owner wants RE-2.5 or RE-5 to allow subdivision	Existing Coastal Plan is AEG160, Request does not fit within any of the Alternatives, warrants project level review	
5	ULANSEY LEE R	Alternative B is T (zoned TPZ) owner wants some RR5-20 to allow subdivision.	Alternative C accommodates request, Commission consideration	12-08-11 Alt B; No change

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas				PC Vote R,M,D
Humboldt Bay Area: <i>Includes Unincorporated Eureka, Arcata, Fields Landing, Manila/Samoa, Freshwater/Indianola and Surrounding Areas</i>				
				Separate GPA
6	CARLSON GENEVIEVE (Buttermilk Lane)	Alternative B is UR/RE2.5-5, property owners do not want UR, would like to retain 5 acre parcel sizes	Current Plan designation is Urban Expansion Commission consideration needed	12-08-11 Yes – change to RE-5 Alt A
7	CASERZA STEVEN	Alternative B is AE/T, owner wants RR40 to allow for subdivision. Beatrice area.	Area is an agricultural/timber area. Not a change appropriate for this countywide plan amendment process. Owner can pursue an individual GP amendment.	
8	SCHNEIDER DAVID; neighbors	Alternative B is RR5-20/RR20, owner wants Alt B or C (RE 2.5-5); Neighbors want T (Alt A)	Based on Commission discussion and neighborhood input, staff recommends keeping it T, defer to separate process for project level review.	1-5-12 Ind GPA
8	Public comments on 1-5-12	Owned 20 years – slide out of TPZ in 1992 into AE. Subdivision in 1992 the AE portion. Petition for a GPA in 1992 for the remainder. Read from staff report.	PC Discussion: 1-5-12 C. Faust recommends that this be a separate process. Commissioners support.	1-5-12 Ind GPA
92	Green Diamond Resource Co	Alternative B is T, owner requests RR5-20 Greenwood Heights Dr.	PC Discussion: 1-5-12 Based on the Commission's action on the Ulansey request, staff recommends Alt B remain T Masten – support RR5-20 for the triangle. But keep T for remainder. Faust – Alt B for T, does not support RR5-20 for triangle – wants to be put in T. Alt A. Kreb also, Masten – why does the Company want it in RR? Craig – wants RR5-20, even in TZP and in timber, this is a small parcel for the Co. it	1-5-12 Keep as is. Change triangle to T (alt A)

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas				PC Vote R,M,D
Humboldt Bay Area: <i>Includes Unincorporated Eureka, Arcata, Fields Landing, Manila/Samoa, Freshwater/Indianola and Surrounding Areas</i>				
			<p>becomes more difficult to manage because it is isolated, small. Nelson – is the triangle TPZ (no – AG B-5(5) Faust – next to forest, I think triangle is wrong. Kreb, Disiere, Gearheart and Nelson supports Faust – should all be T. Masten, Edmonds – does not support Faust. Alt B.</p>	
93	Green Diamond Resource Co	Alternative B is T, owner requests RR5-20 on this 130 acres. Aldergrove Rd area	Property was rolled out of TPZ to AG-B5(20) in 2005. Current GP is RE and OS. Arcata has an interest in acquisition. Staff could support RR5-20 on portion that is RE in current plan (see Map 93A)	1-5-12 PC supports change
93	Craig Comptom with Green Diamond Resource Co	Distinction – this property is on the opposite side of greenwood heights road and is in the JCCP. This rollout from TPZ in 2005, wants RR designation for this property. Don't want T designation – staff recommends change to RR5-20.	PC Discussion: 1-5-12 Applicant agrees with staff recommendation for #93 TH - This will probably become community forest. Kreb – supports staff recommendation RR5-20 and OS for those slopes over 30% - all supports this change. All support.	See above
No #	Karen Brooks 404-101-52	Public Comments: 1-24-12 Jacoby Creek area – I was told that it is being changed to RR5-20 and want to keep it 2.5 acre minimum. Change would affect property values.	PC Discussion: 1-24-12 Staff stated that it is in the Jacoby Creek Plan which is currently RR5-20. this has been in place since 1982. We are not proposing a change to this area. Road, water and neighborhood concerns. Straw Vote: keep as is. To change would require a CPA	Keep as is.

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas			PC Vote R,M,D
Humboldt Bay Area: <i>Includes Unincorporated Eureka, Arcata, Fields Landing, Manila/Samoa, Freshwater/Indianola and Surrounding Areas</i>			
Major changes from existing plan			
Map Reference	Index Number	Proposed Change	Staff Remarks/ Implementation
Agricultural land - either prime land, zoned AE, or used for agriculture and proposed to be Planned AE or AG			
Arcata - Bottoms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 9-73 Alt D = GEN IND/MED DENS RES, Alt B = AE Arcata Sphere of Influence area, Reflects Ag soils and Ag uses ▪ 9-75 Alt D = RV/RL, Alt B = AE Arcata Sphere of Influence area, Reflects Ag soils and Ag uses 		
Fields Landing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 18-129 Alt D = AR-10, Alt B = AE Elk River prime agricultural land 		
Land use designation changed to reflect existing zoning, plan policy, or existing use			
Bayside	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 13-77 Alt D = RS, Alt B = RE2.5-5 Jacoby Creek urban/rural parcel size ▪ 13-78 Alt D = RS, Alt B = RE2.5-5 Jacoby Creek urban/rural parcel size 		
Map correction			
Indianola/ Myrtle town	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 15-79 Alt D = AS, Alt B = RL Indianola area, MH park ▪ 15-80 Alt D = RL, Alt B = RE2.5-5 Indianola area, large lot single family residential 		
General Plan Update database error, not a proposed change			
Bayside	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 13-83 Alt D = T, Alt B = RR5-20 Prior immediate TPZ rezone, no change 		
Proposed land use designation reflects existing mix of housing and commercial, industrial reuse, or infill opportunity			
South Eureka	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 16-108 Alt D = RL(700 UNIT MAX), Alt B = MU Reflects Ridgewood Village proposal ▪ 16-110 Alt D = RL(700 UNIT MAX), Alt B = MU Reflects Ridgewood Village proposal ▪ 16-112 Alt D = RL(700 UNIT MAX), Alt B = MU Reflects Ridgewood Village proposal ▪ 16-113 Alt D = RL, Alt B = MU Reflects Ridgewood Village proposal ▪ 16-119 Alt D = RV/RE, Alt B = RM Humboldt Hill infill proposal ▪ 16-115 Alt D = CG, Alt B = MU Ridgewood area, historic mixed use area ▪ 16-118 Alt D = RL, Alt B = MU Ridgewood area, historic mixed use area 		
Indianola/ Myrtle town	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 15-85 Alt D = CG, Alt B = MU Myrtle town, commercial single family residential mix 		

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas		PC Vote R,M,D
Humboldt Bay Area: <i>Includes Unincorporated Eureka, Arcata, Fields Landing, Manila/Samoa, Freshwater/Indianola and Surrounding Areas</i>		
Planned for annexation by adjacent city		
Arcata - Bottoms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 9-74 Alt D = MG, Alt B = RL/UR Arcata Sphere of Influence area, Reflects annexation plans 	
Proposed land use designation reflects current parcelization and use		
Indianola/ Myrtle town	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 15-81 Alt D = AR, Alt B = RE2.5-5 Ole Hanson/Indianola area, average parcel size 3.5 acres ▪ 15-82 Alt D = AL, Alt B = RR10 Ole Hanson area, average parcel size >5 acres 	
Proposed land use designation reflects historic use and surrounding uses		
Indianola/ Myrtle town	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 15-87 Alt D = RL, Alt B = CG Myrtle town, former school building commercial use 	
South Eureka	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 16-105 Alt D = AE, Alt B = RM Spruce Point mobile home park ▪ 16-116 Alt D = RM, Alt B = RL Ridgewood area, fully developed with single family residential 	
Proposed land use designation or boundary reflects improved constraints mapping		
Fields Landing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 18-123 Alt D = T, Alt B = OS Eggert Tract RL/OS boundary revision ▪ 18-124 Alt D = T, Alt B = OS Eggert Tract RL/OS boundary revision ▪ 18-125 Alt D = RL(240), Alt B = OS Eggert Tract RL/OS boundary revision 	
Freshwater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 17-88 Alt D = RR, Alt B = RE2.5-5 Mitchell Heights, parcel range 0.5 to 10 average = 3.5 acre 	
South Eureka	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 16-100 Alt D = RL, Alt B = OS McKay Tract constraints mapping ▪ 16-101 Alt D = RL(700 UNIT MAX), Alt B = OS Gill/Winzler Tract constraints mapping ▪ 16-102 Alt D = RL(300 UNIT MAX), Alt B = OS Gill/Winzler Tract constraints mapping ▪ 16-103 Alt D = T, Alt B = OS McKay Tract constraints mapping ▪ 16-104 Alt D = RL(700 UNIT MAX), Alt B = OS Gill/Winzler Tract constraints mapping ▪ 16-106 Alt D = RL(700 UNIT MAX), Alt B = OS Gill/Winzler Tract constraints mapping ▪ 16-107 Alt D = RL(700 UNIT MAX), Alt B = OS Proposed land use designation or boundary reflects improved constraints mapping ▪ 16-109 Alt D = RL(700 UNIT MAX), Alt B = OS Gill/Winzler Tract constraints mapping ▪ 16-111 Alt D = RL(700 UNIT MAX), Alt B = OS Gill/Winzler Tract constraints mapping ▪ 16-114 Alt D = RL(240), Alt B = RR5-20 Eggert Tract, steeper slopes ▪ 16-117 Alt D = RL, Alt B = OS Proposed land use designation or boundary reflects improved constraints mapping ▪ 16-120 Alt D = RL(240), Alt B = RR5-20 Eggert Tract, steeper slopes 	

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas		PC Vote R,M,D
Humboldt Bay Area: <i>Includes Unincorporated Eureka, Arcata, Fields Landing, Manila/Samoa, Freshwater/Indianola and Surrounding Areas</i>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 16-121 Alt D = RL(240), Alt B = OS Eggert Tract RL/OS boundary revision ▪ 16-122 Alt D = AR-5, Alt B = OS Eggert Tract RL/OS boundary revision ▪ 16-89 Alt D = T, Alt B = OS Proposed land use designation or boundary reflects improved constraints mapping ▪ 16-96 Alt D = T, Alt B = OS McKay Tract constraints mapping ▪ 16-98 Alt D = RL, Alt B = RM McKay Tract, revised mapping shows greater RM area ▪ 16-99 Alt D = RL, Alt B = OS McKay Tract constraints mapping 	
Proposed land use designation reflects public or quasi public ownership or use		
Manila/Samoa/ Fairhaven	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 12-86 Alt D = MC, Alt B = PF Fairhaven, Samoa Penn FPD land 	
South Eureka	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 16-91 Alt D = RL, Alt B = PR Redwood Ball Fields, Cutten 	
Density and land use designation intended to match parcel size standard of zoning classification		
Freshwater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 17-92 Alt D = AL, Alt B = RR40-160 Mitchell Heights, zoned AE ▪ 17-93 Alt D = T/AL, Alt B = RR40-160 Mitchell Heights, zoned TPZ ▪ 17-94 Alt D = AL, Alt B = RR40-160 Mitchell Heights, zoned AE ▪ 17-95 Alt D = AL, Alt B = RR40-160 Mitchell Heights, zoned AE ▪ 17-97 Alt D = AL, Alt B = RR40-160 Mitchell Heights, zoned AE ▪ 17-88 Alt D = RR, Alt B = RE2.5-5 Mitchell Heights, parcel range 0.5 to 10 average = 3.5 acre 	
Rural residential land use designation applied where rural land is used primarily for residential purposes and area is zoned "U"		
Bayside	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 13-84 Alt D = T/RR, Alt B = RR5-20 Most of parcel is zoned U, improved rural residential 	
Fortuna/Loleta East	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ M-126 Alt D = AG/AL20, Alt B = RR20-160 Kneeland, parcels range from 5-40 acres, average is 35 	

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas				Vote R,M,D
McKinleyville Area: <i>Includes McKinleyville Area, Unincorporated Trinidad, Westhaven Area and Surrounding Areas</i>				
Land use Requests – staff supports				
Index #	Property Owner	Proposed GPU and Requested Change	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	
10	DEPPE DOUGLAS & DEBORAH G L	Alternative B is P, owner wants RR5-20	Staff supports change Map Correction - request consistent with Proposed Plan	PC directed staff to change 12-08-11
16	NORTH SCOTT C & LAUREL G (Michael Bode)	Alternative B is T/RR5-20, owner would like all RR and slide out of TPZ	Staff is not opposed to this change PC Straw votes: Commissioners Faust and Nelson support keeping timberland designation; Commissioners Krebs, Edmonds, Masten, Gearheart support change to RR 5-20.	12-08-11 Yes – change to RR 5-20
19	FLDDBROOK SCHOOL DISTRICT	Alternative B is RR5-20, owner wants PF (Fieldbrook School)	Staff supports map correction	
12	FLDDBROOK CSD	Alternative B is RL1, owner wants PF (Fieldbrook CSD)	Staff supports map correction	
15	REST ANITA H TR (Hooven Ranch subdivision)	Alternative B is RR10; owners wants RR5-20 for 2nd dwelling	Alternative C accommodates request, change was recognized in Housing Element revisions to allow for second residences in this area.	12-08-11 Yes – change to RR5-20
17	DREYER KEVIN R	Alternative B is RR10 and T, owner wants GPU to reflect TPZ boundary	Staff supports change Map Correction to T boundary	
21	SCOLLARD CORRIE L	Alternative B is RE1-5, owner wants to maintain public stable use	Proposed plan is consistent with maintaining ag uses; no change recommended	
22	Stagecoach Road petition	Alternative B is RE 2.5 -5, Petitioners support Alt A for certain Stagecoach Rd areas	Staff supports 5 ac density on northern area; recommend no change to Homan property (See revised map #22)	

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas				Vote R,M,D
McKinleyville Area: <i>Includes McKinleyville Area, Unincorporated Trinidad, Westhaven Area and Surrounding Areas</i>				
94	Green Diamond Resource Co	Alternative B is RE1-5, owner wants CR. Big Lagoon area.	Staff supports this request as it changes this coastal property to a higher priority visitor-serving designation.	1-5-12 All support this change
Land Use Requests – Commission decision				
Index #	Property Owner	Proposed GPU and Requested Change	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	
11	REID LESLIE M et al (Nancy Hueske) Ocean Drive	Alternative B is RL 1-4, neighborhood is concerned with change of density for area	Staff recommends keeping west side Ocean Dr. lots at current RL 0-2 density.	
13	ORLIKOFF LEE et al	Alternative B is RR5-20, Property owner wants RE2.5-5 for his 8.5 ac lot.	Alternative C accommodates request, staff continues to recommend Alt B. Area is adjacent to RE2.5-5 lots.	
14	VANECK FRED M FOREST FOUNDATION	Alternative B is RE2.5-5, suggested land use designation to T to reflect Conservation Easement	Staff supports change subject to confirming conservation easement.	
18	MAAS BRIAN	Alternative B is RE 2.5 – 5, owner wants 1 acre lots. Trinidad/Westhaven area.	Staff does not support 1 acre lots here. No municipal water, and it’s adjacent to resource land.	
20	REINUS JEFFREY & JINNI	Alternative B is AE, Property owner wants RR5-20	Zoned AE, adjacent to resource land, Warrants project level review-refer to individual GP amendment.	
new 12-8	MITCHELL Mike & KAREN	Request entire parcel be changed from RE2.5-5 to RL1	Staff supports west 2/3rds to be RL1 PC Straw Votes: Commissioners Krebs, Masten, Gearheart, Edmonds, Nelson agree to RL-1; Commissioner Faust disagrees – should be considered during subdivision process.	12-08-11 change to RL1 (Alt C)

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas				Vote R,M,D
McKinleyville Area: Includes McKinleyville Area, Unincorporated Trinidad, Westhaven Area and Surrounding Areas				
New 12-8	Kelly Lingreen	Lindgren – 4.33 acre property currently unzoned, with Indian land designation; requests property be designated residential as Rural Estate (RE)	Tom Hofweber – BIA confirmed that parcel is owned fee simple but remains within the boundary of Trinidad Rancheria. The tribe would like this land to continue to be planned as tribal land. Staff would honor tribes request for property within their boundaries to be under the jurisdiction of the tribe and/or BIA. Staff recommends “tribal lands” as the designation and would support development consistent with adjoining properties.	12-08-11 property to remain as tribal lands
Major changes from existing plan				
Map Reference	Index Number	Proposed Change	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	
Land use designation changed to reflect existing zoning, plan policy, or existing use				
Westhaven/ Trinidad	▪ 25	Alt D = RR(C), Alt B = RE2-5	Trinidad, Patrick’s Pt Rd change L/U to match zone	
McKinleyville Area	▪ N-23	Alt D = RR(A), Alt B = TC	Patrick’s Pt, pending CCC action	
Proposed land use designation or density changed to reflect physical constraints				
McKinleyville Area	▪ N-24	Alt D = RR(A), Alt B = RR20	Patrick’s Pt area	
Proposed land use designation reflects current parcelization and use				
McKinleyville	▪ 7-30	Alt D = AE, Alt B = RE2-5	McKinleyville, Archer Rd., average parcel size ~5 acres	
	▪ 7-32	Alt D = AR(10AC), Alt B = RR5-20	McKinleyville, Hooven/Blake/Norton Rds, average Parcel ~5 ac	
	▪ 7-62	Alt D = RE0-2, Alt B = RL1-4	Ocean Ave area, average parcel size 0.6 acres	
Westhaven/ Trinidad	▪ -27	Alt D = CR, Alt B = RE2.5-5	Trinidad, Patrick’s Pt Rd average parcel size ~3 acres	
Proposed land use designation reflects existing mix of housing and commercial, industrial reuse, or infill opportunity				
McKinleyville	▪ 7-34	Alt D = CS, Alt B = MU	McKinleyville, N side of Murray Rd E side of Central Ave, provides	

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas		Vote R,M,D
McKinleyville Area: <i>Includes McKinleyville Area, Unincorporated Trinidad, Westhaven Area and Surrounding Areas</i>		
	flexibility in future use and transition between uses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7-36 Alt D = RL, Alt B = MU Central Ave S of Reasor Rd, provides flexibility in future use and transition between uses ▪ 7-37 Alt D = CS, Alt B = MU Central Ave S of Reasor Rd, provides flexibility in future use and transition between uses ▪ 7-38 Alt D = CS, Alt B = MU Central Ave N of Bates Rd, provides flexibility in future use and transition between uses ▪ 7-45 Alt D = CS, Alt B = MU McKinleyville Town Center implementation ▪ 7-46 Alt D = CS, Alt B = MU McKinleyville Town Center implementation ▪ 7-48 Alt D = CS, Alt B = MU McKinleyville Town Center implementation ▪ 7-68 Alt D = RL, Alt B = RM McKinleyville School parcel, residential infill 	
Proposed land use designation reflects surrounding residential uses and/or density		
McKinleyville	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7-31 Alt D = AS, Alt B = RL1 McKinleyville, Oliver Rd, owner initiated ▪ 7-64 Alt D = CS, Alt B = RL Central Ave, property owner initiated 	

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas				Vote R/M/D
Southern Humboldt Area: <i>Includes Garberville, Redway, Avenue of the Giants, Briceland/Whitethorn/Shelter Cove, Honeydew/Petrolia and Surrounding Areas</i>				
Land Use Requests – staff supports				
Index #	Property Owner	Proposed GPU and Requested Change	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	
23	GARBERVILLE SANITARY DISTRICT	Alternative B is RL, Property owner wants P (Garberville Sanitary District)	Staff supports change Map Correction - request consistent with Proposed Plan	
24	GARBERVILLE SANITARY DISTRICT	Alternative B is RL, Property owner wants P (Garberville Sanitary District)	Staff supports change Map Correction - request consistent with Proposed Plan	
28	COOK TIMOTHY & KATHRYN	Alternative B is RR5-20/T, owner wants all T	Staff supports change Map Correction - request consistent with Proposed Plan	
33	SERGI JAMES S & HUEGEL ALLISON	Alternative B is RR5-20; owner wants CR	Staff supports plan change to CR Plan to reflect existing permitted uses	
34	GARBERVILLE SANITARY DISTRICT	Alternative B is RR5-20, Property owner wants P (Garberville Sanitary District)	Staff supports change Map Correction - request consistent with Proposed Plan	
30	DAZEY STEPHEN	Alternative B is T, owner wants CS	Staff supports change Map Correction - request consistent with Proposed Plan	Yes – PC supports Alt B
36	Vanden Bossche, Edwin	Alternative B is T; owner wants AG	Staff supports change Request consistent with Proposed Plan – both resource designations Straw vote: Commission approves unanimously Alternative C, AG grazing.	12-08-11 Yes – change to Ag
40	LA BOYTEAUX JOHN C III	Alternative B is AGR, owner wants AE	Staff supports change Map Correction - request consistent with Proposed Plan	
41	STEWART JOHN F	Alternative B is P, owner wants AG	Staff supports change	

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas				Vote R,M,D
Southern Humboldt Area: <i>Includes Garberville, Redway, Avenue of the Giants, Briceland/Whitethorn/Shelter Cove, Honeydew/Petrolia and Surrounding Areas</i>				
			Map Correction - request consistent with Proposed Plan	
43	MILLS MARIE A TR Bonnie Blackberry	Alternative B is MU; owners want to confirmation for the allowance of SFR in the MU designation	Staff supports change Straw vote: approved unanimously to support of multi-use with single family and second unit for Index 43. the Commission approved having SFR and second units as an allowable use for the MU Plan Designation. This is a change in the text version of the Plan.	12-08-11 Yes – change MU to allow SFR
25	MCCLURE WILLIAM H	Alternative B is RR5-20, owner wants to maintain building rights	Staff is supportive of planning this area RE2.5-5, which is more consistent with existing lot sizes.	
27	GARBERVILLE SANITARY DISTRICT	Alternative B is RL, Property owner wants P (Garberville Sanitary District)	Staff supports change Map Correction - request consistent with Proposed Plan	
32	GROSS ROBERT & LYNDA R	Alternative B is RR20; owner wants RR20	No changes needed	
29	EASTWOOD WILLIAM	Alternative B is T, owner wants no zoning change	No changes needed Alternative B would not change existing zoning	
?? new	Gabrielle Roach 107-232-04 and 12	Alternative B is RR-40, owner wants to retain TPZ zoning, CE on 5,000 acres and worries this will affect restoration activities.	Staff indicated that this classification will not affect TPZ.	12-08-12 review and return
			1-25-12: Staff reviewed parcel. Split zone U and TPZ. Recommend a split classification of RR-40/T to follow zoning lines.	
Land Use Requests –Commission decision				
Index #	Property Owner	Proposed GPU and Requested Change	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas				Vote R,M,D
Southern Humboldt Area: <i>Includes Garberville, Redway, Avenue of the Giants, Briceland/Whitethorn/Shelter Cove, Honeydew/Petrolia and Surrounding Areas</i>				
26	CAPUTO NICOLE	Alternative B is RE1-5, Property owner wants RL	No sewer available, Clearly not consistent with Proposed Plan , No change recommended	
31	SHER-SKELTON SAMUELA R & OLSON A EHRE	Alternative B is T, owner wants to change RR40	Plan could allow request - Commission consideration needed	
35	Phillipsville community	Alternative B is CFR, property owners want residential designation	Staff does not support Alternative B is same as current Plan, In the designated floodplain, major CEQA issues	
37	MINER DENNIS (Josh Free)	Alternative B is RR20, owner wants RR5-20 to allow for future subdivision	Staff does not support warrants project level review, Alternative C accommodates request, staff continues to recommend Alt B	
38	DORN FAMILY PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT	Alternative B is T, owner wants RR40	Staff supports keeping T/TPZ-(has NTMP on file) warrants project level review, refer to individual GPA	
39	DAZEY STEPHEN	Alternative B is RR5-20 on lower; RR20-160 on hillside – property owner originally wanted RE2.5-5 on the lower portion, most recent letter states he does not want Alternative A	Staff does not support RE2.5-5 Clearly not consistent with Proposed Plan,) warrants project level review Staff continues to recommend Alternative B	No change PC supports B
	1/5/12	Comments – T will be corrected. yes Another 2		Yes – T will be corrected
42	SOUTHERN HUMBOLDT COMMUNITY PARK	Alternative B is mostly RR5-20	Being handled as a separate GP amendment	

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas				Vote R,M,D
Southern Humboldt Area: <i>Includes Garberville, Redway, Avenue of the Giants, Briceland/Whitethorn/Shelter Cove, Honeydew/Petrolia and Surrounding Areas</i>				
44	SCHEINMAN RICHARD P TR	Alternative B is AG, owner wants RR5-20	Zoned U, planned AG; near some small lots. Warrants project level review-refer to individual GP amendment.	
95	Ali Freeland	Noted floodplain affected a portion of Petrolia	Staff recommends revising Village Center designation in Petrolia to avoid flood hazard.	
96 1-5-12	Stephan Harrow (APN 108-015-11)	See submitted public comment letters - currently has designation as AL40 on portion of property. Would like to keep AL40 portion in the new designation of RR40.	See Victoria Copeland original testimony Tom Hofweber – northern portion is zoned mostly AE. Staff would support RR40 as requested. Victoria is correct and you did approve the RR-40 Straw vote: Commission agreed unanimously with staff recommendation.	Yes – PC supports change to RR-40
New 1-5-12	Randall Sand and Gravel	12-08-11 meeting – see Estelle Fennell testimony	Staff supports a separate GPU – applicant will be applying separately	12-08-11 Ind GPA
New 1-5-12	32-051-19 Dottie Russell	Christian Science Reading Room in Garberville – Now CR owner Wants MU	Parcel is very small – spot zoning – recommendation to stay the same. PC - Consideration at a later date. C. Disiere – would like to consider an expanded area for MU for this area in the future.	Ind GPA
New 1-5-12	Dottie Russell	Wants rural MU instead of CR for Avenue of the Giants in Phillippsville	Staff does not support without a CPA – neighborhood issues. Commissioner Kreb: I support Tom’s comment and need more input. Make every effort to go to Phillippsville. Straw Vote: All support Kreb’s suggestion.	Ind GPA
New 1-5-12	Graham Russell	Phillippsville – CR along road – only five businesses rest is residential – it should be changed to VC. Or MU to allow for SFR	C. Edmonds – is the residential been conversion of commercial (maybe historically – motels)	Ind GPA

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas				Vote R,M,D
Southern Humboldt Area: <i>Includes Garberville, Redway, Avenue of the Giants, Briceland/Whitethorn/Shelter Cove, Honeydew/Petrolia and Surrounding Areas</i>				
New 1-5-12	Bonnie Blackberry 22310103 Alderpoint road and Dyerville Loop road	Alternative B is RR40 – owner would like it to be changed to RR20 -40.	Staff – there will be parcels below the recommended density – we don’t support further density. Framework Plan density is AL40 – no change recommended PC Discussion: C. Edmonds - Are there issues with utilities? TH – issues with water C. Kreb –what is the impact for those that are less than 40 – can they not develop with a home? TH - Zoning is AE B-6 – that’s as small as you can go. Doesn’t hurt anyone’s ability to develop with an SFR. Straw vote: All support staff recommendation to keep as is.	PC Supports staff - no change keep Alt B
1-5-12	Tom Grover	Phillipsville – reconsider the CFR overlay – petition. Floodplain. Zone A Poor people here – APA – don’t zone away the rights of poor people		No
1-5-12	Fern	Phillipsville – CFR – confusion – petitions for CAC’s, CSD would like Tom to come back to Phillipsville for clarity.		No
Major changes from existing plan				
Map Reference	Index Number	Proposed Change	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	
Southern Humboldt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ S-174 ▪ S-175 ▪ S-209 ▪ S-211 ▪ S-212 ▪ S-214 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alt D = AL40, Alt B = AGR Alt D = AL40, Alt B = AG Alt D = AL40, Alt B = AG Alt D = AL40/T, Alt B = AGR Alt D = AL40, Alt B = AGR Alt D = AL40/T/AG, Alt B = AGR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Briceland area, Williamson Act land Briceland area, agricultural/timber Harris/Island Mtn area, very large parcels Harris/Island Mtn area, Williamson Act land Harris/Island Mtn area, Williamson Act land Harris/Island Mtn area, Williamson Act land 	

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas		Vote R,M,D
Southern Humboldt Area: <i>Includes Garberville, Redway, Avenue of the Giants, Briceland/Whitethorn/Shelter Cove, Honeydew/Petrolia and Surrounding Areas</i>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> S-216 Alt D = AL40, Alt B = AGR Harris/Island Mtn area, likely Williamson Act land 	
Map correction		
Petrolia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 28-168 Alt D = P/T, Alt B = RR40 Petrolia area, reflects private ownership 28-169 Alt D = P, Alt B = RR160 Petrolia area, reflects private ownership 	
Southern Humboldt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> S-210 Alt D = T, Alt B = RR5-20 Whitethorn area, average parcel size is 15 acres 	
Proposed land use designation or density changed to reflect physical constraints		
Phillipsville	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 32-173 Alt D = T, Alt B = T Phillipsville, poor access and substantial timber 	
Redway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 34-187 Alt D = AL, Alt B = RR40-160 Redway, proximity to river and slopes 	
Boundaries of RCC or VC land use designations changed to reflect precise mapping		
Southern Humboldt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> S-171 Alt D = AG, Alt B = RCC Honeydew area, existing and developable area 	
Proposed land use designation reflects current parcelization and use		
Petrolia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 28-167 Alt D = AG, Alt B = RR5-20 Petrolia, adjacent to VC ~5 acre average parcel size 	
Redway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 34-186 Alt D = IG, Alt B = CS/IG Redway, existing heavy commercial uses 	
Shelter Cove	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 36-195 Alt D = AL160/P, Alt B = RR40-160 Shelter Cove/Kings Peak Rd., rural residential in holdings ~20 ac 36-197 Alt D = AL160/P/P-M, Alt B = RR40-160 Shelter Cove/Kings Peak Rd., rural residential in holdings ~20 ac 	
Southern Humboldt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> S-193 Alt D = AL160, Alt B = RR40-160 Shelter Cove/Kings Peak Rd., rural residential provides subdivide p S-199 Alt D = AL160, Alt B = RR40-160 Shelter Cove/Kings Peak Rd., rural residential in holdings ~20 ac S-200 Alt D = AL160, Alt B = RR40-160 Shelter Cove/Kings Peak Rd., rural residential in holdings ~20 ac S-201 Alt D = AL160, Alt B = RR40-160 Shelter Cove/Kings Peak Rd., rural residential in holdings ~30 ac S-202 Alt D = AL160/P, Alt B = RR40-160 Shelter Cove/Kings Peak Rd., rural residential in holdings ~20 ac 	

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas		Vote R,M,D
Southern Humboldt Area: Includes Garberville, Redway, Avenue of the Giants, Briceland/Whitethorn/Shelter Cove, Honeydew/Petrolia and Surrounding Areas		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ S-203 Alt D = T, Alt B = RR5-20 Richardson Grove area, rural residential average parcel size 3.5 ▪ S-204 Alt D = AL40, Alt B = RR20 Richardson Grove area, rural residential use average parcel size 15 ▪ S-205 Alt D = AL40, Alt B = RR5-20 Richardson Grove area, rural residential average parcel size 3.5 ▪ S-206 Alt D = AL40, Alt B = CR Richardson Grove area, Hwy commercial uses ▪ S-207 Alt D = AL40, Alt B = CR Richardson Grove area, Hwy commercial uses ▪ S-213 Alt D = AL40, Alt B = CR Richardson Grove area, Hwy commercial uses 	
Proposed land use designation reflects existing mix of housing and commercial, industrial reuse, or infill opportunity		
Redway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 34-184 Alt D = CG, Alt B = MU Proposed land use designation reflects existing mix of housing and commercial, industrial reuse, or infill opportunity infill 	
Proposed land use designation reflects historic use and surrounding uses		
Southern Humboldt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ S-217 Alt D = T, Alt B = IR Benbow area, gravel extraction area 	
Proposed land use designation reflects surrounding residential uses and/or density		
Miranda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 31-172 Alt D = T, Alt B = RR5-20 Miranda area, TPZ slide out in progress 	
Southern Humboldt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ S-181 Alt D = AL40/T, Alt B = RR5-20 Briceland area, slight expansion of residential corridor ▪ S-182 Alt D = AL20, Alt B = RR5-20 Briceland area, slight expansion of residential corridor ▪ S-183 Alt D = T, Alt B = RR5-20 Briceland area, owner initiated residential rezone ▪ S-185 Alt D = T, Alt B = RR5-20 Briceland area, owner initiated residential rezone ▪ S-190 Alt D = T, Alt B = RR40/RR5-20 Briceland area, currently zoned U ▪ S-198 Alt D = T/AL20, Alt B = RR20-160 Benbow area 	
Density and land use designation intended to match parcel size standard of zoning classification		
Garberville/Benbow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 35-194 Alt D = AL20, Alt B = RR40 Garberville area, beyond Kimtu 	
Rural residential land use designation applied where rural land is used primarily for residential purposes and area is zoned "U"		
Alderpoint	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 33-176 Alt D = AG/T, Alt B = RR40 ▪ 33-177 Alt D = AG/AR20-5, Alt B = RR40 ▪ 33-178 Alt D = AG/T, Alt B = RR40 Alderpoint area, limited or no subdivision potential 	

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas			Vote R,M,D
Southern Humboldt Area: <i>Includes Garberville, Redway, Avenue of the Giants, Briceland/Whitethorn/Shelter Cove, Honeydew/Petrolia and Surrounding Areas</i>			
Southern Humboldt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ S-166 Alt D = AG, Alt B = RR40 ▪ S-170 Alt D = AG, Alt B = RR40-16 ▪ S-179 Alt D = AG/T, Alt B = RR20 ▪ S-180 Alt D = AG/T, Alt B = RR40 ▪ S-188 Alt D = AG, Alt B = RR40-160 ▪ S-189 Alt D = AL20, Alt B = RR5-20 ▪ S-191 Alt D = AG/T, Alt B = RR40 ▪ S-192 Alt D = AG, Alt B = RR40 ▪ S-196 Alt D = T, Alt B = RR40 ▪ S-208 Alt D = T, Alt B = RR5-20 ▪ S-215 Alt D = AL40, Alt B = RR5-20 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Petrolia area, Mostly vacant non-TPZ Petrolia area, Alderpoint area, limited or no subdivision potential Alderpoint area, limited or no subdivision potential Alderpoint area, limited or no subdivision potential Briceland area, owner initiated Alderpoint area, limited or no subdivision potential Alderpoint area, limited or no subdivision potential Alderpoint area, limited or no subdivision potential Whitethorn area, Benbow area, large parcel size to be limited by zone 	

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas				Vote R,M,D
Fortuna-Loleta: <i>Includes Unincorporated Fortuna, Ferndale, Rio Dell/Scotia, Loleta and Surrounding Areas</i>				
Land Use Requests – staff supports				
Index #	Property Owner	Proposed GPU and Requested Change	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	
46	Christensen et al 5 parcels outside of Fernbridge	Alternative B is RE2.5-5/AE/CR, owner wants RE 2.5-5	Staff supports change Request consistent with approved LCP amendment,	1-24-12 PC supports change
50	CHRISTENSEN PAUL S TR Rio Dell area	Alternative B is RR5-20\UR, owner wants T	Staff supports change for entire RR5-20\UR area back to T. Rio Dell deleted this proposal from their city plan. See new Map #50	1-24-12 PC supports change
51	TUCKER KENNETH W TR	Alternative B is IG, owner wants RE2.5-5	Staff supports change Adjacent to RE2.5-5, being used as residential not industrial, Request consistent with Proposed Plan principles	
Land Use Requests – Commission decision				
Index #	Property Owner	Proposed GPU and Requested Change	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	
45	HILL EDWARD J & DIANE E TR	Alternative B is T/RR5-20, owner wants RR. Hydesville area.	Property is zoned TPZ, Alternative C partially accommodates request, staff continues to recommend Alt B	
47	GOSELIN LOUIS H TR	Alternative B is AG, Property owner wants RR 5-20 Public Comments: 1-24-12 Bounded by parcels on all sides of 5 acres, in non renewal for WA, next to service district. No useable ag.	In Williamson Act in year 5 of non-renewal, Plan could allow, Close to residential development. Commission decision PC Discussion 1-24-12: All support change to RR5-20	1-24-12 PC supports change to RR5-20
48	RICHARDSON MARVIN P JR & JUDITH T TR	Alternative B is RE2.5-5, Property owner wants RE1-5. Rohnerville Rd.	Staff does not support warrants project level review, Alternative C accommodates request, staff continues to	

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas				Vote R,M,D
Fortuna-Loleta: <i>Includes Unincorporated Fortuna, Ferndale, Rio Dell/Scotia, Loleta and Surrounding Areas</i>				
			recommend Alt B	
49	POLASEK DARREL C & CAROLE A TR	Alternative B is AG, property owner wants RR for second residence or subdivision. Wildcat Rd.	Staff does not support warrants project level review, Surrounding lands are all resource lands planned AG, CEQA issues	Ind. GPA petition
		Public Comments 1-24-12 Wants RR because AG does not fit with the area – no grazing lands, Active Gravel Mining operation will cease in 2016, to hilly for ag use. Would like second residences.	PC Discussion: 1-24-12 Return as a separate Plan Amendment.	
Major changes from existing plan				
Map Reference	Index Number	Proposed Change	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	
Agricultural land - either prime land, zoned AE, or used for agriculture and proposed to be Planned AE or AG				
Carlotta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 24-150 Alt D = AL, Alt B = AE Carlotta area, plan to match zone and use ▪ 24-153 Alt D = AL, Alt B = AE Carlotta area, plan to match zone and use ▪ 24-155 Alt D = AR(12), Alt B = AE Carlotta area, plan to match zone and use 			
Fortuna/Loleta East	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ C-154 Alt D = AL40, Alt B = AGR Bridgeville area, Williamson Act parcels ▪ C-161 Alt D = AR, Alt B = AE Swains Flat, zoned AE/TPZ, contains river ▪ C-162 Alt D = AR, Alt B = AE Swains Flat, zoned AE, contains river 			
Rohnerville-Rio Dell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 22-151 Alt D = AG/AL40/AE, Alt B = AE Metropolitan, non-prime soils used for grazing 			
Database error, not a change				
Carlotta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 24-145 Alt D = T, Alt B = RE2.5-5 Prior immediate TPZ rezone, no change 			
Fortuna	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 21-132 Alt D = MG, Alt B = AE Should be planned NR like adjacent land 			
Planned for annexation by adjacent city				
Fortuna	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 21-133 Alt D = AE, Alt B = UR Reflects proposed Fortuna annexation areas ▪ 21-134 Alt D = IG, Alt B = UR Reflects proposed Fortuna annexation areas 			
Proposed land use designation or density changed to reflect physical constraints				
Rohnerville/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 22-148 Alt D = AR, Alt B = RR40 Metropolitan, rural residential use, timber resources 			

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas		Vote R,M,D
Fortuna-Loleta: <i>Includes Unincorporated Fortuna, Ferndale, Rio Dell/Scotia, Loleta and Surrounding Areas</i>		
Hydesville		
Proposed land use designation reflects current parcelization and use		
Fortuna/Loleta East	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ C-160 Alt D = T, Alt B = RR5-20 Swains Flat, zone U/TPZ parcel size 0.25-8 acres residential average~2 ▪ C-163 Alt D = RL, Alt B = RE1-5 Golden Gate, sewer services not available ▪ M-127 Alt D = AG, Alt B = RR20-160 Kneeland, parcels range from 5-40acresidential average=35 ▪ M-139 Alt D = AG, Alt B = RE2.5-5 Ferndale area, parcels average 4.5 acres 	
Rohnerville/Hydesville	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 22-137 Alt D = AE, Alt B = RE2.5-5 Rohnerville area, rural residential average parcel size ~5 acres ▪ 22-140 Alt D = AE/T, Alt B = IG Carlotta, Yager Camp mill and industrial area ▪ 22-143 Alt D = IG, Alt B = RR10Alton, rural residential use amongst industrial uses 	
Rohnerville-Rio Dell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 22-152 Alt D = AE, Alt B = RE2.5-5 Metropolitan, area containing houses 	
Scotia/Rio Dell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 23-157 Alt D = CON-T-R, Alt B = RR5-20 Rio Dell, Monument area rural residential ▪ 23-158 Alt D = CON-T-R, Alt B = RR5-20 Rio Dell, Monument area rural residential 	
Proposed land use designation reflects existing mix of housing and commercial, industrial reuse, or infill opportunity		
Rohnerville/Hydesville	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 22-142 Alt D = CG, Alt B = VC Proposed land use designation reflects existing mix of housing and commercial, industrial reuse, or infill opportunity infill ▪ 22-144 Alt D = CG, Alt B = VC Proposed land use designation reflects existing mix of housing and commercial, industrial reuse, or infill opportunity infill ▪ 22-147 Alt D = IG, Alt B = MU Proposed land use designation reflects existing mix of housing and commercial, industrial reuse, or infill opportunity infill 	
Proposed land use designation reflects historic use and surrounding uses		
Loleta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 19-131 Alt D = RV, Alt B = AE Loleta, near Fireman's Hall 	
Proposed land use designation or boundary reflects improved constraints mapping		
Rohnerville/Hydesville	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 22-141 Alt D = CR, Alt B = OS Alton, owner initiated change 	
Proposed land use designation reflects public or quasi public ownership or use		
Loleta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 19-130 Alt D = RV/AE, Alt B = PF Loleta Fireman's Hall 	
Density and land use designation intended to match parcel size standard of zoning classification		
Fortuna/Loleta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ C-164 Alt D = AE, Alt B = RR40 Bridgeville area, vacant residential and improved rural 	

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas			Vote R,M,D
Fortuna-Loleta: <i>Includes Unincorporated Fortuna, Ferndale, Rio Dell/Scotia, Loleta and Surrounding Areas</i>			
East	residential 40 acre		
Rohnerville/ Hydesville	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 22-146 Alt D = T, Alt B = RR40 Metropolitan, rural residential use, timber resources 		
Rural residential land use designation applied where rural land is used primarily for residential purposes and area is zoned "U"			
Ferndale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 20-135 Alt D = AG, Alt B = RR5-20 ▪ 20-136 Alt D = AG, Alt B = RR5-20 	Owner initiated, appropriate for RR expansion Owner initiated, appropriate for RR expansion	
Fortuna/Loleta East	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ C-149 Alt D = AE, Alt B = RR5-20 ▪ C-159 Alt D = AG, Alt B = RR40 ▪ M-128 Alt D = AG, Alt B = RR20-160 ▪ M-138 Alt D = AG, Alt B = RR5-20 ▪ S-165 Alt D = AG, Alt B = RR40 	Ferndale area, Price Creek limited development potential Bridgeville area, average parcel approx 40 acres Kneeland, parcels range from 5-40acresidential average=35 Ferndale area, Williams Creek portion of 45 acre parcel Bridgeville area, average parcel approx 40 acres	

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas				Vote R,M,D
Highway 299 East: <i>Includes Unincorporated Blue Lake, Glendale Willow Creek and Surrounding Areas</i>				
Land Use Requests – staff supports				
Index #	Property Owner	Proposed GPU and Requested Change	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	
52	ALVERNAZ SUZANNE M & OBANKS THOMAS	Alternative B is CG, owner wants CS Glendale area.	Staff supports change Request consistent with Proposed Plan –	
53	ALVERNAZ SUZANNE M & OBANKS THOMAS	Alternative B is CG, owner wants CS Glendale area.	Staff supports change Request consistent with Proposed Plan –	
55	MCKINNEY AARON & RENIE (Bernice Huston)	Alternative B is MU, commenter wants MU Glendale area.	No changes needed	
56	HUSTON BERNICE	Alternative B is MU, owner wants MU Glendale area.	No changes needed	
59	JACKSON MARY (Bernice Huston)	Alternative B is MU, commenter wants MU Glendale area.	No changes needed	
57	DOBREC VICTOR A JR & ELLA M	Alternative B is OS/CF, owner wants RE1- 5/CF. Willow Ck area.	Staff supports change Map Correction - request consistent with Proposed Plan	
61	ABLER WILLIAM L & EHLERT-ABLER PATRIC	Alternative B is RE2.5-5; owners want to maintain ag uses, limit lot splits. Warren Ck area	Existing AG zoning would not change; no change recommended	
66	GUINTOLI PAUL	Alternative B is RE2.5-5; owners want to maintain ag uses, limit lot splits. Warren Ck area	Existing AG zoning would not change; no change recommended	
67	KINZER DAVID C & ROBIN C TR	Alternative B is RE2.5-5; owners want to maintain ag uses, limit lot splits. Warren Ck area	Existing AG zoning would not change; no change recommended	
69	SMITH THOMAS A	Alternative B is RE2.5-5; owners want to	Existing AG zoning would not change; no	

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas				Vote R,M,D
Highway 299 East: <i>Includes Unincorporated Blue Lake, Glendale Willow Creek and Surrounding Areas</i>				
	& SUSAN D	maintain ag uses, limit lot splits. Warren Ck area	change recommended	
83	TONKIN ARTHUR K CONSTRUCTION INC	Alternative B is RL1; owner wants commercial. Willow Ck area.	Staff supports change to CS or CG	
Land Use Requests – Commission decision				
Index #	Property Owner	Proposed GPU and Requested Change	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	
54	SAWATZKY KENT & TERESA	Alternative B is AE, owner wants residential Willow Ck area. (Glendale area)	Staff does not support Clearly not consistent with Proposed Plan, planned and zoned for resource production, warrants project level review, CEQA issues	No change Keep AE
54			PC Discussion: 1-5-12 Staff - there is a potential for residential dev in upland areas but that should be a followup map for residential area. We are supportive of AE designation. Kreb – support staff rec Disiere – support staff rec. All support staff.	Keep AE
NEW	SAWATZKY KENT & TERESA	Wants RE1-5 (parents property)	PC Discussion: 1-5-12 Staff - RE1-5 (parents property) Liscomb Hill. Two more lots. Two legal parcels. Could get 5 -6 more lots, within service boundaries. May have trouble getting water.	All support change to RE1-5
60	MORRIS STEVEN S & GWEN K –	Alternative B is CS/IG, commenter concerned about MU across the road, and noise compatibility. Glendale area	Staff continues to recommend Alt B Commission consideration of land use compatibility in Glendale	
62	SHEPHERD BEN & WAHLUND WENDY	Alternative B is CG, owner wants CG; public comment against. Glendale area	No change needed.	

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas				Vote R,M,D
Highway 299 East: <i>Includes Unincorporated Blue Lake, Glendale Willow Creek and Surrounding Areas</i>				
63	RIBAR-COX TIMBERLANDS LP	Alternative B is RR5-20; owner wants Alternative C (RE2.5-5) for 38 acre parcel. Glendale / Liscomb Hill area	Alternative C accommodates request, staff continues to recommend Alt B	Okay w/split between RR 5 and T new map on 1-24-12
63	Merritt Lindrom-Ribar -Cox 1-5-12	Public Comments 1-5-12: 31205146 – timber co. bought this and cleaned it up and planted trees. Derelict MH on property, clean up costs for trailer want to re-coup for a subdivision. has sewer and water, wants to cluster parcels near road and keep in timberlands.	PC Discussion on 1-5-12: Staff - Zoned U, not TPZ David Blackwell – said they had done extensive planning on the property – reforestation. Support parcels as small as 2.5 if remainder would be timber	On 1-5-12 GPA
63		Public Comments 1-24-12: Owner submitted a new map that showed a split between RR5 and T	PC Discussion on 1-24-12 – Staff supports new map Straw Vote – all support change	PC supports
64	MERCER FRASER COMPANY	Alternative B is IR and CR, owner wants IR/MH on entire property Willow Ck area.	Alternative C could accommodate request, but warrants project level review. Staff continues to recommend Alt B based on community input. Should the plan support this industrial operation for entire parcel?	
1-5-12	Mercer Frasier See letter submitted 1-5-12	Essex parcels – see letter. No index number – recommended Alt B would be IR – support that. Willow Creek - #64 – in mineral resource use for 50 years. CUP extension. Wants Alt C. Alt B not consistent with existing operations. Split designations are difficult to manage over time. Want to know why if it is	See discussion below. Essex site was looked at carefully when it was before the Commission for vested rights. Has been used since the 30's – the IR is appropriate. Allows processing. Masten – we need to be consistent – IR versus CFR. Willow Creek site – we designated the	All Support IR for Essex Ind GPA

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas				Vote R,M,D
Highway 299 East: <i>Includes Unincorporated Blue Lake, Glendale Willow Creek and Surrounding Areas</i>				
		not the case of not IR.	operational area as IR but not the entire ownership. Public access site here. Old air strip here. Community plan was CR with community input. They would not like to see the expansion of the footprint. Disiere – how about GPA? Yes All support.	Keep IR on a portion Alt B
New 1-5-12	51617107 Blue lake Eureka ready mix Paul Krauss	Gravel operators would like specific zoning for processing of gravel. Along the Mad River. Mapping splits processing plant with Request to work with staff to be consistent with parcels. Upland portion is zoned AE, lower is CFR. Wants AE for the CFR portion where their shop is - or be IR. Rec plan does say go back to ag. Rob - This has been operations since the 60's and should be treated like the Essex site – arbitrary. If you have a different zoning you are treated differently along the way.	AE zoning, Resource designation plan designation. These have CUP's and the reclamation plan is to restore to AE use. We support this as designating this to IR, but you would be changing the course for the rec plans. We planned the river channel, CFR, which allows mining. They do have an entitlement to take gravel, they have expanded, do processing that is permanent. Are issues with these sites that deserve consideration. Could qualify the zoning. Kirk – we may need to look at this long term planning – work with the industry as a whole. C. Faust – while it may be desirable to head to some goal, this has not been analyzed. This process in not the right process. GPA. Staff recommends CFR? TH – we may want to just keep as AE for the whole site and return PC supports staff.	Ind GPA Change CFR to AE
65	COHEN EDWARD	Alternative B is RR5-20; owner wants RE2.5-5 to allow for future subdivision. Warren Ck area	Current plan is 1 acre dispersed housing. Staff is not opposed to this change.	

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas				Vote R,M,D
Highway 299 East: <i>Includes Unincorporated Blue Lake, Glendale Willow Creek and Surrounding Areas</i>				
68	THOMAS CYNTHIA T CO-SUC-TR	Alternative B is RM, owner wants Alternative A (RL) Glendale area	Plan could allow request - Commission consideration needed	PC supports change to RL
68		Public Comments 1-24-12: Vince Thomas requested RL instead of RM	PC Discussion on 1-24-12 – Sewer is a problem, currently planned AG, good area for RM (next Straw Vote – all support change	PC supports change to RL
70	SAWATZKY KENT D & TERESA B	Alternative B is RR5-20; wants to change RE 1-5 to allow for future subdivision. Willow Ck area.	Staff does not support warrants project level review, Alternative C accommodates request, staff continues to recommend Alt B	No change
54/ 70	Bob Brown giving testimony	1-5-12 - testimony 4 properties under consideration. Submitted a summary sheet. Lack of consistency on how properties were designated. Those adjacent to prime ag soils. Lot of confusion. These proposed designations will create non conforming lots. Need clear policy to allow the use to continue. Will submit Powerpoint in writing. There should be opportunity to allow clustering an keep AE. #70 AE – want RE 1-5 (40 acres) Buckly Road – Unclassified zone – 1963 map Wants 2.5 - 5 Glendale Drive – 3 properties, 2.5 – 5 want 1-5 acres. Have water, #54 – in prime ag/flood zone – now AE, was in dispersed housing – want Alt C 1-5 acres. Lack of consistency on our zoning. AE – CR, RF and MS all live on prime ag soil.	This is a steeply sloped property. For the most part this is not suitable for 1 acre lots, RR5-20, zoned AG B-10. Not appropriate for 1 acre lots. Could support All support staff recommendation	No change

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas				Vote R,M,D
Highway 299 East: <i>Includes Unincorporated Blue Lake, Glendale Willow Creek and Surrounding Areas</i>				
No #	Kent Sawatsky 1-24-12	Public Comments: 1-24-12 Referring to discussion for 1-5-12 meeting – didn't have the APN for the fourth parcel – his parent's property – APN 312-043-18 – also had 3 petitions from neighbors to change this area to RE2.5 -5.	Staff comments: This area is planned and zoned for timber under 1968 plan. We do not support increasing density here. Steep terrain and road issues. Straw Votes: All support keeping RR 5-20 except C. Edmonds who supports RE2.5-5	No change – keep Alt B RR5-20
71	JURIN CHARLES R & BILLIE J TR	Alternative B is T, owner wants to change RL to allow for residential subdivision Willow Ck area.	Staff does not support Not consistent with Proposed Plan principles, needs individual petition, no change recommended	
72	DOBREC VICTOR A JR & ELLA M	Alternative B is AE, owner want to remain RL1 (RE1-5) (Alt C, D); Alt B = AE Willow Ck area.	Currently planned and zoned for 1 acre lots. Appears to be good productive farm land.	
73	ROHN ALEXANDER D & JILL M	Alternative B is RR 5-20, Property owner wants RE2.5-5 for future division Blue Lake area.	Staff does not support Alternative C accommodates request, warrants project level review, staff continues to recommend Alt B	
74	GERBER TRUST & GLEASON TRUST	Alternative B is AG; owner wants RR5-20 Willow Ck area.	Staff does not support Alternative C accommodates request, warrants project level review, staff continues to recommend Alt B	
75	PLEVIN STEPHEN R & SHERRY K	Alternative B is RE2.5-5; owner wants to subdivide. Blue Lake area.	Staff does not support Alternative C accommodates request, warrants project level review, staff continues to recommend Alt B	
76	SHANNON PATRICK E & KATHERINE M O	Alternative B is RE2.5-5; owner wants to add cabins Willow Ck area.	Staff supports. A plan change to CR would be acceptable; adjacent to CS, good hwy frontage.	
77	PHILLIPS NOLEN R WRSE	Alternative B is T, owner wants RR1-5 Willow Ck area.	Staff does not support Not consistent with Proposed Plan principles,	

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas				Vote R,M,D
Highway 299 East: <i>Includes Unincorporated Blue Lake, Glendale Willow Creek and Surrounding Areas</i>				
			planned and zoned for resource production, slope constraints.	
78	ROVERSI ANN	Alternative B is AG, property owner wants RR Redwood Valley	Alternative C accommodates request, small lots in vicinity, but surrounding area all planned AG, neighborhood opposition; staff continues to recommend Alt B	
79	NEW RIVER TIMBER CO INC	Alternative B is T, owner wants CG or IG Willow Ck area.	Not consistent with Proposed Plan principles, planned and zoned for resource production, Not a change appropriate for this countywide plan amendment process. Owner can pursue an individual GP amendment.	
80	SHANNON KATHERINE	Alternative B is T, owner wants RR1-5 Willow Ck area.	Not consistent with Proposed Plan principles, planned and zoned for resource production, Not a change appropriate for this countywide plan amendment process. Owner can pursue an individual GP amendment.	
81	SHANNON PATRICK	Alternative B is T, owner wants RR1-5 Willow Ck area.	Not consistent with Proposed Plan principles, planned and zoned for resource production, Not a change appropriate for this countywide plan amendment process. Owner can pursue an individual GP amendment.	
82	SHANNON PATRICK	Alternative B is T/RR40-160, owner wants RR1-5 for more housing Willow Ck area.	Not consistent with Proposed Plan principles, planned and zoned for resource production, Not a change appropriate for this countywide plan amendment process. Owner can pursue an individual GP amendment.	
91	Green Diamond Resource Co	Alternative B is T, owner wants RR5-20. Blue Lake area.	Small 9 acre holding of TPZ fragmented by Hwy 299, however it is adjacent to other land	Keep as is

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas				Vote R,M,D
Highway 299 East: <i>Includes Unincorporated Blue Lake, Glendale Willow Creek and Surrounding Areas</i>				
	New for 1-5-12		planned T. Mapping incorrectly show portion as PF, needs correction. Staff recommends it remain T.	
91	Craig Compton Green Diamond	1-5-12 Testimony: Small parcel, should be changed.	C. Disiere – supports the staff, stay T Faust, Gearheart, Kreb support Disiere, Edmonds, Masten, Nelson (keep as T).	Keep as is
Major changes from existing plan				
Map Reference	Index Number	Proposed Change	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	
General Plan Update database error, not a proposed change				
Willow Creek - North	▪ 5-41	Alt D = AS, Alt B = RE2.5-5	Willow Creek, no change in use or density	
Map correction				
Willow Creek - North	▪ 5-44	Alt D = P, Alt B = RL1	Willow Creek, reflects private ownership	
Proposed land use designation or density changed to reflect physical constraints				
Hwy 299 East	▪ -40	Alt D = AR20-5, Alt B = RR20	Willow Cr, Brannon Mtn area, average parcel size ~20 acres	
	▪ -63	Alt D = AR20-5, Alt B = RR20	Willow Cr, Brannon Mtn area, average parcel size ~20 acres	
Willow Creek - North	▪ 5-33	Alt D = RL(1), Alt B = RR5-20	Willow Creek, Patterson Rd rural residential and agricultural	
	▪ 5-35	Alt D = RL(1), Alt B = RR5-20	Willow Creek, Patterson Rd rural residential and agricultural	
	▪ 5-42	Alt D = AS, Alt B = AG	Willow Creek, WCCSD critical water supply	
	▪ 5-43	Alt D = AS, Alt B = AG	Willow Creek, WCCSD critical water supply	
	▪ 5-47	Alt D = AR, Alt B = AG	Willow Creek, WCCSD critical water supply	
	▪ 5-49	Alt D = AR, Alt B = AG	Willow Creek, WCCSD critical water supply	
	▪ 5-54	Alt D = CR, Alt B = AG	Willow Creek, WCCSD critical water supply	
Willow Creek - South	▪ 6-72	Alt D = RL, Alt B = RE1-5	Willow Cr, 299 no sewer services, current dens too high	
Proposed land use designation reflects current parcelization and use				
Willow Creek - North	▪ 5-39	Alt D = RL, Alt B = RL1-4	Willow Cr, country club area, ~1/4 acre smallest	
	▪ 5-51	Alt D = AR, Alt B = RE1-5	Willow Creek, developed single family residential, limited development potent	
	▪ 5-59	Alt D = CS, Alt B = RE2.5-5	Willow Creek, Willow Rd area	

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas			Vote R,M,D
Highway 299 East: <i>Includes Unincorporated Blue Lake, Glendale Willow Creek and Surrounding Areas</i>			
Proposed land use designation reflects existing mix of housing and commercial, industrial reuse, or infill opportunity			
Willow Creek - North	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 5-56 Alt D = IG, Alt B = RM Proposed land use designation reflects existing mix of housing and commercial, industrial reuse, or infill opportunity infill ▪ 5-57 Alt D = IG, Alt B = CS Proposed land use designation reflects existing mix of housing and commercial, industrial reuse, or infill opportunity infill ▪ 5-60 Alt D = IG, Alt B = PF Proposed land use designation reflects existing mix of housing and commercial, industrial reuse, or infill opportunity infill ▪ 5-65 Alt D = CS, Alt B = MU Proposed land use designation reflects existing mix of housing and commercial, industrial reuse, or infill opportunity infill ▪ 5-66 Alt D = CS, Alt B = MU Proposed land use designation reflects existing mix of housing and commercial, industrial reuse, or infill opportunity infill ▪ 5-67 Alt D = CS, Alt B = MU Proposed land use designation reflects existing mix of housing and commercial, industrial reuse, or infill opportunity infill ▪ 5-69 Alt D = CS, Alt B = MU Proposed land use designation reflects existing mix of housing and commercial, industrial reuse, or infill opportunity infill 		
Proposed land use designation reflects historic use and surrounding uses			
Willow Creek - North	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 5-28 Alt D = RL(1), Alt B = CR Willow Creek, S.R. 96 owner initiated w/ CR use type 		
Proposed land use designation or boundary reflects improved constraints mapping			
Willow Creek - North	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 5-53 Alt D = AR, Alt B = OS Willow Creek, slope and resource areas adjacent to Trinity ▪ 5-55 Alt D = CR, Alt B = RR5-20 Willow Creek, owner initiated change ▪ 5-58 Alt D = IG, Alt B = OS Willow Creek, slope and resource areas adjacent to Trinity 		
Proposed land use designation reflects surrounding residential uses and/or density			
Willow Creek - South	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 6-70 Alt D = RL(2)/RL(1), Alt B = RE2.5-5 Willow Creek, SR 299 may provide increase in density ▪ 6-71 Alt D = AR, Alt B = RE1-5 Willow Creek, SR 299 would provide increase in density 		
Density and land use designation intended to match parcel size standard of zoning classification			
Willow Creek - North	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 5-29 Alt D = AS, Alt B = RE2.5-5 Willow Creek, prior residential density not appropriate ▪ 5-61 Alt D = RL, Alt B = RE1-5 Willow Creek, prior residential density not appropriate 		

No public comments for this area.

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas				Vote R,M,D
Northern Humboldt Area: <i>Includes Orick, Hoopa, Weitchpec/ Orleans, and Surrounding Areas</i>				
Land Use Requests – staff supports				
Index #	Property Owner	Proposed GPU and Requested Change	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	
85	MCMURRAY THOMAS J JR & GRETHA K TR	Alternative B is T; owner wants CR on portion of property between hwy and river. Orleans area.	Staff supports requested change Map Correction to reflect existing uses - request consistent with Proposed Plan principles	
86	HORN THOMAS W (Jen Kalt)	Alternative B is IG/RE1-5, commenter wants Alternative A Orleans area.	Alternative A accommodates request, staff supports request	
87	MACHADO RICHARD J & KATHLEEN E TR	Alternative B is RR5-20; wants to change RA-10 to 5 acre minimum. Orick/Freshwater Lagoon	Alt B accommodates request – no change needed.	
88	PURCELL KATE M	Alternative B is RR 40 - 160, the property owner wants RR 20 similar to the neighbors	Staff supports making whole parcel RR20.	
89	COMSTOCK DONALD L	Alternative B is TC/AE60 owner wants to retain ag uses and a boundary adjustment between TC and AE60	Staff supports change. Map Correction - request consistent with Proposed Plan principles	
90	CORDOVA MIKE J & BRENDA K	Alternative B is CG; owner wants CR to accommodate possible RV park	Staff supports change. Plan could allow request, Staff is supportive of change to CR	
Land Use Requests – Commission decision				
Index #	Property Owner	Proposed GPU and Requested Change	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	
	None			
Major changes from existing plan				
Map Reference	Index Number	Proposed Change	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	
General Plan Update database error, not a proposed change				
Northern Humboldt	5N-16	Alt D = AEP, Alt B = AE Dry Lagoon, AEP to AE, not a change		

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas			Vote R,M,D
Northern Humboldt Area: <i>Includes Orick, Hoopa, Weitchpec/ Orleans, and Surrounding Areas</i>			
Orick	▪ 2-13	Alt D = AR, Alt B = RR5-20 Orick area, proposed density and use the same	
Map correction			
Northern Humboldt	▪ 5N-20	Alt D = PR, Alt B = TC Big Lagoon area, Land use boundaries to reflect ownership	
Proposed land use designation or density changed to reflect physical constraints			
Orick	▪ 2-10	Alt D = AL, Alt B = RR40-160 Orick area, wetland/flood/slope/habitat	
	▪ 2-12	Alt D = AL, Alt B = RR40-160 Orick area, wetland/flood/slope/habitat	
	▪ 2-6	Alt D = AL, Alt B = RR40-160 Orick area, wetland/flood/slope/habitat	
	▪ 2-9	Alt D = AL, Alt B = RR40-160 Orick area, wetland/flood/slope/habitat	
Proposed land use designation reflects current parcelization and use			
Northern Humboldt	▪ N-1	Alt D = AL40, Alt B = RR5-20 Orleans, will allow legalization of existing dev	
	▪ N-17	Alt D = AG, Alt B = RR5-20 Dry Lagoon area, parcel ~5 acres	
	▪ N-19	Alt D = AG, Alt B = RR5-20 North Big Lagoon area	
	▪ N-2	Alt D = AL40, Alt B = RR5-20 Orleans, will allow legalization of existing dev	
	▪ N-21	Alt D = AR/RCC, Alt B = RR5-20 Weitchpec, previous RCC deleted	
	▪ N-3	Alt D = AL40, Alt B = RR5-20 Orleans, will allow legalization of existing dev	
Orick	▪ 2-15	Alt D = RL, Alt B = CG Orick area, owner initiated former church property	
	▪ 2-7	Alt D = AL, Alt B = RE2.5-5 Orick area, developed parcel	
Proposed land use designation reflects current parcelization and use			
Orick	▪ 2-11	Alt D = IR/P, Alt B = CR Orick area, former Simpson mill	
	▪ 2-14	Alt D = CR, Alt B = MU Proposed land use designation reflects existing mix of housing and commercial, industrial reuse, or infill opportunity infill	
	▪ 2-4	Alt D = IR, Alt B = CR Orick area, Redwood Parks Lodge initiated proposal	
	▪ 2-5	Alt D = AS/AE, Alt B = CR Orick area, Redwood Parks Lodge initiated proposal	
Willow Creek-North	▪ 5-50	Alt D = IG, Alt B - RL3-8 Proposed land use designation reflects existing mix of housing and commercial, industrial reuse, or infill opportunity infill	
Proposed land use designation reflects public or quasi public ownership or use			
Orick	▪ 2-8	Alt D = AL, Alt B = P Orick, Redwood Nat'l Park property	
Density and land use designation intended to match parcel size standard of zoning classification			
Northern Humboldt	▪ N-18	Alt D = AG, Alt B = RR5-20 North Big Lagoon area	

Draft Land Use Maps: Geographic Areas				Vote R,M,D
Northern Humboldt Area: <i>Includes Orick, Hoopa, Weitchpec/ Orleans, and Surrounding Areas</i>				